



**The Workers' Safety Adviser  
Challenge Fund: Round One**

**A report on activity in 2004/05**

**June 2005**

## Index

Executive Summary.....	3
Report on the first year of the Workers' Safety Adviser Challenge Fund.....	5
Background.....	5
WSA Challenge Fund project activities and outcomes.....	6
Administration of the Fund .....	9
The Management Board.....	9
Challenge Fund Manager .....	10
Challenge Fund Evaluator .....	11
HSE Activities.....	12
Lessons learned from round one activities .....	13
Appendix A – WSA Challenge Fund Management Board 2004/05 .....	14
Appendix B – Projects funded by the WSA Challenge Fund in 2004/05 .	15
Appendix C – Fund expenditure 2004/05 .....	21

# Executive Summary

This report summarises the activity undertaken in the first year of the Workers' Safety Adviser (WSA) Challenge Fund, announced by Rt Hon Andrew Smith MP in October 2003 and launched by Bill Callaghan in March 2004.

The objectives of the Fund are to improve health and safety at work through the intervention of workers' safety advisers, who work with participating organisations and their employees to improve worker involvement in health and safety.

The 12 projects awarded funding in the first year assisted 648 organisations with 49 WSAs. We estimate that this reached about 18,000 workers (assuming 28 employees per organisation).

The Fund has had:

- **A positive impact on worker involvement:** The first year of the WSA Challenge Fund was effective in increasing worker involvement. It led to employers adopting a more positive attitude towards worker involvement over the year. Workers showed a marked increase at year-end in willingness and confidence in becoming involved in health and safety risk management. The proportion of organisations with no form of worker involvement fell from 28% to 7%.
- **A positive impact on health and safety:** Workers' Safety Advisers reported better attitudes and arrangements likely to lead to health and safety improvements over the course of the year, even in workplaces with a high baseline standard of health and safety management. This improvement is attributed to changes in management activity, rather than investments in physical hazard-reduction equipment.

In addition, we have found that **key WSA skills are not limited to health and safety skills**. Participants' views on the skill set required by WSAs to achieve effective worker involvement were that 'softer' skills, such as communication, facilitation and conflict management were as important, if not more so, than health and safety qualifications, though most thought that a qualification and substantial experience were important too.

There has been a significant **impact of the reduced timescale of round one**. The operation of round one was significantly affected by the late start for the Fund. As projects did not begin until July 2004, Round one lasted for nine months, rather than a full calendar year. This meant some projects were unable to recruit their target number of workforces. This had an adverse impact on the cost-effectiveness of projects, as start-up costs in round one were high, primarily for WSA recruitment and training, whilst operational time was truncated.

We have collected some information on **cost effectiveness**, and this will be extended in future years. The average cost per workplace visit was in the region of £365; the cost per worker was about £39. These figures are broadly

the same as in the 2002 pilot study, though the averages mask large differences in the performance of different projects. The economies of scale envisaged by setting up the Fund compared to the pilot tended to materialise only in those projects that had well-established partnerships.

**Key lessons learned** so far include:

- The need for WSAs to acquire 'soft' skills alongside health and safety competence.
- The need to better publicise the application process.
- The need to make explicit to all projects the evaluation requirements before the new round commences.
- The need to ensure that examples of good practice are communicated to participating projects.
- The need to ensure that participating projects spend in accordance with their planning.

Action has been or is being taken on all these points.

# Report on the first year of the Workers' Safety Adviser Challenge Fund

## **Background**

1. The Workers' Safety Adviser Challenge Fund is a grant scheme designed to increase worker involvement and consultation, through the intervention of the Workers' Safety Adviser (WSA), as a means of building of partnership and driving improvements in occupational health and safety. Organisations such as trade unions, employers' organisations, local authorities and primary care trusts submit joint bids of up to £100,000 to fund the recruitment of WSAs.
2. The Rt. Hon. Andrew Smith, then Secretary of State for Work and Pensions, announced the creation of the Workers' Safety Adviser Challenge Fund in October 2003. The fund was to be used to stimulate worker involvement in small businesses, with the aim of improving health and safety performance as a result. The announcement of the Fund followed a pilot study undertaken by the Health and Safety Executive in 2002.
3. Funds of £3m (£1m in 2004/5; £1m in 2005/6; £1m in 2006/7) were granted to HSC/E by the Department of Work and Pensions to take forward the WSA Challenge Fund. The Chair of the Health and Safety Commission, Bill Callaghan, formally launched the Challenge Fund on 31 March 2004. The closing date for applications for funding from round one was 7 May 2004 – seventy applications were received.
4. The Health and Safety Commission approved the management arrangements for the first round of the fund at its meeting of 11 May 2004. These arrangements include:
  - (a) A Challenge Fund Management Board of experts in health and safety and worker involvement to assess applications and advise HSE on progress with the fund;
  - (b) A Challenge Fund Manager to manage the work on a day-to-day basis;
  - (c) An independent evaluation of the effectiveness of the Fund.
5. Round one of the Fund ran from 1 April 2004, to 31 March 2005, with 12 projects selected for funding, as detailed in appendix B. These 12 projects recruited 648 organisations, against a target of 812. This figure would have increased had projects been operational from 1 April 2004, rather than July 2004. The delays were caused by initial start-up arrangements after funding had been secured, causing round one to be truncated into nine months, rather than twelve.

