

Health and Safety Executive Board Minutes		B/02/M12	
Meeting Date:	6 November 2002	Open Gov. Status:	Fully open
Type of Paper:	Minutes	Paper File Ref:	
Exemptions:	None		

HEALTH AND SAFETY EXECUTIVE

HSE Board

Minutes of a meeting of the HSE Board held on Wednesday 6 November 2002 at 09:30am in the Fortune Room, Rose Court

Present

Paul Davies
Vivienne Dews
Sandra Caldwell
Alan Osborne
Justin McCracken
Peter Graham
Robert Humm
Sian Lewis
Nick Starling
Kate Timms
Laurence Williams (from item 4 onwards)
Timothy Walker

Also attending

For item 4:
Steve Woolley
Sarah Jones
Brian Etheridge
Mike Fountain
Phil Scott
Gordon Macdonald

Apologies; Adrian Ellis

Alastair Cannon - Secretariat

1 Draft minutes of the HSE Board meeting held on Wednesday 2 October (B/02/M010 prov).

1.1 The minutes along with their open government status were agreed.

2 Timothy Walker formally welcomed Alan Osborne and Vivienne Dews to the Board.

3 Health & Safety; Oral report by Justin McCracken

3.1 The following points were made:

- a The statistics revealed the same pattern as previous months with slips and trips remaining a problem; there had been a reportable injury of this type in the last month.
- b It has been agreed previously that health & safety management arrangements were to be revised by next July. Recent variable quality of returns from several Directorates indicated that this was necessary. In the interim the current FOD arrangements are the best example of what we would like as a model

- c Directorate heads were asked to review and support the new arrangements in due course and bring them to the attention of staff.
- d The question as to whether different Directorates needed separate arrangements was raised. It was observed that it made most sense to ensure that each geographic location had a coherent set of arrangements avoiding unnecessary duplication.

Action: Kate Timms and Vivienne Dews to look at the corporate health and safety arrangements in Rose Court.

- e Peter Graham reported his recent efforts and difficulties in getting staff to report a near miss. The Board strongly supported these efforts.
- f Justin McCracken reported that next month a Refit report should be available on how to reduce musculoskeletal risk from computer software.

4 Change Programme: Report on Phase 1. A paper by the change programme team.

4.1 Gordon Macdonald presented the paper and made a number of points by way of introduction;

- a This paper built on the September proposals and shows how the structural changes and new ways of working will combine. But structure is not the main element to the changes, the main change centres on culture and behaviours which will require ongoing support and emphasis is to ensure that the benefits of the structural changes are capitalized upon.
- b S&T is embedded in different parts of the structure; it will continue to be dispersed.
- c The paper does not yet include the Communications function, this will need to be integrated.
- d Project and programme working is a key feature in the proposals.
- e Leadership will be very important; senior staff themselves must make space to address behaviours issues and encourage others to do as well.

4.2 The following points were raised in the general discussion:

- a Timothy Walker emphasised that the new structure was a means not an end; Board members must be seen to act differently and consider what they needed to do to be seen as role models. The same was true of the SCS.
- b There was a wish to see a quick move to some programme and project working; but this will require facilitating and will not simply happen of its own accord.
- c Staff must see themselves as working for HSE; as an example of what this means in practice, Adrian Ellis has agreed that Divisional Directors in FOD would undertake a wider representational role.
- d The need now was to move from discussion and analysis to implementation and Peter Graham had taken on this job as a full time responsibility reporting to Timothy, Justin and Kate with Vivienne as the Change Programme Board.

Agreed: The further detail on the shape of the policy structure was

agreed subject to the need for further detailed work, but on the basis that the organogram in Annex 1 is purely illustrative of what it would look like if we mapped all existing functions on to the new structure.

- 4.2 a On Sectors: a fundamental review of what they do was under consideration with the aim of ensuring that they served the whole of HSE and that there was no duplication of effort. At the same time care was needed not to lose unnecessarily any work coming to fruition now.

Agreed: The general direction outlined in the paper for Sectors was agreed.

Sectors should remain domiciled in operational Directorates and be geographically dispersed.

Sectors will be a corporate resource for HSE.

Change in the distribution of sector effort will be expected to reflect more closely HSC/E priorities.

- 4.3 a On programme working: team and programme working are both essential but it is important to avoid confusing one with the other.
- b We need to consider too what will not be done; we need to be able to say that something might be desirable but nevertheless, was not a priority for us for now,.
- c The programme unit will scrutinise proposals and filter them in conjunction with the Strategy Unit which will be the custodian of the big picture.
- d Resources would be managed in a vertical way, there would be contracts with managers horizontally on what they can contribute and what the vertical manager can contribute to the programme. Efficiency and accountability, namely responsibility for delivery, remain with the vertical manager and the agreed programme outcomes/outputs the responsibility of the horizontal manager.

Agreed: We want to move faster not slower toward programme working. We need to proceed ahead of whatever IT/systems changes might eventually be desirable.

We want to avoid a bureaucratic structure to resource and manage these programmes.

The expectation is that detailed programme resourcing decisions will be taken below the level of the Board.

We want to identify some suitable candidate programmes now, in addition to the priority programmes. Others could be; forthcoming legislation; mandatory work; the prosecution pilot/Paul Harvey work; section 3; dealing with large companies; permissioning regimes.

- 4.4 On the project and programme unit: a central question is the extent to which the unit will monitor major programmes. The following points were made;

- a We need to learn from other organisations' experience of similar

units to avoid mistakes made elsewhere.

