

Health and Safety Commission Paper		HSC/05/31	
Meeting Date:	8 February 2005	Open Gov. Status:	Fully Open
Type of Paper:	Above the Line	Paper File Ref:	
Exemptions:	None		

## HEALTH AND SAFETY COMMISSION

### Delivering HSC/E's Targets: Summary performance report: 3rd quarter 2004-05

A Paper by Carole Lomax

Agreed by Resource and Delivery Group - January 2005

#### Issue

1. A summary of performance in HSE's Strategic Programmes (SPs) for Quarter 3 (Q3) 2004/05.

#### Timing

2. Routine

#### Recommendation

3. The Commission considers this summary report. The report will then be submitted to the Minister for Work. In short, progress on Major Hazards is very similar to Q2. On the FIT programme significant progress on restructuring, and good progress against key milestones - we are now developing intermediate outcome indicators.

#### Background

4. With the move to full SP working in 2004/05, SP Directors have provided quarterly reports on delivery to HSE's Delivery Board (now subsumed into the newly-formed Resource and Delivery Group (RDG)). This paper contains a summary of the position for Q3 2004/05 (October – December), based on the information provided in the quarterly reports from SP Directors.

#### Argument

5. Q3 has been a busy period including the restructuring of SPs. There are now 2 key strategic 'delivery' programmes – FIT and Major Hazards, aligned with the 2 parts of the new PSA target. In addition, there are now 4 'enabling' programmes – the Local Authorities SP continues as before but we are developing new programmes on Worker Involvement, Business Involvement and Enforcement.
6. Largely positive progress is reported overall. An Amber rating for the FIT SP is based on individual ratings for milestones achieved in Programme blocks (four Ambers/three Greens). Three elements (nuclear/onshore/offshore) of the Major Hazards SP remain Green (offshore improved) but the projection is that the rail target is unlikely to be met. The revised/more detailed LA SP plan is on track: positive feedback is emerging from stakeholders.
7. Table 1 below reports the present position on the 'FIT' programme in a way which enables comparison with reports on Q1 and Q2 while Table 2 provides the current assessment of the component programmes within the new FIT structure. Table 3 shows progress with the Major Hazards Programme and Table 4 shows progress with the Enabling Programmes.

**Table 1: Progress with milestones in the occupational health and safety**

<b>Strategic Programme</b>	<i>Quarter 1 (2004/05)</i>	<i>Quarter 2 (2004/05)</i>		<i>Quarter 3 (2004/05)</i>
<b>Sector SP</b>	<b>A</b>	<b>G</b>	<b>Now merged into the *FIT SP</b>	<b>A</b>
<b>Health and Safety Hazards SP</b>	<b>A</b>	<b>A</b>		
<b>Better Health at Work Partnership (BHWP) SP</b>	<b>R</b>	<b>A</b>		

\*Fit for work, fit for life, fit for tomorrow (FIT): The former Hazards, Sector and Better health at work SPs

**Table 2: FIT SP – Q3 assessment by Strategic Programme Block/Component Programme**

<b>FIT SP – Programme Block/Component Programme</b>	<i>Rating – Q3 2004/05</i>
<b>Injury Reduction</b>	<b>A</b>
<b>Construction</b>	<b>A</b>
<b>Sector Stakeholder Engagement – (Agriculture)</b>	<b>A</b>
<b>Sector Stakeholder engagement (MUST*)</b>	<b>A</b>
<b>Ill Health reduction</b>	<b>G</b>
<b>Disease Reduction</b>	<b>G</b>
<b>Days Lost (public sector)</b>	<b>G</b>

\*MUST – Manufacturing, Utilities, Services, Transport

**Table 3: Progress with the major hazards target (a sustained Reduction in precursor incidents).**

<b>Major Hazards:</b>	<i>Quarter 1 (2004/05)</i>	<i>Quarter 2 (2004/05)</i>	<i>Quarter 3 (2004/05)</i>
<b>Nuclear</b>	<b>G</b>	<b>G</b>	<b>G</b>
<b>Offshore</b>	<b>A</b>	<b>G</b>	<b>G</b>
<b>Onshore</b>	<b>G</b>	<b>G</b>	<b>G</b>
<b>Rail</b>	<b>A</b>	<b>R</b>	<b>R</b>

\* Great care should be taken in interpreting short term performance because statistical uncertainties have to be taken into account

**Table 4: Progress with Enabling Programmes**

<b>Enabling Programme</b>	<i>Quarter 1 (2004/05)</i>	<i>Quarter 2 (2004/05)</i>	<i>Quarter 3 (2004/05)</i>
<b>Local Authorities</b>	<b>A</b>	<b>G</b>	<b>G</b>
<b>Worker Involvement</b>	<b>New enabling programmes In Q3</b>		<b>A</b>
<b>Business Involvement</b>			<b>A</b>
<b>Enforcement</b>			<b>*</b>

\* – not yet assigned

## Key points

8. Highlights include:
  - a) FIT SP: a major step forward in governance – see Annex for milestone/activity highlights.
  - b) Major Hazards SP: Increase in the percentages of resources deployed to front line activities and the development of more effective working relationships and communications with external stakeholders.
  - c) LA SP: at field level, evidence of growing take-up by LAs of the priority topics.
  