## ***WSA Challenge Fund project activities and outcomes***

6. The evaluation of round one suggests that the WSA Challenge Fund was effective in increasing worker involvement and improving the provision of indicators suggesting improved health and safety performance. There were, however, some lessons learned which will be incorporated into the management of rounds 2 and 3.

### *Impact on Worker Involvement*

7. Employers held a positive attitude towards worker involvement at the outset of the year, and maintained this throughout the year. Workers displayed a marked increase at year-end in willingness and confidence in becoming involved in health and safety risk management.
8. The level of worker involvement increased. The proportion of organisations with no form of worker involvement fell from 28% to 7%. There were significant increases in the appointments of Health and Safety Representatives; health and safety committees were established, and where already in existence, met more frequently; individual workers were consulted more regularly. High levels of WSA activity with workers resulted in large increases in the number of workers involved in hazard spotting, risk assessment and group discussions on health and safety.

### *Impact on health and safety management standards*

9. Workers' Safety Advisers reported better attitudes and arrangements likely to lead to health and safety improvements over the course of the year, even in workplaces with a high baseline standard of health and safety management.
10. Workplaces with health and safety standards rated "poor" and "very poor" were reduced by 17% by the end of the year, with no workplaces identified as "very poor". 95% of workplaces were rated as "adequate" and above by year-end, with a 20% increase in workplaces rated as "good".
11. This improvement can be attributed to changes in management activity, rather than investments in physical hazard-reduction equipment. Improvements were noted in risk assessment; policy creation and review; increased training provision; creation of worker involvement mechanisms, and provision of health and safety documentation.

### *Identification of key WSA skills*

12. The skill-set required by WSAs to achieve effective worker involvement was evaluated. The results strongly identified that 'softer' skills, such as communication, facilitation and conflict were as important, if not more so, than health and safety qualifications. This message has been communicated to round two projects, as it has the potential to reduce the resource needed for capacity building (in terms of health and safety training for WSAs), releasing WSAs to engage with organisations much earlier than in round one.

### *Impact of reduced timescale of round one*

13. The operation of round one was significantly affected by the late start for the Fund. As projects were not operational until July 2004, round one lasted for nine months, rather than a full calendar year. As a result, cost effectiveness has been reduced, as start-up costs in round one were high, primarily for WSA recruitment and training, and operational time was truncated, meaning some projects were unable to recruit their target number of workforces before the end of the year.

#### *Cost-Effectiveness*

14. Projects in round one underspent their allocation of £812,000 by £101,000. This has been carried over into round two and steps are being taken to manage projects' spend more closely. As a matter of routine, HSE's internal audit team is auditing round one of the Challenge Fund to ensure propriety and best use of public funds.
15. Cost per worker was about £39. The effects of the truncation of round one have developed a marked split between the cost effectiveness of the projects. The five largest projects delivered best economy of scale, as they delivered the most workplace visits. By contrast, those projects achieving fewer workplace visits had much higher costs, and were not as cost effective.

#### *Evaluation*

16. The late start of the evaluation arrangements resulted in variable response levels between projects, particularly at the end of year stage, with one project returning no evaluation forms at all. The end-of-year figures do not therefore give a completely accurate picture of improvements made in certain projects over the course of the year.
17. The evaluation process has been streamlined in response to projects' helpful comments, and the need for correct and detailed evaluation was heavily emphasised during the application workshops for round two. The quality and timeliness of evaluation should improve for round two as a result.