- b Very careful consideration would need to be given to whoever was put in charge of this unit - if this unit is set up poorly, or is poorly led it will likely impede rather than assist the programmes.
- c Whilst there was agreement that the unit should monitor the effectiveness of programme and project working across HSE, rather than monitoring the delivery of specific programmes, it was recognised that this too was part of the current responsibility of PEFD.
- d The aim should be that the unit prepares reports to the Board in the business risk “traffic light” mode.

Agreed The unit was not to be a command and control unit, rather a source of expertise.

Action Vivienne Dews and those responsible for the Delivery Plan, to agree the level of Delivery Plan monitoring required and to clarify the role of the new unit and other key players, particularly PEFD.

4.5 On S&T resource and the Chief Scientist’s Unit: Mike Fountain reported that getting staff buy-in had been key and a considerable amount of work had gone into this. In essence the aim was for a network of S&T resource across HSE which is corporate. The Chief Scientist will be the key player and will oversee all S&T resource in line with government requirements. His role will be one of oversight, not direct control, but he will challenge if he judges that this resource is not being put to best use.

- a Paul Davies emphasise that this was about him supporting, not controlling, and that there would be a prime responsibility on those Directorate heads who host S&T groups, to network across HSE to ensure they served corporate interests.
- b The location of RPU had been a subject of much discussion. Its immediate “home” had been settled but will be reviewed at a suitable later date.

Agreed Further discussion will take place on who should be the recipients of the radiation element of the Physical Agents CTG. (This was agreed subsequently and will go to NSD).

It was agreed that HDD4 (Biocides and Pesticides) staff would go to FOD and not HID.

- c Although not in the paper, on further reflection Paul Davies proposed that he, as Chief Scientist, should take over responsibility for Knowledge Management in HSE as there will be a key role in establishing and promulgating good practice and evaluation.

Agreed Paul Davies to make a case with options to present to the Board.

4.6 On the “ways of working” pilot events:

- a Timothy Walker stressed that these are important, they were about what we would do, not whether we would do it, and needed time and resource devoted to them. The pilots should aim to discover what works and scope the scale of what resource would be required to roll this out across HSE.

- b Consideration needs to be given to the staff skills that will be needed.
- c The issues of behaviours was absolutely central to the change programme; the structural changes are designed to help facilitate behavioural change, but behavioural changes are crucial to capitalise the major benefits.

Agreed **The proposed pilots were approved and it was agreed that these are not designed to decide "whether" but "how" to proceed. Because behavioural changes are so crucial a further extended session on this would take place at the December formal Board. At the December Board indications of costs, both marginal and opportunity would be needed to inform the discussion. The Board awayday in January will focus on what more and what better Board members might do to support behavioural change.**

4.7 On the Annex 7 process flow diagrams;

Agreed **That these could be a useful aid to discussion (but clearly not an alternative to it).**

4.8 On corporate services the following points were made;

- a The main question was the right balance between what should remain local and what should be at the centre and whether the current balance is right, particularly in light of the new arrangements for budgets flowing primarily through the DDGs.
- b This was an important question but one hard to judge the answer now whilst structures remain unclear.
- c More work will need to be done on the analysis of both the efficiency and effectiveness of any arrangement that should, in any case, seek to encourage managers to manage corporately.
- d A number of career development issues would likely arise. Laurence Williams had recently agreed to take on a corporate role on career development in HSE.

Agreed **Vivienne Dews would continue to take this forward on the basis of a wide remit to seek whatever would deliver efficient and effective services and would also help reinforce the desired outcomes from managers.**

4.9 On communications: the following points were made;

- a There was a need to agree with the HSC on where HSE would be positioned over the next 5 years before deciding the essential communications questions.

Agreed **Decisions on communications have been deferred; until our strategic goals are clear, the structure and mechanism to communicate them cannot be decided. Further work will be done and linked to the paper to the Board in December. Kate Timms and Vivienne Dews to look at what DIAS publishes, how these are geared to priorities, and what media is used for delivery.**

- 4.10 On the new management arrangements;
- a Peter Graham has been given the full-time role of overseeing implementation of the Change programme, reporting to Timothy, Justin and Kate with Vivienne as the programme board.
 - b Whilst most Board members had been given corporate roles in helping take forward the implementation of the Change programme it would be unfair to give Alan Osborne such a corporate role at this stage in view of his need to focus upon establishing the new role of Director of Railway Safety.
 - c All Board members, in addition, have a corporate role to play in helping to present the programme to staff.
 - d Timothy Walker, Kate Timms and Justin McCracken will discuss with individual Board members in the near future what the extent of their individual commitment of time to the programme will be.

4.11 On direct briefings to staff, Gordon Macdonald stressed that a consistent message to staff was required that conveyed a compelling vision. Although the intranet is a resource, it would be unwise to assume that all that is posted on the Change page is either understood or accepted. The following points were then made;

- a Timothy Walker stressed that Board members must continue to consider and explain how the changes will affect individual members of staff.
- b A programme of events was required that Board members can use to meet staff and promulgate the message.

Agreed In taking out the change message to staff Board members would actively seek opportunity to talk to other than line management staff.

Agreed A communiqué would be issued, the main components of which would be that generally the Board had agreed the papers, wished to progress faster rather than slower, the essential feature of change is changed behaviours (which will discussed further at the December Board), the resources required for the change programme next year will be factored into the budget cycle.

Action Gordon Macdonald and the Change team.

Action Peter and the Change team to produce a briefing pack for Board members to use when getting the message out.

Action Alastair Cannon to produce an early list of decisions, ahead of the minutes, that can be cascaded to staff.