

## STAKEHOLDER MANAGEMENT FAILURE

HSE/02/041

RISK	PROBABILITY OF RISK	INCREASING or DECREASING?	EFFECT \ CONSEQUENCE OF RISK	
<p><b>12. Partnership Failures</b></p> <p>a) At the Strategic Level</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- with industry and trade unions</li> <li>- with local authorities</li> <li>- with other agencies and regulators</li> <li>- with OGDs</li> <li>- with professional organisations</li> </ul>	<p>M</p> <p>M</p> <p>M</p> <p>L</p> <p>L</p>	<p>No change</p> <p>Poss</p> <p>D</p> <p>D</p> <p>D</p>	<p>Significant implications for delivering strategic plan given partnership is key to our way of working</p> <p><i>(High)</i></p>	<p>(a) <u>Control Measures in Place</u>: For other agencies and regulators, there are MOUs and Agency Agreement. For other partners, there are no formal control measures; the control measures essentially hinge on the sensitivity of staff, especially senior staff, to ensuring the maintenance of effective partnership. For professional organisations, we support involvement of HSE staff (in some cases on boards).</p> <p><u>Mechanisms for providing assurance</u>: For MoUs and Agency Agreements there are formal monitoring and review arrangements. But for all forms of partnership, assurance is essentially provided by intelligence which can alert us to developing weaknesses or confirm strength of partnership. A risk though is that either the intelligence is not generated (i.e. staff don't see they have that role) or that intelligence is not gathered or collated and passed to senior colleagues.</p>
<p>b) At the Working Level</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- with individual trade associations and trade unions</li> <li>- with individual local authorities</li> <li>- with OGDs</li> </ul>	<p>M/L</p> <p>L</p>	<p>Fragile</p> <p>No change</p>	<p>Delivery difficult at local or sector level</p> <p>Lost opportunities <i>(Medium)</i></p>	<p>(b) <u>Control measures in place</u>: Involvement of HSE through policy contacts, sector groups, advisory committees, <b>divisional and local intermediaries and other partners (Small Firms Business Links, Learning and Skills Councils, RoSPA-affiliated safety groups)</b>.</p> <p><u>Mechanism for providing assurance</u>: As above, assurance is essentially by intelligence. Challenge is to ensure intelligence works effectively</p>
<p>c) Failure to recognise need for or to pursue partnership</p>	<p>L</p>	<p>D</p>		<p>(c) <u>Control measures in place</u>: Scrutiny of development policies; project plans that include partnership considerations.</p> <p><u>Mechanism for providing assurance</u>: Structural approach to projects; intelligence on opportunities taken and missed.</p>
<p><b>13. Poor Public Image</b></p> <p>Appearing as:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- a weak, indecisive or incompetent regulator</li> </ul>	<p>L</p>	<p>D</p>	<p>Lack of trust In HSE <i>(High)</i></p>	<p><u>Control measures in place</u>: Effective relationship between press office and directorates; <b>field divisions work with local intermediaries, media and interested groups</b>.</p>

## STAKEHOLDER MANAGEMENT FAILURE

RISK	PROBABILITY OF RISK	INCREASING or DECREASING?	EFFECT \ CONSEQUENCE OF RISK	
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- a “nanny” regulator</li> <li>- closed, secret, partial or inconsistent</li> <li>- indifferent</li> <li>- not independent from government</li> <li>- suspicion of regulatory capture</li> </ul>	<p style="text-align: center;">M</p> <p style="text-align: center;">L</p> <p style="text-align: center;">M</p> <p style="text-align: center;">L</p> <p style="text-align: center;">M</p>	<p style="text-align: center;">I</p> <p style="text-align: center;">D</p> <p style="text-align: center;">Fragile</p> <p style="text-align: center;">Fragile</p> <p style="text-align: center;">Fragile</p>		<p><u>Mechanism to provide assurance:</u> Monitoring press/media and correspondence to Ministers etc. Chief Press Office and Directors also to ensure presentation etc taken into account as part of delivery.</p>
<p><b>14. Poor relations with Key Stakeholders</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- with Ministers and Parliament</li> <li>- with key industry and trade union bodies</li> <li>- with key professional bodies</li> <li>- with the European Commission</li> <li>- with European Agency for Health and Safety Bilbao</li> </ul>	<p style="text-align: center;">M</p> <p style="text-align: center;">L</p> <p style="text-align: center;">L</p> <p style="text-align: center;">M</p>	<p style="text-align: center;">D</p> <p style="text-align: center;">D</p> <p style="text-align: center;">D</p> <p style="text-align: center;">No change</p>	<p>Serious threat to survivability/financing etc of HSE</p> <p>Tripartism at risk</p> <p>Professionals not committed to our agenda</p> <p>Lack of influence (High)</p>	<p><u>Control measures in place:</u> Quality policy (assuming quality of submissions to Ministers etc). Senior scrutiny to ensure sensitivities of key stakeholders are taken into account – at all levels in HSE (note: a clutch of minor failures can be as damaging as a single more serious failure). <b>FOD sectors/Field Divisions strive to ensure good relationships with eg major companies.</b></p> <p><u>Mechanisms to provide assurance:</u> Intelligence on sensitivities with key stakeholders. (Risk is intelligence function does not work as well as it should.)</p>