#### *Conclusions*

- The Workers' Safety Adviser Challenge Fund has successfully increased worker involvement during round one.
- The Fund has engendered attitudes and arrangements likely to lead to health and safety improvements in participating organisations through the intervention of the WSAs.
- The WSAs themselves do not require high levels of health and safety qualification to effectively promote worker involvement – communication and other “softer” skills are as important.
- The management arrangements for the Fund have successfully provided governance, financial and administrative assistance.
- The Fund has not yet realised across the piece, the economies of scale over the pilot study that were envisaged.

## *The Future*

18. The Labour Party document "People at work, forward not back" gave a commitment to extend the WSA initiative.
19. HSE will identify options for the possible extension (or otherwise) of the Fund beyond round 3, with a view to presenting these to the Health and Safety Commission in early 2006. The thinking around these new options will be informed by the activities and evaluation of round one, but will also encompass radical changes to the existing model. Some initial concepts for development have been identified:
  - Provide larger amounts of funding to fewer projects, over a number of years;
  - Develop a model project, and provide funding to bids that come closest to matching the model;
  - Fund projects in one or two specific sectors with known worker involvement deficiencies;
  - Fund projects in one or two geographical areas;
  - Fund projects that will address worker involvement in areas where HSE and LA officers cannot;
  - Fund only the most innovative projects;
  - Expand the funding by seeking external (corporate) sponsorship;
  - Expand the capacity of individual projects by requiring prospective projects to provide matched funds;
  - Retain the existing funding arrangements.
20. Key stakeholders will be consulted by HSE for their views on the future of the Fund, and will be consulted on proposals developed. It is hoped that recommendations for the future of the Fund will be agreed by HSC and Ministers in time to allow for continuation or winding-up of the existing Fund arrangements by the end of round three, in March 2007.

## ***Administration of the Fund***

### **The Management Board**

21. The primary role of the Management Board is to provide expert assessment of applications for awards from the Challenge Fund and make recommendations on awards to HSE. Recommendations for awards are agreed and approved by HSE. The Management Board also has a role to play in monitoring the effectiveness of projects funded, and in shaping the direction of the fund.
22. The remit of the Management Board was formally set out in the document, *“Roles and Responsibilities of HSC, HSE, the Challenge Fund Management Board and Challenge Fund Manager”* (dated 23 April 2004). The Health and Safety Commission formally approved the arrangements at its meeting on 11 May 2004.
23. The Management Board consists of nine members, including the chair, Professor Stephen Wood of the Institute of Work Psychology, University of Sheffield. Members of the Board took up post on 21 May 2004 and their appointments ran until 31 March 2005. A list of members during round one is at **appendix A**.
24. One issue that arose during round one was the need to introduce greater transparency into the remuneration arrangements for Board Members. Board members were able to claim remuneration for expenses and fees levied in round one directly from the Challenge Fund Manager, with no limits set on the amount of time, and therefore the amount of remuneration that could be claimed. Whilst there is no suggestion of any impropriety by Board Members, it was quickly realized that the levels of expenditure involved were not easily scrutinized, and that the fees system was not transparent as a result. Contracts were therefore drafted by HSE during the course of round one for those members who claim fees, and these were introduced for round two, to formalize the remuneration process and allow greater openness.

#### *Management Board activities*

25. The Board met five times during round one, and settled into its role over the course of the year.
26. At its initial meeting, the Board agreed the protocols for the Management Board, and selected projects to be recommended to HSE for funding. These recommendations were agreed by HSE, and funding was subsequently authorized. A list of participating round one projects is at **appendix B**.
27. The remaining Board meetings were concerned with oversight of progress during round one; revision of the application process for round two, and consideration of round two bids.
28. The oversight role led to a particularly detailed debate about the role and competence of WSAs. Agreement was reached that where WSAs were

providing advice, a level of competence was necessary, and the board set this baseline. Where WSAs do not give such advice, their health and safety competence was not an issue. This outcome resulted in revisions to the round two application process, to emphasize the worker involvement elements.

29. Members also undertook 'mentoring' of individual projects, through an initial visit, then further contact to a degree determined by the projects themselves. The visits were intended to demonstrate the Management Board's responsibility to ensure that Challenge Fund and project objectives are being met. The main purpose of the visits was to provide support and reassurance to the projects, rather than to evaluate effectiveness, and to allow members to gain a firsthand insight into the activities undertaken by the WSAs. In the event, responses to the visit were mixed, with some projects maintaining regular contact with their nominated member, and others restricting themselves simply to the initial visit. In spite of this, the exercise was perceived by board members to be worthwhile, and will be repeated in round two.
30. Finally, the Board met in January 2005, to consider applications for round two. 12 projects were recommended for funding, of which 11 were agreed with HSE. Six of these projects continued from round one, with five new projects funded.

