

Minutes of the Thirteenth Meeting of the Asbestos Liaison Group, held on 23 September 2004, Rose Court

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
Andy Phillips, CSD3A
Bill MacDonald, CFPD
Kevin Walkin, CFPD
Mike Williams, ALPI (Rose Court)

TAs/TUs

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

1 Introductions, apologies, welcome etc

1.1 Mr MacDonald chaired the meeting until midday when Ms Wilson, Mr Johnson and Ms Cairns arrived after severe travel delays. Mr MacDonald thanked everyone for attending and welcomed Richard Morgan from the GMB and Mike Williams, ALPI, to the group. Apologies were received from Susan Murray, TGWU, Jean Prentice, ACAD, and John Harris, the new NFDC representative.

2 Minutes of the meeting held on 20 May 2004

2.1 The minutes were agreed.

3 Matters arising

3.1 **(3.1 – Protimeter devices)** discussion remitted to substantive agenda item 5.

3.2 **(3.2 – type 5 coveralls)** Dr Gibson and Dr Phillips both commented on the specification for overalls. Category 3, Type 5 would be specified in the Contractors' Guide as the maximum standard required. Dr Phillips was concerned that a higher specification could result in the wearer suffering from heat stress.

Item discharged

3.3 **(3.4 – asbestos waste packaging items)** Mrs Standen reported that there was unlikely to be changes made to the ADR requirements for the carriage of hazardous goods in the near future. In the meantime, a pragmatic approach to waste handling will be set out in the Contractors' Guide. Mr Blackburn said that he was informed that waste was being hidden from analysts to allow the clearance to be issued. Mr Williams said that there was often no space to store a skip on London sites and that there was likely to be an increase in transfer stations as a result.

(Post meeting note: Contact has been made with the Department for Transport to pursue the long-term goal of resolving the issue of conflicting legislation).

Item discharged

3.4 **(4.5 - Asbestos Liaison Group – moving forward)** Discussion remitted to substantive agenda item 6.

- 3.5 **(4.6 – (Success criteria)** Discussion remitted to substantive agenda item 6.
- 3.6 **(4.7 – Sub group meeting)** Discussion remitted to substantive agenda item 6.
- 3.7 **(5.4 – PAS standards)** Mr Keeligan stated that all 3 standards should be published by the end of 2004.

Item discharged

3.8 **(6.1 – Guidance update)** Dr Gibson stated that the Analysts' Guide was with the publishers and should be available in November. UKAS had already put a draft copy on their website. The Contractors' Guide should be published in February or March 2005. There was a discussion amongst members about the best means of publicising the launch of the guides and it was agreed that a mixture of approaches was required; e.g. via e-mail alerts, Info Line, at the proposed Step Change events, HSE Books and via members' organisations. Dr Gibson stated that the guide for hot work asbestos removal had been withdrawn.

Action: Dr Gibson

3.9 **(6.2 – Soffit Guide)** Dr Gibson said that he had not received any comments from members on the draft guide and that it was on hold until after the Analysts' and Contractors' Guides are published. Mr Wilkes and Mr Beglan were concerned that standards for removal of AIB would drop as a result of publishing the soffit guidance in its current form. Dr Gibson said that further consultation within HSE and with dutyholders would take place before the final HSE line was agreed.

Action: Dr Gibson

3.10 **(8.1 – Analysts decontaminating)** Dr Gibson and Mr Blackburn responded. UKAS check whether analysts decontaminate during their announced site visits. The Analysts' Guide will set out the different forms of decontamination for analysts. Dr Gibson stressed that they should not wear their own clothes under coveralls when entering an uncleared area. Mr Blackburn stated that UKAS expect the analyst to provide RPE etc for their site auditors.

