

Minutes of the Fourteenth Meeting of the Asbestos Liaison Group, held on 21 January 2005, Belford House, Edinburgh

Present

HSE

Anne Wilson, Chair, Head of Health Unit
Trevor Johnson, Head of ALU
June Cairns, ALU
Liz Standen, ALU
Martin Gibson, Scotland Specialist Group
Robbert Hermanns, Scotland Specialist Group
Bill Macdonald, CFPD

TAs/TUs

Mike Keeligan, ACAD
Mike Wilkes, ACAD
Rob Blackburn, ATaC
Terry Jago, ARCA
Grant Beglan, ARCA
Richard Morgan, GMB
Susan Murray, TGWU

1 Introductions, apologies, welcome etc

1.1 Ms Wilson welcomed everyone to the meeting and tendered apologies for absence on behalf of Mr Williams and Mr Walkin, HSE and from Miss Prentice, ACAD and Mr Harris, NFDC. She explained that whilst Mr Phillips from HSE's Central Specialist Division would no longer attend ALG meetings, unless the subject matter required it, he would remain a "paper" member of the Group and would participate in the ("virtual") technical sub group. She also announced that, due to a change in their portfolios, neither Dr Hermanns nor Mrs Standen would attend future meetings. She thanked them for their contributions. At the end of the meeting Mr Macdonald announced that he would be moving on promotion and that this would be his last ALG meeting. Members offered their congratulations and recorded their thanks for his contribution and participation to the Group over the last 4 years.

2 Minutes of the meeting held on 23 September 2004

2.1 The minutes were agreed.

3 Matters arising

3.1 **(3.8 – Guidance update)** discussion remitted to substantive agenda item 4.

3.2 **(3.9 – Soffit Guide)** discussion remitted to substantive agenda item 4.

3.3 **(3.10 – Analysts and decontamination)** Mr Blackburn reported that the current guidance on this was open to interpretation. Dr Gibson stated that the guidance contained in the forthcoming Analysts Guide was much clearer about the decontamination procedures analysts were expected to follow including what should be worn under coveralls if the enclosure was not shown to be clean, etc.

Item discharged

3.4 **(4.1 – Protimeters – other moisture measurement techniques)** – Ms Cairns confirmed that a colleague of Mr Gwilliam was developing a fluorescent dye technique that would indicate when the material was sufficiently wet. HSE would be interested in assessing its merits once the system had been fully developed.

Item discharged

3.5 **(6.2, 6.4, 6.5, 6.6, 6.7 – all actions relating to moving ALG forward) -** discussion remitted to substantive agenda item 5.

3.6 **(7.2 – possible changes to asbestos licence charging regime) –** Mr Johnson thanked members for their comments. He had no further developments to report at present. This was because HSE's finance team had been concentrating their efforts on preparing the usual annual fees uprate (Health and Safety (Fees) Regulations 2005). However, the submission to the Minister had flagged up the issue. Mr Jago reported that when this was discussed at ARCA regional meetings, members stated a preference for fees to be based on the number of notifications, resulting in proportionate charging, whereby busier companies would pay more. This was the system operated by the Environment Agency for special waste carriage/disposal. Otherwise, contractors would find it difficult to take random, ad hoc charging on an individual basis on board. Mr Keeligan added that ultimately the additional costs would be passed on to the client.

Item discharged

3.7 **(7.4 – Polythene bags for asbestos waste) -** Mr Jago reported that there was a worldwide shortage of polythene expected, as a result of which imports of thinner bags were anticipated. Mrs Standen reminded members that if they came across evidence of sub-standard bags being supplied to report the matter to HSE.

Item discharged

3.8 **(8.1 – supervisory licence holder training)** Mrs Standen confirmed that the ALG memo 8/01 (rev) had been amended to take account of the new training guidance and had been issued as ALG Memo 3/05. It would be available on HSE's website.

Item discharged

3.9 **(8.3 Asbestos Workers Registration Scheme)** Ms Wilson had hoped that other members might have taken the opportunity to become involved in the development and promotion of the scheme initiated by ARCA. She noted the comments made by ALG members that the decision to register rested with individual members of the organisations they represented, but was disappointed. She had hoped others would have been encouraged to become involved in the scheme at an operational level. Mr Jago reiterated the comments made at the last meeting viz that ARCA would prefer to make this an industry wide scheme and that they had hoped to hand it over to another organisation to continue once the scheme was in place. The official launch would take place on 4 April 2005.