### **Challenge Fund Manager**

31. Following an open tender exercise, in July 2004 HSE appointed Project North East (hereafter PNE), a not-for-profit organization based in Newcastle upon Tyne, to manage and administer the Challenge Fund. Administration costs (including PNE's fees) are met from the Fund itself.
32. The Challenge Fund Manager's responsibilities include:
- Assessing bids against the criteria set out in the Information for Applicants and making recommendations to the Challenge Fund Management Board;
  - Administering awards from the Challenge Fund, the financial management of the Challenge Fund including accounting to HSC/E for expenditure and auditing projects in receipt of awards; and
  - Monitoring progress and providing HSC/E and the Management Board with regular progress and financial management reports. The end-of-year expenditure report is provided at **appendix C**.

#### *Activities*

33. In addition to the above responsibilities, the Challenge Fund Manager also developed and maintains the website for the Challenge Fund (<http://www.wsa-cf.org>), and organizes the marketing of the Fund during rounds two and three.
34. The Challenge Fund website contains the latest news on the Fund, and details the Management arrangements. It is also home to the Web Forum for successful projects, which is intended to provide a common discussion

board, where issues can be discussed, good practice disseminated, and materials useful to all can be shared. Limited use was made of the Forum during round one, and PNE will be marketing it to round two projects, in order to stimulate activity.

35. The Fund Manager also jointly organized with HSE a September 2004 workshop for the new WSA projects, to clarify the roles and expectations of Project Managers and WSAs, and identify any development needs. The workshop featured presentations from former WSAs during the pilot and the Management Board Chair, along with a series of syndicate exercises designed to identify the actions necessary to successfully involve workers and manage projects.
36. The event enabled all parties to gain a clear conception of the role and activities of the WSA.
37. PNE undertook the marketing for round two during Autumn 2004. Three types of publicity were used: workshop events; press releases and a website.

### **Challenge Fund Evaluator**

38. Following a limited tender exercise, HSE contracted Greenstreet Berman (hereafter GSB) to evaluate the effectiveness of the WSA Challenge Fund and in particular the impact of the WSAs on health and safety performance through increased worker involvement. Evaluation costs were met by HSE, rather than being taken from the Fund itself. As such, whilst GSB regularly update the Management Board, they are ultimately accountable directly to HSE.

#### *Activities*

39. Greenstreet Berman were appointed as Fund Evaluators after the Fund had commenced. As an interim measure, initial evaluation materials were produced by HSE staff (and subsequently adopted by the projects). These materials were then replaced by GSB's own baseline profiling materials, which resulted in projects completing two sets of evaluation documents, and combined with the slow start some projects made, meant baseline profiling was completed later than planned.
40. Nevertheless, a baseline survey of workers and their employers was completed, and provided a useable dataset for comparison over the course of round one.
41. Specific difficulties were encountered due to the nature of the evaluation process, which required WSAs to give employer and employee respondents questionnaires, to be completed and returned over the course of the year. This method caused particular problems with the construction sector projects, which tended to see them merely as form-filling exercises. Here, Project Managers thought that the evaluation process was acting as a barrier to worker involvement, and harming take-up of WSA assistance, as they were perceived by respondents to be intrusive. As a result, no end-of-year materials were received from one of the construction projects, though telephone interviews were held. This was not an issue within other

projects, although some drop occurred between respondents in each project from baseline to end-of-year.

42. GSB undertook a range of end-of-year evaluation activities, including face-to-face interviews of all lead partners, WSAs from all projects, and a sample of other partners; telephone verification interviews with a sample of employers and employees; final evaluation surveys to 190 respondents (to counter the drop-off from baseline activities), and administration of a 'final reflections' questionnaire to all WSAs. These activities have resulted in the creation of a 'long-list' of potential candidates for case studies; the creation of an overview report of the evaluation, which is summarized below; and the full technical report, which is presented separately from this report.

## **HSE Activities**

Round one of the Challenge Fund proved to be resource intensive on HSE. Whilst the appointment of a permanent Fund Manager reduced administrative burdens considerably, a number of activities were still left within the HSE remit, including:

- Organizing the tender for, and appointing, the Fund Managers
- Providing initial evaluation materials
- Organizing the tender for, and appointing, the Fund Evaluators
- Organizing the awards ceremony for both rounds one and two
- Attendance at five Challenge Fund Management Board meetings to provide overall direction and advice
- Organization and attendance at workshops for round one projects in Sheffield, Manchester and Oxford.
- Creation of contracts for Management Board members requiring fees.
- Organization of replacements for a departing Board member
- Arranging the design for the Challenge Fund logo
- Developing and enacting an appeal system for unsuccessful applicants in round two.
- Providing strategic oversight of the Fund, and reporting progress to HSC and Ministers.