Action: ATaC/ALU (to pursue with UKAS)

4 Protimeters

4.1 Dr Gibson reported that the HSL report would be published shortly and gave out a summary sheet. He summarised the results by saying that he would not advise the use of a Protimeter because the results could be easily misinterpreted and lead to a false sense of security about the moisture content of the product being wetted. The meter detects electrical conductivity rather than actual moisture content. The 2 Guides will mention several different methods of assessing moisture content, but the most important issue is the correct use of wet-strip equipment. ALU agreed to speak to Mr Gwilliam of Asbestostrip Innovations to ask about any moisture measurement techniques he may be developing.

Action: ALU

5 Forthcoming legislative changes

5.1 Mr Walkin gave a summary of the issues to be reviewed as a result of the need to implement the amended asbestos Directive by 15 April 2006 as shown below:

- ✓ Single control limit of 0.1 f/ml³ over 8 hour TWA. Do we want a 4 hour TWA? Do we still need short-term limits?
- ✓ Action levels likely to be abolished
- ✓ Short-term exemption from licensing to be re-defined to fit 'sporadic, low intensity work with non-friable materials'. It will also have an effect on notifications and the need for medical examinations
- ✓ Licensing is not a requirement of the Directive
- ✓ Air monitoring will have to follow the WHO methodology
- ✓ Evidence of competency to work with asbestos containing materials (ACMs) may be required
- ✓ ACMs must be identified before work starts
- ✓ Implications for training of all workers likely to encounter ACMs not just removal workers
- ✓ Definition of licensable ACMs to change
- ✓ Should we have one set of regulations to cover all aspects of asbestos work?

5.2 Mr Macdonald went on to discuss Type 3 surveys and concerns that had been raised about some surveying organisations who had been refused insurance cover for this work. The MDHS 100 definition states that a type 3 survey "is used to locate and describe, as far as reasonably practicable, all ACMs in the building and may involve destructive inspection, as necessary, to gain access to all areas, including those that may be difficult to reach." but the insurance industry's interpretation appeared to go beyond this. In an effort to improve matters, HSE were developing a best practice guide.

5.3 Mr Macdonald reported that HSE had received Ministerial support to explore the case to extend the Duty to Manage regulation to the domestic rented sector, but had also been asked to consider alternatives under other legislation. He stressed that it was very early days, and that the next steps would be to consult with major housing organisations, OGDs, Scottish Executive, etc.

6 Asbestos Liaison Group – moving forward

6.1 Ms Wilson thanked the subgroup for the paper, which incorporated members' comments following the last ALG meeting. (copy appended to the minutes).

6.2 **Draft aims for the asbestos licensed industry** – whilst the meeting accepted the proposed aims, it was agreed these needed to include reference to management standards, commitment, competence, etc. Also the fact that workers must be physically fit to do the work, needed to be reflected. Mr Beglan offered to involve his PR staff to redraft the aims to make them shorter and snappier.

Action: Mr Beglan

6.3 Targets and objectives for the industry – The meeting noted the comments in the sub group’s paper and agreed that we needed a target that was measurable. HSE’s performance figures could be used for this purpose, but there were some problems, as although the figures measured compliance, they did not distinguish easily between serious risk and relatively minor issues, so it was difficult to tease out underlying problems. Ms Wilson suggested that rather than have an HSE biased target, that it might be possible to include targets from industry. Mr Jago mentioned ARCA’s site audit scheme and offered to provide anonymised data on poor performers. Mr Keeligan suggested that the work being done with ACAD members via the Worker Safety Adviser scheme might provide useful data. He confirmed that ACAD did not have a system of site audits. However, applicants were vetted prior to joining the trade association.

6.4 Ms Wilson requested that action be taken in relation to developing targets for the performance of asbestos removal contractors, as follows:-

- (i) Mr Johnson and Mr Blackburn to consider HSE targets;
- (ii) Mr Jago to consider ARCA targets;
- (iii) Mr Keeligan and Mr Morgan to consider ACAD targets

**Action: Mssrs Johnson/Blackburn/
Jago/Keeligan/Morgan**

6.5 Re the draft industry objective – it was agreed this would need to be redrafted in the light of the revised aims, as currently there was a contradiction.