Item discharged

4 Guidance Update

4.1 **Analyst Guide** - Dr Gibson reported that the Analyst Guide (HSG 248, priced £16.50 ISBN 07176 28752) would be published in February (post meeting note – 10.2.05) and would replace EH10, MDHS 39 and MDHS 77. The delay had been caused by the time required (7 months) by HSE's publications section for editing, checking, etc. Some minor changes, mainly to aid clarification, had been made to the document since being submitted for publication in July. None of the changes were significant or changed the substance of the guidance.

4.2 **Licensed Contractors Guide** – Dr Gibson confirmed that he was now working on this and hoped to send it to the publishers in March. However, in the light

of the recent experience with the Analyst Guide, it was unlikely to be published until the autumn. Because of the delay it had been decided, as an interim solution, to produce an ALG memo, which would provide information about the significant changes contained in the guide. The ALG memo would then have the same status as guidance, but until then the existing standards (eg EH47, EH51, etc) would apply. Dr Gibson agreed to approach the publishers to explore the possibilities of speeding up the publication process.

Action: Dr Gibson

5 Moving ALG Forward

5.1 ALG “Branding”

5.1.1 Mrs Standen explained the thinking behind this viz that if we wanted ALG to become a vehicle for leading on and sharing good practice for the whole of the wider asbestos community (and not just the parts of it represented by the current ALG membership) it might assist to have an “ALG brand”. For example we might have usefully been able to include an ALG brand to promote the posters developed recently by ARCA, instead of considering the use of the traditional HSE logo alongside ARCA’s. In this instance, ARCA used the “working in partnership with HSE” logo instead. Some members thought that this logo/brand would suffice for ALG.

5.1.2 This then sparked a wider discussion about the need to analyse the key stakeholders who have an interest and who have the power to influence standards in the industry. It was acknowledged that there were a number of interest groups not represented by ALG and that it could be argued by some that currently ALG was seen as a “closed shop”.

5.1.3 The following was agreed:-

(i) Members to provide comments to Ms Cairns on the branding issue (ie whether it is desirable/suggested appropriate wording/proposals as to what the logo might look like) by **4 February 2005**.

Action: All

(ii) A stakeholder analysis exercise would be carried out by a sub group eg 6/7 ALG members* plus a member of Policy Group, experienced in this type of exercise to act as facilitator. It was noted that the group would need to consider the outcome of a similar exercise to analyse Duty To Manage stakeholders, as some stakeholders were likely to apply to both groups

(*Eg Ms Murray, Mr Morgan, Mr Beglan/Mr Jago, Ms Cairns, an ALPI and Policy Group rep)

Action:Ms Cairns

(iii) ALU would consider sending an electronic alert to the asbestos web community to inform them about the availability of the ARCA posters mentioned earlier.

Action:Ms Cairns

5.2 Step Change Event for Licensed Contractors

5.2.1 Mr Johnson gave a progress report on this initiative, which was to hold a half day event for the Chief Executive Officers plus one other, of licensed companies based in the North West of England, whose licence would expire before December 2006. The event had originally been scheduled for late March but it was now likely to take place on 16 June 2005 at the JJB stadium in Wigan. He explained that the event was being pitched at a high level to motivate those who could influence the culture, direction, performance and standards within their companies – for this reason invitations would be restricted to 2 per company. Although the detail had yet to be worked out, the probable format would be a mixture of plenary and breakout sessions (eg business self improvement; licence complacency; the gap between the standards that can be achieved and what it actually achieved) plus an action planning session. It was likely that a non-HSE person might be involved in the event to get the message across. The event was being run as a pilot – if successful further events would follow. Now that plans for the initiative were more developed, Mr Johnson welcomed the involvement of ALG members and invited comments.

5.2.2 In response to the query as to why not all of the licence holders from North West England would be invited, Mr Johnson explained that this was because the evaluation in the medium term would be followed up at licence renewal assessments, so it was necessary to include licensees who would be reassessed in the short/medium term. There was also the issue of logistics and manageable numbers to be considered. In the short term, there would be some form of validation a few weeks after the event, eg phone calls to check on progress, etc. Ms Murray asked about whether a traditional style Safety and Health Awareness Day (SHAD) had been considered. Mr Johnson acknowledged the value of SHADs but felt that these were more pitched at telling people at operative level what they needed to do, whereas this event was aimed at top management. Admittedly, the asbestos SHADs held in Yorkshire and the North East of England had been aimed at management, but the focus had been different – the step change event was about trying to motivate the CEOs to want to change the culture within their companies from seeing compliance as aspirational to being the normal standard.