These activities required significant resource commitment from the Worker Involvement Unit. It is envisaged that management arrangements will have bedded down for round two, and participating projects should have a better understanding of the strategic role for HSE, with day-to-day activities managed by PNE, thus reducing resource commitments further.

## Lessons learned from round one activities

- *The need to publicise the benefits of the WSA Challenge Fund for businesses and workers.* The findings of the round one evaluation will form the basis of the marketing of round three. This will include advertisement on the HSE and WSA-CF websites, print advertisements, and a stand at the TUC Congress in September 2005.
- *The need to ensure that the good practice from the round one evaluation is communicated to participating projects.* GSB are developing case studies from round one that effectively illustrate good practice and successful involvement techniques. These will be forwarded to all round two projects, and will be published on the Fund Website.
- *The need to make explicit to all projects the evaluation requirements before the new round commences.* This has been addressed through a Workshop, held prior to the round two award winner's event, and a similar event will be held in round three. All projects should now be familiar with the evaluation materials, and understand the need for evaluation and the importance of collecting evaluation materials from participants.
- *The need to better publicise the application process for round three.* HSE's Communications Directorate has been engaged to assist with the marketing of round three, which should ensure a more integrated and better-targeted advertising campaign. This should, in turn, ensure that application workshops are well attended, to give prospective projects the best chance of success.
- *The need to better market the opportunities offered by the Challenge Fund website, and Fund Web Forum, to participating projects.* This will be undertaken by PNE during round two. More vigorous use of the Forum should reduce burdens on HSE and PNE from projects, by allowing for peer review and the sharing of good practice.
- *The need for WSAs to acquire 'soft' skills alongside health and safety competence.* This will be communicated to projects during round two, and incorporated into round three application workshops.
- *The need to ensure that participating projects spend in accordance with their planning.* PNE will continue to monitor projects, and will identify and challenge any significant project underspend.
- *The need to ensure strong control of expenditure.* Contracts with Management Board Members have been instituted where required for round two, and will be renewed in round three as is appropriate.

## Appendix A – WSA Challenge Fund Management Board 2004/05

Professor Stephen Wood (Chair)	Institute of Work Psychology, University of Sheffield
Janice Bentham	Former WSA in the WSA Pilot
Jacquie Hill	Head of Occupational Health and Safety, Barclays plc
Richard Jones	Director of Technical Affairs, IOSH
Paul Reeve	Health and Safety Adviser, Electrical Contractors Association
Philip Russell	Proprietor, Russell Building Services
Rob Sneddon	National Health and Safety Officer, Community
Claire Sullivan	Senior Negotiating Officer, Chartered Society of Physiotherapy
Dr Luise Vassie	Lecturer in Health and Safety Management, University of Leicester

## Appendix B – Projects funded by the WSA Challenge Fund in 2004/05

Name, location and status of lead partner	Other partners	Project location	Sector/s	Project description (taken from application)
British Glass Sheffield <i>Not-for-profit trade association</i>	Ceramics & Allied Trade Union	GB-wide	40 Glass and Ceramic businesses	Two WSA's with a caseload of 40 organisations. By creating a partnership between trade associations, trade unions and the 40 companies involved, the project aims to raise awareness of the importance of health and safety at both employer and employee levels. The project aims to increase health and safety knowledge on topics such as risk management, hazard identification and training techniques.
Coalfields Regeneration Trust Rotherham <i>Charity</i>	- Community Services UK Ltd - TGWU	GB-wide	20 Voluntary and Community workplaces	The project will provide a system of worker safety advisors who will promote a health and safety culture of involvement, consultation, co-operation and partnership working within the Coalfields Regeneration Trust and its member organisations.
Community Ventures	- Development Trusts	GB-wide	20 Voluntary and	The project will provide a system of worker safety advisors who will