Action: ALG Sub group

6.6 Revised role and purpose of ALG – the meeting were content with the suggested revised role/purpose, subject to including more explicit reference to the roles and priorities for management.

Action: ALG Sub group

6.7 Table of “issues”/key priorities for ALG – it was not possible in the time available to go through the table and prioritise the issues. However everyone accepted that any ALG workplan would have to link to the agreed aims, objectives and targets. The sub group would consider the table contents once the targets had been resolved (see 6.4)

Action: sub group idc

6.8 Technical issues – the meeting favoured the suggestion that technical queries be dealt outwith the ALG. Mr Johnson proposed setting up a “virtual” technical sub group to deal with such queries in future, (if they couldn’t be resolved via Trade Associations, HSE Infoline, etc). The technical sub group would operate electronically, with meetings being held only on rare occasions if the need arose. He envisaged that this would work, by remitting the query to ALU, by email. ALU would set up a technical log, consult the appropriate people and relay the response to all ALG members. Outcomes would be reported at ALG, as a “below the line” matter. Although it was expected that this would be the norm, it was acknowledged that the facility would still remain to raise issues of interpretation, etc at ALG if necessary.

7 ALU Update

7.1 Revised licence revocation policy – Mr Johnson referred to the policy, already circulated to members, which would be available on the HSE website shortly and which provided details of the procedures HSE would follow.

7.2 Possible changes to asbestos licence charging regime – Mr Johnson explained that currently the licence application fee covered the cost associated with the processing and assessment of new and renewal licence applications. However, as it was HSC policy to recover all the costs involved in permissioning regimes (asbestos licensing comes into this category) ALU had been asked by HSE's Finance Policy team to explore the possibility of extending the charging regime to cover the costs of all work in respect of all licensed activities eg inspection visits, investigation of complaints and incidents, processing waiver requests, processing notifications, reviewing method statements, provision of advice, etc. Charges would be based on an hourly charging rate. Consultation would take place once the proposals had been fully explored. In the meantime, members were invited to provide any comments by 29 October 2004 to ALU.

Action: TAs/TUs

7.3 Feedback from Asbestos Training Providers WG meeting - Mr Johnson reported that as the industry had already agreed the content of draft training chapter of the consolidated Licensed Contractors Guide, it had been decided issue the chapter under cover of an ALG memo, rather than wait for the published version next year. He advised that a letter would be going out to all training providers in the next few weeks to tell them to start implementing the guidance forthwith. Training providers who confirmed in writing to HSE that their training complied with the new training guidance, would be included in the list of asbestos trainers on HSE's website. He added that a seminar for all training providers was scheduled for January 2005 and that an HSL project to visit a selection of training providers to assess the content and quality of the courses was likely to commence in April 2005. He envisaged that later next year the WG would be reformed and one of its tasks would be to review progress.

7.4 Polythene bags for asbestos waste – Mrs Standen asked members to let her know of any suppliers they might encounter who provided bags of an inferior quality.

Action: TAs/TUs

7.5 4-stage clearance – provision of certificate of reoccupation to contractor – Ms Cairns mentioned several queries she had received from contractors and inspectors about contractors not being provided with a copy of the certificate of reoccupation if the analyst had been engaged by the client. Mr Blackburn said this was tied in with UKAS procedures. The forthcoming Analyst Guide would cover this point, as irrespective of who had engaged the analyst, the contractor required a copy of the certificate to prove the site had been cleared and for completion of their records.

8 Trade Association issues

8.1 **Supervisory licence holder training** - Mr Jago asked for clarification about the appropriate training for companies holding supervisory licences. Mrs Standen explained that supervisory licence holders would have to cover the appropriate modules in the training chapter of the guidance, including practical training. She undertook to revise the training elements of ALG memo 8/01(rev) on this issue.