9. The FIT SP: Significant progress has been made in designing the new SP. Hand-in-hand with this has been the integration of sector staff into Policy Group (PG) and the reorganisation of PG responsibilities to align with programme activities. Each component programme is continuing to progress planning work to develop innovative interventions, concentrating on

activities that can make the most impact. Work is ongoing to develop and populate intervention logic models (ILM<sup>1</sup>s) (see footnote) that will identify intermediate outcomes to serve as performance indicators for programme measurement. These will not be established before April 2005. Until performance indicators have been established and survey data gathered, an assessment of progress towards delivery cannot be provided, although indications are that planned activity is on track and this is expected to impact on targets.

10. RDG discussed progress of this and other priority programmes at its meeting on 26 January. It welcomed the organisational progress made, and agreed that priority for the next quarter should be to further develop programme governance arrangements at the strategic and component programme level, to continue work on developing intermediate indicators, and to a programme of targeted recruitment to meet the skills deficiencies identified to date.
11. **Major Hazards SP:** The rail status indicator remains at Red (as advised last quarter, the model was modified substantially during Q2, introducing significant changes to the index). This trajectory continues to be above target and the projection is that, although performance is showing slight improvement with respect to the baseline, it is not enough to prevent further divergence from target. HMRI continues to work in conjunction with dutyholders to develop the index, and is also directing its inspection resources towards areas that will help to drive the index in the right direction. All key areas of concern were planned to be challenged at the meeting between HMRI and Network Rail (28 January).
12. **LA SP:** Q3 has seen progress on track with the revised and more detailed LA plan. The Programme is now concentrating on the specific projects identified as delivering the intentions set out in the high-level plan and the Statement of Intent (SoI). Positive signs of engagement include: HSE's Partnership Managers report positive feedback from attendees at Regional events; at field level, there is evidence of growing take-up by LAs of the priority topics and LA practitioners are on the whole positive.
13. **Other Enabling Programmes:** will be covered in their own right in future reports
14. A more detailed summary of performance is attached at Annex 1.

#### Related issues and developments

15.

- A Performance Reporting workshop was held for FIT Programme managers in January. Over 30 managers attended and presentations were given by Jonathan Rees, Jane Willis (SP Director) and CoSAS. CoSAS provided advice on the development of performance indicators;
- Information to the Minister on progress with SP performance will be by way of this written report only for Q3; HSC/E senior managers will meet with the Minister to discuss Q4 performance.

#### **Consultation**

16. This information is a summary of the key issues contained in SP Director performance reports for Q3 and discussions in RDG on 26 January.

#### **Action**

17. The Commission is invited to consider the summary performance report and advise of any changes it wishes to make before it is submitted to the Minister.

---

<sup>1</sup> \* *The Intervention Logic Model (ILM) is a performance management tool, based on the different stages of the delivery chain (i.e. input > output > initial outcome > intermediate outcome > final outcome). The ILM:*

- *Sets out the sequence of changes necessary to deliver outcome targets;*
- *Provides a framework for recording the specific activities and resources proposed to achieve these changes;*  
*and*
- *Identifies evidence to monitor whether a programme is on track to deliver.*

Broadly, the **key points/issues in each of the SP Director's reports** are:

**FIT Strategic Programme** (Amber)

*The worker involvement and business involvement workstreams are reported here this time but will be reported separately as a new policy programme in future*

**Current performance**

Particular milestone/activity highlights include:

- Successful launch of stress management standards – not newsworthy but sensible.
- Setting up the architecture for the GSE element of the Public Services programme – securing commitment and launching the Ministerial Task Force review on managing sickness absence in the public sector.
- Publication of the slips trips assessment tool and guidance on the web site and roll-out of inspirational training to field staff to get them engaged on the topic.
- Agreement to a communications/blitz campaign in 05/06 on slips and trips and MSD.
- Successful completion and evaluation of the Kent transport initiative as an example of partnership working.
- Publication of a package of good practice guidance on managing sickness absence that gained DWP recognition.
- Delivery of construction SHADs and take up of the Construction Skills Certification Scheme in excess of targets.
- Progress ahead of plan on the former MUST waste and recycling project involving stakeholder engagement and establishing baselines for future outcome measurement.
- Very positive feedback following development and launch of the agriculture self-assessment software.
- Successful stakeholder engagement involving a major retailer (ASDA) to harness the pressure they can bring to bear on health and safety standards in the food and farming supply chain.

**Future outlook**

- A number of component programmes are in transition having developed intervention strategies and standards/guidance and now need to establish their delivery plans. Historically operational inspectors would have done this work but the SP is now identifying the skills mis-match referred to above. Increasingly HSE will have to either re-train or recruit new staff to influence and market messages developed.

