

|                       |                |                          |            |
|-----------------------|----------------|--------------------------|------------|
| <b>Meeting Date:</b>  | 2 October 2002 | <b>Open Gov. Status:</b> | Fully Open |
| <b>Type of Paper:</b> | Minutes        | <b>Paper File Ref:</b>   |            |
| <b>Exemptions:</b>    | None           |                          |            |

## HEALTH AND SAFETY EXECUTIVE

### HSE Board

**Minutes of a meeting of the HSE Board held on Wednesday 2 October 2002 at 9.30 am in the Fortune Room, Rose Court**

#### **Present**

Richard Clifton

Paul Davies

Adrian Ellis

Peter Graham

Richard Hillier

Nick Starling

Kate Timms

Laurence Williams

Timothy Walker

Justin McCracken

Alastair Cannon - Secretariat

Apologies - Sandra Caldwell, Robert Humm, Sian Lewis

#### **Also attending**

Vivienne Dews (observing ahead of joining the Board in November )

|                | Items        |
|----------------|--------------|
| John Ives      | 2 & 3        |
| Alun Williams  | 4            |
| Jane Willis    | 5,6,7,8,9&10 |
| Linda Derrick  | 6,7,8 & 9    |
| Linda Varney   | 6,7,8,& 9    |
| Tony Mulhall   | 5,6,7,8 & 9  |
| Robert Vaughan | 6,7,8, & 9   |
| Tony Bandle    | 5            |
| Bill Tomkins   | 5 & 9        |
| Blair Hilton   | 10           |

#### **1 Minutes of the HSE Board meeting held on Wednesday 18th September (B/02/M05), and matters arising**

1.1 Due to a problem in distribution, the minutes could not be agreed and will be put before the Finance Board on 16th October for agreement.

1.2 In relation to 4.7f; Adrian Ellis had reported that the Basingstoke office would be taking on the FOD commitment to pilot a project on behaviours.

#### **2 Health and Safety: Monthly report by Justin McCracken. Advisor John Ives.**

2.1 In answer to a query at the previous meeting, the marked drop in accidents noted for 2000/01 coincided with a change in internal accident reporting requirements including a new form requiring more detail. These changes had proved unpopular and have since been revised further. The most likely cause of the fall in the figures therefore was an increase in underreporting.

- 2.2 More near misses were being reporting now and a special effort is being made to encourage reporting during European health & safety week.
- 2.3 There were several accidents relating to bumping into things, ( shelves, doors, etc ) in offices. These could be serious and one was now the subject of a civil claim. Standards of housekeeping in HSE were variable and senior staff had a role to intervene when they observed unacceptable standards.
- 2.4 European health and safety week commences on 14th October. It was heartening to see the numerous and varied events planned around the country by HSE offices.

**Agreed: Board members would ensure that they all supported these events by participating themselves.**

**Action: John Ives to circulate a list and location of the planned events to Board members and place a list on the Intranet.**

### **3 Health and Safety in HSE Annual Report 2001/02. (B/02/044) A paper by David Ashton.** Presented by John Ives.

3.1 The following remarks were made by way of introduction;

- 3.2
  - a The reported year was one of getting better organised. The numbers of reported incidents had risen but the analysis was that this reflected improved reporting rates helped by the new electronic reporting mechanism.
  - b A number of significant initiatives had been started including a benchmarking exercise with the Highways Agency, a study of the H&S implications of HSE IT systems, and the causes of sickness absence.
  - c Nevertheless there remained room for improvement. Looking ahead the emphasis should remain firmly on the known hazards causing the majority of incidents - DSE equipment, slips/trips and travel. Management had a role to play to ensure that these remained the priority in the minds of staff. In particular, senior staff were asked to ensure that DSE assessors, who frequently are Band 5 and 6 staff, receive proper support in carrying out thorough assessments.
  - d Despite the expertise within the organisation more work is needed to ensure that appropriate risk assessments are carried out to determine the significant risks, and then ensure that the findings are implemented.
  - e There remained a problem in ensuring incident investigation reports of adequate quality.

3.3 The following points were made in discussion;

- a Timothy Walker endorsed the need give full support to DSE assessors and to conduct proper risk assessments. Accidents must be reported and properly, but proportionately, investigated.

**Agreed: Any inadequate investigation reports will continue to be returned to local coordinators for revision but henceforth copied to the head of Directorate too.**

**Agreed: Following drafting changes suggested by the Board, the report**

should be published on the Internet this year and henceforth, as well as the Intranet.

**Action:** Main text drafting changes by John Ives, revised foreword by Timothy Walker

**4 Developing HSE's response to Civil Contingencies (B/02/042) Paper by Alun Williams.** A paper reporting the initial findings of the Civil Contingencies Project seeking a decision to establish a part time Band 0 function and a steer on HSE's role and appropriate level of response for major incidents.