Action: Mrs Standen

8.2 **Asbestos Workers Register** – Mr Beglan outlined the scheme being developed by ARCA, through which they hoped to capture as many UK asbestos workers as possible and the project had reached the stage where other bodies could get involved in further development. He explained that the scheme was voluntary and was aimed at providing public access to a database of asbestos industry workers in the UK which would enable employers, clients, etc to check details of an individual's training, medicals, face fit tests, etc. ARCA verified the individual's certification and input the data onto the system. Some members expressed concern about data protection issues and whether the scheme would be better operated by an independent body. Mr Macdonald commented that it might be better if the scheme was mandatory and would explore whether this could be considered for inclusion in the revision of CAWR 2002. Mr Jago confirmed that the scheme would start on 1 January 2005 as an ARCA initiative, but he would be happy for ARCA to relinquish ownership if an appropriate "owner" was found for it.

8.3 Ms Wilson reiterated that whilst ARCA would proceed in the meantime, she encouraged other ALG members to take the opportunity to become involved in the development and promotion of the scheme. In the longer term HSE would consider the legal implications for making the scheme mandatory.

Action: ACAD/TUs/Mr Macdonald

9 Any other Business

9.1 **Wet vacuum cleaners** – Mr Wilkes asked about whether it was acceptable to use this type of equipment to absorb liquid spills (eg injection fluid, etc) for asbestos work. In theory using wet vacs seemed a good idea, but as they didn't have HEPA filters, he asked whether this would be acceptable to HSE, as there could be a problem when the filter dried out. Dr Gibson thought that providing the risk had been assessed and an effective procedure had been developed for dealing with the filter, it would be acceptable to use the equipment, if circumstances permitted.

9.2 **Licensed scaffolders** – Ms Cairns had received a request from a licensed scaffolding company to ask ALG to change the guidance in paragraph 5 of ALG memo 3/03 about foreseeability of disturbance along the lines of "if a scaffolding component at any stage is to come within a 2 meter touching distance of any identified/suspected asbestos then a licensed scaffolder will be required". Following discussion it was confirmed that being so prescriptive about when it is foreseeable that asbestos is likely to be disturbed by scaffold erection or dismantling could lead to more difficulties and that the current guidance should stand.

Post meeting note – ALU confirm the current guidance in ALG 3/03 regarding enclosure building and licensed scaffolders is correct viz that a licence is required if a scaffolding contractor erects, alters, maintains or dismantles scaffolding which will form a key part or all of the support from which an enclosure will be built for the purpose of "working with asbestos".

10 **Date, time, location of next meeting(s)**

10.1 The meetings for the next year were confirmed as follows:

27 January 2005 (Edinburgh) – **post meeting note - this date to be rescheduled;**
19 May 2005 (Rose Court)
22 September 2005 (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.

ALG Sub-Group
9 September 2004

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]</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?]</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]</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]</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?]</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]</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]</p>	<p>22 Influencing directors – changing standards from within companies [comment – see item 14 comments. Also links in with proposals for step change events]</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]</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.]</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?]</p>	<p>23 Getting message across to clients (need for planning/take time/costs) [comment – see comments at item 21]</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]</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?]</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]</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]</p>
<p>5 Elimination of uncontrolled dry stripping [comment – evidence suggests this practice continues. Robust enforcement line taken when encountered]</p>	<p>12(a) New item – Development of more robust equipment [comment – addressed to some extent by PAS 60 work]</p>	<p>17 Accredited/ Training Providers [comment – 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.</p>	<p>25 Language new item – issues re immigrant asbestos workers and English not being first language</p>

Basic standards issues	Aspirational issues	Competence issues	Support issues
<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?]</p>		<p>18 Impact on EC Asbestos Worker Protection directive on training [comment – Training WG issue idc]</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]</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 rather than separate, dedicated whistleblowers line.</p>	

<i>Basic standards issues</i>	<i>Aspirational issues</i>	<i>Competence issues</i>	<i>Support issues</i>
<p>8 Impact of Asbestos Worker Protection directive/Asbestos (Licensing) Regulations review – deregulation? Eg soffits; artex</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]</p>	