5.2.3 Mr Jago confirmed that ARCA would like to be involved and was hopeful that they might be able to assist by providing some form of sponsorship. It was agreed that members would consider their level of involvement in the event and let Ms Cairns have their ideas and any offers of financial help by **28 February 2005**.

Action: TAs/Tus

5.3 Moving ALG forward – progress report

5.3.1 Ms Cairns reported that for a number of reasons, none of the actions remitted to a variety of members at the last meeting had been progressed. Whilst this was disappointing, the earlier discussion on branding and stakeholders had led her to think that it might be wise to hold in abeyance further work on the revised role, purpose and plan of work of ALG until after the stakeholder analysis exercise had been completed. It would then seem sensible to involve new stakeholders in the process to agree aims, objectives, plan etc. This was agreed. In the meantime, the table of issues appended to the paper would be updated with progress information. It was noted that ultimately we needed to agree on a small number of projects, which would result in reducing exposure to asbestos.

Action: Ms Cairns

6 Policy Group Issues

6.1 Asbestos Worker Protection Directive (AWPD)

6.1.1 Mr Macdonald reported that the key issues emerging from this work included:- **the revised control limit** – the directive stated a single control limit of 0.1f/ml over 8 hour TWA. HSE was currently considering 3 options viz:

- (1) 0.1f/ml over 8 hours - all types of asbestos; or
- (2) 0.1f/ml over 4 hours - all types of asbestos; or
- (3) 0.1f/ml over 4 hours for amosite and chrysotile and 0.05f/ml over 4 hours for crocidolite

6.1.2 He welcomed any views from members on these options.

Action: All

6.1.3 **definition of licensable work** - the term “sporadic and low intensity” used in AWPD would feature in the regulations with an explanation in the ACoP of what this meant and the work that would require a licence (also likely to be explained in a chart format indicating that work above a certain line would require a licence). The current short duration exemption, which has been convenient but was not logical in terms of risk, would end, as would the exemption for employers working on their own premises using their own employees.

6.1.4 Work with asbestos insulating board (other than minor “Asbestos Essentials” type tasks) would continue to be licensable, in view of the risk. On asbestos containing decorative coatings, however, the initial findings of the work being undertaken by HSL on fibre release had shown the levels had been very, very low. Therefore, in view of the low risk, work with decorative coating was likely not to require a licence in future.

6.1.5 It was planned to dispense with ASLIC and include the relevant regulations in CAWR.

6.1.6 **Training** – he reported that the ACoP would bring in the concept of competence by linking training with certain passport schemes. Whilst the ACoP would recommend this it could not be made mandatory, as HSE was unable to make an economic case for it at present.

6.1.7 **Health surveillance** – he confirmed that it was hoped to change the current arrangements to make the medical into a fitness for work medical.

6.2 Outcome of meeting with UKAS

6.2.1 **Accreditation for 4-stage clearance** – Mr Macdonald said that it was likely that accreditation for 4-stage clearance would become mandatory. It was acknowledged that not all work required all four stages of the clearance procedure (eg licensable work done outside; minor works,etc), so this would need to be taken into consideration.

6.2.2 **Accreditation for asbestos surveying** – he reported that whilst the accreditation scheme for asbestos surveying organisations had been very successful (91 organisations accredited with a further 66 in the process) there were still problems with the individual personnel certification schemes, neither of which had got off the ground yet. As such it would not be possible to make accreditation/certification

a mandatory requirement, although there might be an opportunity to do so when the proposals to extend the duty to manage regulation were considered at a later date.

6.2.3 WHO counting method – this would be included in the new regulations and the plan was for all laboratories to switch to the new method at the same time when the regulations come into force in 2006.

6.3 Other issues

6.3.1 Licence suspension - Mr Johnson explained that it had been HSE's intention to include this in the new regulations, however HSE Solicitors had confirmed that this would not be permitted under HSWA. It would however be acceptable to revoke a licence and if appropriate grant a new one within a relatively short time scale, thereby achieving the same ends as a licence suspension. It was intended to provide the detail of what this entailed in the revised ACoP.