4.1 The following points were made in discussion:

- a The fact of continuing regular work emanating from Whitehall on civil contingencies matters was recognised along with the fact that HSE now had a de facto seat at the table for these discussions in view of this work and HSC's role in providing H&S guidance to Ministers. This was particularly important given that DWP were not engaged with civil contingency issues in the way of our previous sponsor department.
- b There was considerable merit in having one person carrying out this function in order to build experience and personal networks to ensure greater effectiveness and efficiency. Government contingencies work now depended heavily on the COBRA approach, with all interested parties sitting at one table.
- c This was a new function, not a new post with the person having "horizontal" authority in HSE to initiate work which would require requiring reprioritising of work elsewhere as necessary.

**Agreed:** This was a necessary function that would need to be incorporated in the Autumn planning process (in the context of the change programme proposals put to the Board at the November meeting).

**Action:** Nick Starling.

- d Discussion then moved to HSE's response in emergency. A distinction was drawn between major incidents of the kind HSE has dealt with historically and a catastrophe of 9/11 dimensions, not yet faced.
- e Custom and practice in the level and timing of response varied across operational directorates. There was no suggestion that HSE failed to respond appropriately, however there are no current clear written instructions or procedures outside of NSD, which is part of well rehearsed government wide response arrangements for a nuclear incident .
- f The duty office system was effective in filtering inappropriate requests for HSE assistance out of hours, however there had been some difficulties on occasions in reaching senior staff for a decision.
- g If there was a 9/11 type of incident, there would be an expectation that HSE would respond and we would wish to anyway to the best of our ability. However we lack contingency plans for such an eventuality.
- h A full call-out response system across HSE had not been costed

but clearly would be expensive. The expected costs of having such an arrangement might be highly disproportionate to the benefits, but this was not yet known.

**Agreed:** There should be a robust HSE call-up, duty officer system. However to in order for the Board to decide not to have an HSE wide 24/7 call-out system at least approximate costings were required.

**Action:** Alun Williams to

a) review and refine the existing duty officer system and prepare proposals for augmenting this with robust arrangements for senior management decision making.

b) compare this system with other equivalent organisation to identify good practice any gaps.

c) obtain approximate costings of an HSE wide call out system and the cost of filling any identified gaps.

In addition d) to draw up draft catastrophe contingency plans.

All to be brought back to the Board.

**5 Business Risk Management (B/02/041). A paper by Bill Tomkins.** Advisors Jane Willis, Tony Bandle, & Tony Mulhall. This paper followed previous papers on the subject and presented further detail on control measures for the agreed risks.

5.1 The following points were made in discussion;

a The 6 categories of risk and the 25 individual risks had now been agreed and the intended control measures stipulated, however it was not clear either whether the controls were in place or what was now the residual risk.

**Action:** All risk owners to produce a short commentary to state;

a) that they have tested the controls and found them adequate, and b) what action taken if not adequate, along with c) an assessment of residual risk. In addition d) if more than adequate control is in place, what controls may be removed.

**Action:** Bill Tomkins with RPU to produce a brief question set to aid risk owners in testing the controls.

b A decision on para 10(ii), HSE's risk appetite, could only be taken at a subsequent Board once an assessment of the residual risk is available.

**Agreed:** There was no requirement for a communications strategy for the model. The SCS would wish, and need, to see the model, the risk categories and the individual risks; other staff simply need to be aware of how their work helps HSE manage a given risk but this should be handled within existing line management arrangements.

**Action:** Bill Tomkins to make model and contents available to SCS.

**Agreed:** No separate training plan (para 10iii) is required to explain the model to managers of the risks as already this is a core part of their function

6 **Presentation on DWP Performance Management by Gareth Williams.** In attendance Linda Derrick, Jane Willis, Tony Mulhall, Linda Varney and Robert Vaughan.

6.1 This presentation was given against the background both of the recent move to DWP and the progress being made with HSE's change programme. DWP were working on a consolidated plan for its ten PSA targets and would be looking to fit HSE and its targets within that. This is currently at the second draft stage with the final draft due to go to HMT and the PM Delivery Unit in November. The salient features adhered to PM Delivery Unit guidance with resources clearly allocated to outputs. Jobcentre Plus, for example will be reporting against targets quarterly supported by monthly high level reports.

There is yet to be a discussion at the top level between DWP and HSE about the consequences of the SR2002 and to that extent HSE is behind the rest of the department. DWP will be looking for an additional PSA target for 2006 for HSE to align with the DWP plan.

6.2 Timothy Walker thanked Gareth for the presentation. HSE would however resist strongly any move back from outcome targets to output targets. In addition for many areas it will be impracticable to provide monthly information. There are some fundamental differences between HSE and other parts of DWP that the department will have to recognise.

7 **Public Spending Targets 2004 and Beyond. (B/02/046). A paper by Tony Mulhall.** Advisors, Linda Derrick, Jane Willis, Tony Mulhall, Linda Varney and Robert Vaughan. A paper seeking a decision from the Board on the existing targets and whether there should be an additional 2006 target.

7.1 The following points were made in discussion;

- a Current PSA targets failed to capture large parts of the work of HSE; the control of major hazards was an inescapable priority for HSE and so, therefore, a target for these of comparable standing within DWP, was needed.
- b Equivalent targets for the major hazards might be a reduction in the number of precursor incidents.
- c This target too would require a delivery plan.
- d A PSA target for public health similar to that which appeared in Securing Health Together is extremely difficult to formulate and should not be taken forward.