Name, location and status of lead partner	Other partners	Project location	Sector/s	Project description (taken from application)
Middlesbrough <i>Charity</i>	Association - Amicus		Community workplaces	promote a health and safety culture of involvement, consultation, co-operation and partnership working within the Development Trusts Association and its member organisations.
Enworks Manchester <i>Voluntary</i>	- Groundwork West Cumbria - Business Link East Lancashire - Business Link North Manchester - Groundwork Wirral - Groundwork Environmental Business Services - UNISON	North West	160 Construction, Hospitality, Retail and Voluntary SMEs	The project will create a service, in the North West from which health and safety training, advice and support can be provided to small firms. The service will help employers and their employees realise and deal with their responsibilities to health and safety. The ultimate aim of this project is that any small firm in the area will be able to access this support at no cost.
Federation of Master Builders London	- UCATT - TGWU	South West	175 Construction SMEs	Through setting up a sustainable worker safety advisor scheme for the federation's members and their

Name, location and status of lead partner	Other partners	Project location	Sector/s	Project description (taken from application)
<i>Employers' Association</i>				employees, the project aims to engage with the work force to increase their understanding of health and safety policies and practices on site, as well as develop communication between employers and workers.
GMB London <i>Trade Union</i>	- Asbestos Control Division of the Thermal Insulation Contractors Association	Nottinghamshire, Leicestershire, Lincolnshire and East Yorkshire	19 Asbestos removal businesses	The project for the hazardous asbestos removal industry, aims through the promotion of worker involvement to create a positive health and safety culture and increased self-regulation within the industry. This will be done by promoting areas such as communication, positive health and safety attitudes and effective management techniques.
Health@Work Liverpool <i>Charity</i>	- Liverpool Chamber of Commerce - Liverpool Business	Liverpool	40 Hospitality and Retail SMEs	Working within Liverpool's hospitality and retail industry, the project aims enhance the capacity of employers and employees to deal with health and safety issues. Worker safety

Name, location and status of lead partner	Other partners	Project location	Sector/s	Project description (taken from application)
	Partnership Group			advisors will work with employers and their staff to establish practices such as workplace safety representatives, risk assessments and disability access audits.
HealthWorks in London Newham <i>Voluntary</i>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- London Borough of Newham</li> <li>- UNISON</li> <li>- Access Partners</li> <li>African Caribbean Business Network</li> <li>- Newham Chamber of Commerce</li> <li>- Newham Primary Care Trust</li> </ul>	East London	500 SMEs	Working with small firms in East London the project aims to increase communication between employers and employees so that they can work together to improve health and safety standards. The project is particularly interested in promoting the use of 'body mapping' to help workers and their employers establish their occupational health needs.
Kirklees Metropolitan	- Huddersfield South Primary	Kirklees, West Yorkshire	Up to 470 SMEs	The project will create an integrated occupational health and safety

<b>Name, location and status of lead partner</b>	<b>Other partners</b>	<b>Project location</b>	<b>Sector/s</b>	<b>Project description (taken from application)</b>
Borough Council Huddersfield <i>Local Authority</i>	Care Trust - Central Huddersfield Primary Care Trust - North Kirklees Primary Care Trust			support service; aimed at small firms and provided at no cost. Working actively with both employers and employees, the project aims to help them work together with areas such as policy, risk assessment and training.
Park Royal Partnership West London <i>Not-for-profit urban regeneration company</i>	- GMB	Park Royal, West London	60 Food SMEs	Targeted at small firms in the West London food sector, the project aims to raise awareness of health and safety amongst the work force and increase communication between employers and their staff. To achieve this the project will provide services such as practical advice on health and safety issues, legislation and training.
Sheffield Occupational Health Advisory Service Sheffield <i>Charity</i>	- Voluntary Action Sheffield	Sheffield	50 Voluntary SMEs	To provide voluntary sector organisations with a framework, involving both employers and employees, for preventing accidents and ill health to both themselves and their clients. The project will include

Name, location and status of lead partner	Other partners	Project location	Sector/s	Project description (taken from application)
				services such as the provision of self-reporting systems and stress management techniques.
UCATT London <i>Trade Union</i>	- Construction Confederation - National Federation of Builders	Midlands	130 Construction SMEs	Working with small firms in the West Midlands construction industry, this project aims to improve health and safety management. Utilising worker safety advisors the project aims to motivate workers to take an active role in preventing accidents and ill health in the workplace, and promote the benefits of worker involvement to employers.

## Appendix C – Fund expenditure 2004/05

Total project expenditure in 2004/05	£710,924
Project support activities (events to establish the Fund)	£15,689
Promotion costs	£4,208
Management overheads*	£158,895
Miscellaneous consultancy costs	£12,300
Leaving an <b>underspend</b> of	£97,984

\* Made up of £120,936 PNE fee, £30,983 Management Board fees and £6,976 Management Board expenses