6.3.2 Mr Jago was concerned about the proposals to remove decorative coatings from the licensing regime and asked for an explanation. Mr Macdonald explained that the reason was because the evidence showed that precautions were not proportionate to the risks. Dr Gibson added that irrespective of licensing, consideration would still need to be given to developing appropriate standards to control, contain, minimise the spread, etc of asbestos containing decorative coatings. In some instances an enclosure would be necessary, in other situations it wouldn't. Mr Macdonald agreed that in the circumstances there might be a case for providing specific guidance for work with decorative coatings.

6.3.3 In response to Mr Blackburn's query about how to classify materials that were found to contain one or two asbestos fibres (eg single fibre identified in a carpet, towel etc) Mr Macdonald confirmed that there was no intention to introduce a de minimus limit in the new regulations.

6.4 Mr Macdonald hoped to have more definite proposals available soon, which he would arrange to have circulated to ALG members for their initial thoughts prior to the formal consultative exercise.

Action: Mr Macdonald

7 Asbestos Licensing Unit Update

7.1 Use of step ladders in enclosures – Mr Johnson reported that following an appeal a prohibition notice had been upheld. One of the reasons the job had been stopped was because an operative was using a step ladder in an enclosure to gain access to remove AIB ceiling tiles. In the inspector's opinion there was a risk of falling (bearing in mind the weight of the ACM, the manual handling issues, manoeuvring and balancing skills required for shadow vacuuming, etc) and a safer system of work was required (eg tower scaffold). Only when it was not practicable to use some form of scaffolding would step ladders be acceptable for work with asbestos.

7.2 Draft ALG Memos – Ms Cairns circulated the latest draft versions of 2 new ALG memos – 1/05 Asbestos containing archshields used in electrical switchgear and ALG 2/05 Notification of licensed asbestos work. She asked for comments to be sent to her by 28 February 2005.

Action: TAs/TUs

7.3 **PAS 60 update** – Ms Cairns confirmed that all three parts of the PAS 60 specification for equipment used in asbestos removals work had been produced. She was currently arranging for a note to go on the HSE website to “advertise” them. BSI had also been approached about the possibility of making copies of the standards available electronically.

7.4 **Licence holder matters** – Mr Johnson reported that an applicant had been refused a licence outright in August last year. Since then, they had taken significant steps to effect an improvement and were subsequently granted a licence for a short period (6 months) in late December. He also mentioned that a licence review board would meet in early February to consider the case for revoking a licence.

8 Trade Association Issues

8.1.1 **ASB5s and acknowledgement of receipt** – Mr Jago referred to an incident whereby a dispute arose about whether a notification had been submitted. He appreciated automatic receipts could be received for notifications submitted electronically and noted that this was covered in the draft ALG memo 2/05, however on this occasion there had been an IT system failure. He sought confirmation that all HSE offices were equipped to receive electronic notifications. Ms Cairns responded that in some HSE offices 95% of notifications were now received electronically. She was sure that all offices had the facility but undertook to check.

Post meeting note – confirmed that **all** main HSE offices and most local offices have the facility to receive electronic notifications

8.1.2 **Licensed contractor/independent analyst failings** – Mr Jago had been asked by an ARCA member about the legal position if a laboratory has issued a clearance certificate for an area that was subsequently found not to have been cleaned properly by the licensed contractor. Dr Gibson stated that this was why it was imperative that the licensed contractor and the analyst liaised properly at the outset of the contract so that the latter was clear about their responsibilities. It was the licensed contractor’s responsibility to clean the area. If residual amounts of asbestos were left after completion, then the contractor was at fault. However, if the analyst incorrectly cleared the area, then they were also at fault.

9 Any other business

9.1 **Qualification and Curriculum Authority** – Mr Johnson reported that Mrs Standen had recently attended a QCA seminar in HSE. As some of the information provided might be relevant to the work of the training providers, he would arrange for the issue to be put on the agenda for the training providers seminar on 16 February.

Action: Mr Johnson

9.2 **Mesothelioma death of hairdresser** – Mr Jago referred to the recent report in the press of a hairdresser who had died of mesothelioma as a result of the asbestos contained in old style hood hairdryers used in the salon and asked about the type of asbestos that had been used. Dr Gibson confirmed it wasn’t certain which type of asbestos the hairdryers had contained. Older equipment contained a combination of crocidolite and chrysotile; more recent equipment contained only chrysotile asbestos.