**Agreed: A target for the major hazards to be developed.**

**Action: Justin McCracken to coordinate a position on a major hazards target and consider the requirements for its delivery plan**

**Agreed: It was agreed that the existing 2004 and 2010 targets be kept but in addition a target for 2006 should be developed.**

**Action: PEFD**

**Agreed: There would not be a target for the health of the public.**

8 **SR 2000 PSA Targets: Preparation of Delivery Plan. A paper by**

**Kate Timms.** Advisors Linda Derrick, Jane Willis, Tony Mulhall, Linda Varney and Robert Vaughan. A paper asking the Board to consider the emerging structure of the plan and the issues raised ahead of the HSC discussion of the plan on 15 October

- 8.1 The following points were made by way of introduction:
- a The plan represented work in hand. Work on the delivery mechanism in particular was ongoing and would be informed by the outcomes from the Change programme. A clearer view would be available by the time of the November Board.
  - b The discussion on the earlier item had determined that there would be, in addition, a major hazards target with its own delivery plan

- 8.2 The following points were made in discussion;
- a The plans for both targets should be as consistent as possible.
  - b It was important to remember that there was considerable resource devoted to activities that fell outside of the scope of the priority programmes, eg 40% of FOD resource, which would nevertheless contribute to the overall delivery of the PSA targets. The effect of this other work toward achieving the targets has not been modeled.
  - c It would be helpful if the risk register indicated whether the assessment of risk was residual or before the application of risk controls. The Board examined the register and suggested a number of changes and gave their estimation of the residual risk once the intended control measure had been put in place.

**Agreed: The Risk Register would be recast in the light of the Board's guidance, indicate the control measures along with a statement of the residual risks for each as estimated by the Board; following which the plan would go forward to the HSC.**

**Action: Linda Derrick**

**9 Balanced Scorecard - Key Performance Indicators (B/02/045). A paper by Tony Mulhall.** Advisors Linda Derrick, Jane Willis, Tony Mulhall, Linda Varney, Bill Tomkins and Robert Vaughan. A paper asking the Board to consider what indicators they required.

- 9.1 .The following points were made by way of introduction;
- a The paper included a variety of indicators, leading and lagging.
  - b Developing some quantitative indicators may be difficult and costly, especially those concerning continuous improvement and external stakeholders.
  - c The intention was to provide the Board with quarterly scorecards of mainly leading indicators and an annual scorecard. The intention is that the use of the scorecard will replace the end year report and be used to inform the subsequent planning events.

- 9.2 The following points were made in discussion;
- a There were too many indicators at present. The aim should be for around 15 strategic indicators, although those actively managing the risk below the Board would likely have more for their own use. Their purpose for the Board should be akin to a series of cockpit lights that usually flash green and would be seen readily if they

flash red to prompt the Board to initiate appropriate remedial action.

- b Purely numerical indicators were unlikely to satisfy this aim and some qualitative judgment would be required.
- c It would be helpful to keep in mind what a useful indicator would be; what would tell the Board, for example what sort of measure would tell the Board whether a priority programme was on target from one quarter to another.

**Action: Tony Mulhall to produce a small number, around one or two measures, that would be incorporated in the regular quarterly return to the Board along with a list of others that would be incorporated additionally if an indicator was “flashing red”**

**10 Financial Accounting System Development (B/02/043) A paper by Jane Willis.** Advisor, Blair Hilton. A paper seeking a steer from the Board on options.

10.1 The following points were made by way of introduction;

- a The current RASP system product will not be supported by the supplier beyond April 2005.
- b The options were to commission a full replacement now or improve the existing system to extend its life, with other possible options on improved functionality.
- c The future resource management information needs are not clear given that the change programme proposals have yet to be decided, nevertheless an early decision on which option to choose would maximize the benefits. However the RASP replacement project board are conscious that the Board is likely to require a project and programme resource management capability.

- 10.2 The following points were made in discussion;
- a Timothy Walker stated that he was reluctant to move now toward a full enterprise resource planning capacity (option 4) both because we do not yet know what we would want it for nor yet have the necessary skills internally.
  - b It was established that the £200K required for option 1 would need to be made available from 03/04 IT budget.
  - c Given that option 4 was unwise at this stage then some action is required to provide insurance beyond 2005. However as option 1 could be completed in 4 months there was no need to select option 1 yet. There would be advantage in waiting until the change programme proposals had been decided in November to see what additional functionality might be desirable. This advantage outweighed the better return on investment of starting now.
  - d Also, although there was an acceptance of the need for some expenditure, and as there remained some flexibility as to timing, the timing of the spending had to be judged against other priorities

**Agreed: A decision on RASP replacement to follow the Board decisions on the change programme in November.**

**Action: RASP project Board to determine appropriate additional functionalities in the light of Change programme outcomes, and financial constraints, and progress early in the next Financial Year with a RASP replacement.**