## **Key challenges to address:**

- re-casting of programmes to align with the new structure and the development of new intervention strategies to increase their contributions to meet the targets given is identifying a skills mis-match in areas such as programme and project management, marketing, outreach and other communications;
- following reorganisation of the strategic programme structure, more needs to be done to help staff working within both the agriculture and MUST programmes to see their work in the new context;
- issues around getting the right staff, with the right skills in the right numbers engaged in programmes;
- programme governance arrangements at the strategic and component programme level are being developed. Existing programme boards will need to be re-cast to include cross-HSE and external representation, and local authorities.

## **Risks**

(i) Lack of coordination/knowledge sharing between programmes (governance arrangements also disrupted by programme re-organisation): **RED** Action taken: Appointment of a Programme Office, Communications Director and Research Coordinator to ensure greater coordination and oversight of programme activity. New governance arrangements being planned.

(ii) Inadequate measures of progress **RED:** Action taken: Establishing the link between targets and outcomes through outcome relationship mapping and ILM work is ongoing.

## **Major Hazards Strategic Programme**

### **Milestones**

**Green.** The assessment is derived from an indicator, which captures outturn against timeliness/quality for the completion of safety case assessments. **Q3** data shows consistent high levels of performance are being maintained (Nuclear = 100%; Offshore = 100%; Onshore = 100%; and Rail = 97.)

### **Risks include:**

(i) Lack of industry commitment: **Q2** (elevated to Amber because (a) Nuclear: Nuclear Decommissioning Authority (NDA) are rushing ahead with commercial tendering;(b) Rail: implementation of major changes arising from the Rail Review might Reduce the focus on safety of key players). **Q3:** NII are confident that the activities of NDA do not present a risk but concerns from the Rail Review remain, (overall risk therefore remains **Amber**).

(ii) Lack of data below precursor level may make it difficult to track progress and detect problems sufficiently early to take appropriate action: **Q1** The proposed MH strategic programme consider development of a richer set of proxy measures. **Q2** Amber: Programme to develop proxy measures now established with good progress made in the onshore chemical industry and with the revisions made to the Rail index providing more data etc. **Q3** The project team has recently completed draft guidance for industry on the suite of proxy measures. Finally, the revisions made to the Rail index provide more data

and permit more sophisticated analyses. This risk will be re-rated once these actions have been seen to provide a better picture of performance. Until then it remains **Amber**.

### **To Note:**

The usual qualifications apply to the major hazards report:

a) It is important not to draw too many conclusions from quarterly data. However, there is nothing to suggest, at this stage, that significant problems are likely to arise in the foreseeable future.

b) Importantly: (i) the target does not capture the totality of HSE's work to regulate major hazards, and (ii) a cross-cutting programme of work for the MH sector, now being established, may well lead to further targeted effort aimed at delivering improved performance in precursor management

## **Local Authorities Programme (Green)**

### **Key points:**

- As an “enabling Programme” there are no specific numerical targets: however, agreeing LA contributions to RHS targets is one of the Programme’s objectives
- The Programme is now concentrating on the specific projects identified as delivering the intentions set out in the high-level plan and the Statement of Intent (Sol). HSE continues to work with CoSAS to refine these plans and the related monitoring and evaluation approaches.
- Work on publicising the Sol, and communicating with LAs, continued this quarter with regional events organised by HSE’s Partnership Managers, who reported positive feedback from attendees. In addition, the HELA Conference on 8 December had as its theme “The New Partnership” with Philip Hampton giving the keynote address, which was particularly timely in view of his recently published report. The HELA Conference also provided an early opportunity to present the findings of the Kings College London research into factors influencing LA interventions.
- The Programme Board and the elected members’ Steering Group both met this quarter, endorsing the detailed plan and providing guidance on priorities. Work has also now started on the review of liaison arrangements between HSE and LAs and proposals will be brought to HSC in the spring ensuring an effective local and national level of governance.
- Most LA secondees have now taken up post, working with HSE’s Partnership Managers (PMs), which will further help in the effort to build strategic relationships with their LA contacts.
- At field level, there is evidence of growing take-up by LAs of the priority topics – for example, the number of LAs posting topic inspection reports on the HELA Training Co-ordination website rose considerably between April and December 2004; in addition, 26 LAs posted topic inspection reports for the first time.
- Further progress was made with specific projects such as development of the “Extranet”, Support, Information and Training Needs Analysis for LA officers, and a programme of S&T support to LAs from April 2005 - £5m is to be spent over the next 4 years.
- There is a good working relationship with the FIT and, in particular, Public Services Programmes, recognising the need *inter alia* to manage the potential for multiple approaches to LAs (and their senior officers). The Hampton agenda will be a significant influence in the next quarter, both to the shape of the Programme and communicating any resultant changes. The final Communication Plan will be informed by the wider stakeholder research being carried out – which is due to report in April.