10 **Date, time, location of next meeting**

10.1 The next meeting would take place at 10.00am on 19 May 2005 in Rose Court, London. (The next again meeting was confirmed for 22 September 2005 in Edinburgh).

ANNEX

The Asbestos Liaison Group – moving forward

Outcome of ALG sub group meeting - discussion paper for September 2004 ALG meeting

1 At the May 2004 ALG meeting, members were asked to comment on:

- (a) the proposed revised aim of the asbestos industry;
- (b) the contents of the table included in the previous paper;
- (c) other/better ways of communicating on technical issues, rather than through ALG; and
- (d) the proposals for step change events aimed at MD level

The ALG sub-group was asked to review members' comments and to put forward proposals to the September 2004 ALG meeting. The sub-group, comprising Grant Beglan (ARCA); Susan Murray (TGWU) and June Cairns (ALU), met on 3 September 2004 to do this.

2 Aim(s) for the licensed asbestos industry

Based on the comments received, the following aims for the industry are proposed:-

- (i) To prevent any new cases of asbestos related disease arising out of work with asbestos by achieving exemplary standards within the asbestos removal industry, acknowledging that the legal standard is a minimum and not an aspirational standard;
- (ii) To ensure work is carried out by suitably trained, competent, well-motivated and involved personnel at all levels; and
- (iii) To develop and maintain the most safe and effective work techniques and promote the diversity of effective, robust, well maintained work equipment

[The sub-group recognise that this is wordy but were unable to come up with something snappier!]

3 Targets and objectives for the industry

One of the comments received from ALG favoured setting a target for improvement as an aim for the industry. Rather than include this as an aim, the sub-group considered whether this could be converted into a target or objective for the industry, which could be measured.

We can't use accident/ill health statistics like other sectors as a measure of determining improvement in performance – but we do have performance data for asbestos work based on inspector site visits. Currently only 20% of sites visited require no action, which means on 80% of visits inspectors either provide advice, send a letter or take enforcement action. We could use this information as a baseline and chart progress within a timescale. The sub-group discussed this and acknowledged the difficulties of setting such a target, but felt at the same time that some form of target was needed. The following industry objective or target is suggested below:-

Industry objective:

To improve performance onsite so that at least 80% of licensed jobs achieve compliance with at least the minimum legal standards within xx?? years; **or**

To achieve compliance on all sites with a 20% incremental improvement annually.

3 Revised role and purpose of ALG:

3.1 The sub-group considered the existing purpose of ALG taken from the existing terms of reference (see below) and proposed a revision – see 3.2

Current version: The purpose of the Group is to provide a forum, which will work together in a constructive way:

- To provide an opportunity to share information and exchange views on asbestos issues, in particular those that impact upon the asbestos licensing regime;
- To promote best standards and practice in relation to control and work with asbestos;
- To identify and raise issues of concern in relation to asbestos matters and develop an outline of possible solutions;
- To promote consistency of approach GB wide, on asbestos issues, in particular those that impact upon the asbestos licensing regime.

3.2 Suggested revised purpose and role of ALG:

The purpose of the Asbestos Liaison Group is to provide a forum, which will support and drive the asbestos licensed industry forward in order to achieve its (the industry's) overall aims. The ALG does this by helping the industry to:

- bring about positive cultural change at all levels
- recognise the need to have challenging targets and to achieve them
- focus attention on areas of work where contractors are poorly performing
- promote greater worker involvement at all levels
- promote best standards and practice
- contribute to making information and advice clearer and simpler
- get the right messages across to all licensed contractors

The ALG intends to do this by developing a plan of work, which will target the top xxxx issues?

4 Table of “issues” and key priorities for ALG

The sub-group reviewed the comments received and have included these in the table – see attached - using Anne's suggested headings (basic standards, aspirational issues, competence and support). As can be seen, many of the items are being progressed to some degree already, whilst some may be less likely to be taken

forward. The sub-group felt that some issues might naturally fall to a technical or training sub group to deal with, if it is decided to proceed on this basis.

The sub-group's opinion was that ALG should focus on a **few** priorities and identify key deliverables over the short term and medium term, which would form the basis of an ALG workplan. These could be drawn from the items on the table. For example

- (i) To promote/assist in holding a series of events for MDs etc aimed at securing commitment that a cultural step change is necessary within the industry;
- (ii) To assist in the development of user friendly asbestos operative employee handbook (in the style of essential health and safety toolkit)

ALG are now requested to prioritise the issues contained in the table and decide which ones are appropriate to progress.

5 How to deal with technical issues on ALG

Comments received suggest that the industry should be encouraged to channel queries via their Trade Associations and the Training Providers WG (TPWG). Queries can then be submitted in writing to ALU and the response communicated by email to all ALG members. There were also suggestions that a technical sub committee should be set up with support to continue the TPWG. The sub-group favoured the latter suggestion, although there is an issue about the amount of resource this would require.

However the comment has also been made that although HSE don't view ALG's prime function as resolving technical queries, there does still have to be vehicle for clarifying grey area issues of interpretation and that this facility should remain.

ALG are now requested to decide on whether to create a separate technical committee and if so, its remit and membership.

6 Review feedback from ALG members about potential "step change" events

Very little feedback was received from ALG members about the proposals for these events and the sub-group ran out of time to discuss in any detail. As there have been no objections to the proposals, can we assume that ALG therefore support the initiative????

7 Action

ALG members are asked to consider the issues in this paper and to;

- (i) agree the proposed revised aims for the industry;
- (ii) agree the proposed target for the industry;
- (iii) agree the proposed revised purpose and role of ALG;
- (iv) decide on the priorities to be taken forward by ALG;
- (v) agree on method for communicating on technical issues; and
- (vi) agree on the way forward for proposed "step change" events.

Basic standards issues	Aspirational issues	Competence issues	Support issues
<p>1 Enforcing Authorities to approve Method Statement prior to work commencing (eg Belgium) [comment rec'd – worthy aspiration – but insufficient resource to achieve] No further action proposed at present (Feb 05)</p>	<p>9 Developing role/influence of Trade Associations – pre membership HO audits; membership criteria; site audit schemes; standards committee [comment – good idea – could help set standards that inspectors might seek to apply in some way to non TA members (eg require 3rd party site audit) – but TA systems and audits must be robust – anecdotal feedback to the contrary. Do ACAD/NFDC carry out independent audits?] For ACAD/NFDC to consider further ? (Feb 05)</p>	<p>13 Training Providers forum (cf 10) [comment – good idea to continue with this forum – would help consolidate earlier work and help with benchmarking. ARCA should be encouraged to re-join] Seminar planned for TPs on 16.2.05 (Feb 05)</p>	<p>21 Develop website/ web communities/e: registration tool [comment – this ties in with items 15 and 23 – we could put something on the website for one off clients explaining what they need to do and what they should expect of the licensed contractor. But concerns too that some contractors will miss out on updates if they are only available electronically] website development ongoing (Feb 05)</p>
<p>2 3rd party monitor the work (eg Supervisory Licence Holder/consultant/ auditor [comment – good idea – but not feasible in current political climate – likely to lead to accusations of OTT approach. But as contractors work better when a 3rd party is present – how can the same effect be achieved? No further action proposed at present (Feb 05)</p>	<p>10 Create ALG sub groups for technical/training/compliance/communications (inc intelligence) issues [comment – good idea if the groups are “notional” – otherwise could be resource intensive if expected to meet too often] Agreed in principle (Feb 05)</p>	<p>14 Refocus content of management training (eg ARCA course) [comment – this should help address a problem which crops up often at licence assessments demonstrating poor management abilities. Fits in with item 22. This issue could be dealt with by Training WG] Remit to Training WG (Feb 05)</p>	<p>22 Influencing directors – changing standards from within companies [comment – see item 14 comments. Also links in with proposals for step change events] 16.6.05 Step Change event pilot planned for CEOs/MDs in North West ALG members involvement encouraged (Feb 05)</p>

Basic standards issues	Aspirational issues	Competence issues	Support issues
<p>3 More inspector visits – esp Local Authority Environmental Health Officers [comment – supported. HSE LA strategic programme and proposed initiative re training of EHOs should help] Project planned for 05/06 to deliver asbestos removal /DTM training at 15 seminars for EHOs (Feb 05)</p>	<p>11 Develop user friendly employee handbook rather than usual “heavy” HSE publications [comment – supported – would need to be joint venture with all ALG parties. ACAD have produced an alternative ACoP; ARCA developing cartoon based posters.] ARCA Posters produced – HSE to consider including reference to them on the website. Re handbook, views expressed at ALG suggest there are already plenty of publications available – the bottom line- would a handbook reduce employee exposure? (Feb 05)</p>	<p>15 Develop better client training [comment – agree with the thinking but the problem is so many clients are one offs. An issue for Training WG idc?] No further action proposed at present (Feb 05)</p>	<p>23 Getting message across to clients (need for planning/take time/costs) [comment – see comments at item 21] Stakeholder analysis exercise planned – decisions to be made idc about widening membership of ALG to represent wider asbestos community (Feb 05)</p>
<p>4 National HSE asbestos inspection team [comments – mixed views about how effective this would be in practice. But HSE’s nominated asbestos personnel (ie personnel who can enter enclosures) are regarded as a national resource which can be deployed across GB as necessary] No further action proposed at present (Feb 05)</p>	<p>12 Worker safety advisors - improved consultation and worker involvement/ empowerment to challenge employer’s bad practices (cf 19). Improved access to specialist advice for employers/employees[comment – supported – asbestos industry would benefit from this – but what about resistance?] ACAD/GMB have submitted their application for funding for year 2 of the scheme. (Feb 05)</p>	<p>16 Registration scheme for asbestos workers [comment – ARCA have started work on this. Scheme to be available for all asbestos employers/ employees; ARCA will sponsor in first year. WG being set up – now is the time for others (ACAD, NFDC, GMB, TGWU) to get involved] No take up from other ALG members – leave it up to individuals. Possible to link with a passport scheme supported in the revised ACoP (Feb 05)</p>	<p>24 Involvement of insurance industry??? [comment – what about their involvement from the point of view of dealing with emergency works (burst pipes and artex ceilings etc) and their knowledge and awareness of the requirements? Some work done on awareness raising already] See comments at 23 above (Feb 05)</p>
<p>5 Elimination of uncontrolled dry stripping</p>	<p>12(a) New item –</p>	<p>17 Accreditation/ Training Providers [comment –</p>	<p>25 Language</p>

Basic standards issues	Aspirational issues	Competence issues	Support issues
<p>[comment – evidence suggests this practice continues. Robust enforcement line taken when encountered]</p> <p>Work ongoing to monitor at site visits/follow up complaints (Feb 05)</p>	<p>Development of more robust equipment [comment – addressed to some extent by PAS 60 work]</p> <p>PAS 60 in place – no further action proposed in immediate future (Feb 05)</p>	<p>licensing not a viable option. Accreditation – an issue for Training WG to pursue in the longer term. Meantime, HSE project to monitor selection of TPs to check compliance with forthcoming training guidance – see item13. HSL project to start in early 2005 (Feb 05)</p>	<p>new item – issues re immigrant asbestos workers and English not being first language</p> <p>Training issue?</p>
<p>6 New licence holders – treat as“ probationers” approach [comment – HSE try to do this already by targeting new licence holders for visits. Can’t join ARCA until licensee has operated for at least a year. Rules for ACAD/NFDC?] No further HSE action planned at present- ACAD/NFDC to consider ? (Feb 05)</p>		<p>18 Impact on EC Asbestos Worker Protection directive on training [comment – Training WG issue idc] Implications to be addressed in CD -no further action proposed at present (Feb 05)</p>	
<p>7 Tougher penalties - eg penalty point system – 3 strikes and out/ licence suspension/easier revocation [comment – supported – HSE seeking legal advice re suspension and need to change law; revised revocation policy issued - August 04] Licence suspension to be achieved via modified revocation procedure. Other</p>		<p>19 Better intelligence -- eg whistleblowers line (cf 12) [comment – OK so long as complainants try and resolve issues in house first and don’t come straight to HSE (But accepted this route always needs to be there). Also raises a resource issue. Probably best to use informal channels eg TPs; TAs (via audit problems); TUs; analysts, etc</p>	

Basic standards issues	Aspirational issues	Competence issues	Support issues
<p>options for further discussion idc (Feb 05)</p>		<p>rather than separate, dedicated whistleblowers line. Already happening in some respects – referrals from TPs, analysts, equipment suppliers received in HSE and followed up (Feb 05)</p>	
<p>8 Impact of Asbestos Worker Protection directive/Asbestos (Licensing) Regulations review – deregulation? Eg soffits; artex ALG to be involved in informal consultation prior to formal CD exercise (Feb 05)</p>		<p>20 Better targeting of contractors - improved IT ALU/COIN*/ANS* * HSE computer systems [comment – HSE is getting better at this – but new IT system might present problems. Also problems re sharing of targeting info with LAs] Dependent upon the capability of COIN (Feb 05)</p>	