

## Health and Safety Executive Board Paper

<b>Meeting Date:</b>	1 October 2003	<b>Open Gov. Status:</b>	Open
<b>Type of Paper:</b>	Final Update Note	<b>Paper File Ref:</b>	RPD/100/1000/03
<b>Exemptions:</b>	No		

### HEALTH AND SAFETY EXECUTIVE

#### The HSE Board

#### FINAL UPDATE ON PROGRESS WITH THE IMPLEMENTATION OF THE CORPORATE SUPPORT REVIEW AND DETAILS OF MEANS OF TAKING THE WORK FORWARD

**Author: Kevin Allars**

**Cleared by Vivienne Dews on 25 September 2003**

#### Issue

1. Embedding the implementation of the Corporate Support Review into routine HSE Business.

#### Timing

2. This is the last opportunity for the Board to comment on the totality of the implementation programme for the Corporate Support Review before the Project Lead (Kevin Allars) moves on, and the work to take forward the changes are embedded into routine HSE business.

#### Recommendations

#### 3. That Board members

- note the update, ask for clarification as necessary, and provide any comments or input that they consider appropriate;
- note the named SCS staff that have been identified as project leads in taking forward the work;
- continue to encourage their staff to participate fully with the workstreams in order that the identified outputs can be realised as soon as practicable;
- disseminate the paper widely within their commands in order to ensure that staff are aware of the continuing work streams (the wider issue of communicating and engaging with staff on this work will be raised orally at the Board meeting).

## **Position Reached on the 24 CSR Recommendations**

4. The Board has received monthly updates on the CSR Implementation Project. The attached table is modeled on those provided previously, but has been amended to show who, at SCS level, will now take the work forward as part of their routine work programme, what achievements have been realised to date, and what short-term outcomes can be expected.

## **Overview of Progress achieved by the CSR Implementation Project**

5. The project has certainly stimulated a number of worksteams that will eventually realise savings in staff and direct financial resources, as well as producing a more efficient, and I believe more effective, corporate support function within HSE.
6. The team has not achieved as much as had initially been envisaged: this is due to a number of factors, including
  - summer holiday availability within HSE and the CSR team;
  - the team not being able to concentrate fully on just the CSR work (see para 8);
  - some significant resistance to several recommendations from staff and the TU side; and
  - needing to bring staff up to speed with the content of recommendations that they considered they had not been adequately consulted on during the earlier work.
7. Most of the projects have attracted concern from sectors of staff and more generally from the TU side. Some, like the London-review, Flexible Working, Spans of Management, and the T&S system review, have created considerable anxiety with potentially affected staff, and have aroused considerable TU side concerns.
8. One staffing issue that needs recording and learning for the future is that relating to the CSR team. Myself and the 3 staff assigned to the work all brought with them significant and quite long-term duties from their previous posts, and had some anxiety as to where they would move to following the limited timescale CSR work programme. One staff member left HSE employ soon after the project started, and I've still not been able to replace him. I would recommend, therefore, that in order to allow staff on projects of this nature to concentrate fully on the project, that staff are seconded to such teams with no 'baggage' and with a clear route to a future post.

## **CSR Team Staffing Issues**

9. My own role as Head of the CSR Implementation Project will cease on 6 October when I move to HID.
10. Ged Malone (Band 3) will continue to coordinate the work on the corporate support functions, London review and flexible working issues, transferring to RPD in September firstly to continue the CSR work, reporting to Steve Dennis and Vivienne Dews, and then to a permanent post in BEU from January 2004.

11. Denis Toohey (Band 2) will continue working in RPD for the foreseeable future working on his identified CSR topics and other work identified by RPD.
12. Niall Miller (OSD Band 3) will hopefully soon now join RPD, more generally, rather than the CSR team, on a 3-month secondment to take forward the training issues. He will report to John Gould.

### **Presentational Issues**

13. So that staff can see that the disbandment of the CSR Implementation Team doesn't signal the 'end' of the implementation process for the CSR recommendations, it is imperative that they are given the opportunity to see what has been achieved so far, and how and by whom it is to be taken forward. The vehicle for this is this paper, and more pointedly the attached progress table. The wider issue of communicating and engaging with staff on this work will be raised orally for discussion at the Board meeting.
14. Can I please ask the Board members, therefore, to continue to encourage their staff to participate fully with the workstreams in order that the identified outputs can be realised as soon as practicable, and to disseminate the paper widely within their commands in order to ensure that staff are aware of the continuing work streams.

25 September 2003

<u>No.</u>	<u>AGREED RECOMMENDATIONS and BOARD COMMENTS (2/4/03 and 7/5/03 Board Meetings)</u>	<u>PROGRESS to end September 2003</u>	<u>PRIORITY and OUTPUTS</u>	<u>SCS LEAD</u>	<u>HSE LEADS</u>
1 B/03/25 3i	<p><b>Endorse broad messages:</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>○ <b>Make corporate support matter within HSE's values;</b></li> <li>○ <b>Ensure professional management of corporate support is achieved;</b></li> <li>○ <b>Move towards a consistent map of policies, service level standards and systems of accountability;</b></li> <li>○ <b>Colleagues leading or delivering corporate support to engage and communicate more with those they are supporting.</b></li> </ul> <p><i>The support 'organisation' must be seen as valued and enabling, and must be supported in its task, especially the junior staff. All Board Members to emphasise this to their staff.</i></p> <p>and</p> <p><i>More line management responsibility needs to be exercised on ensuring value for money decisions.</i></p> <p><i>See also the outcome required from Recommendation 3.</i></p>	<p>Following the May 2003 Board meeting, all Board members cascaded the supportive message to their staff. There is some encouraging feedback from some 'pockets' of RPD staff that things are improving (although the 'Living the Value' sessions are not fully bearing this out). At the September 2003 Board it was further stressed that work on corporate support activities should be seen as an integral and valuable part of overall career development within HSE. Further evaluation will be undertaken via the <b>2003/4 Staff Attitude Survey results (specific questions have been suggested to the authors).</b></p> <p><b>Managers and staff in technical administrative roles should be expected to have, or to work towards having relevant and appropriately targeted qualifications e.g. those working in Personnel, Finance, Planning and Management functions.</b> This will help them do their jobs and will help them in dealing with professionals in other parts of Whitehall and would be consistent with HSE's image as a professional organisation. Unions support the enhancement of professional qualifications for corporate support staff. <b>This to be addressed via recommendation 23.</b></p> <p>The issue of line management responsibility for value for money decisions is being primarily addressed via recommendation 9 (T&amp;S) and, to a lesser extent, recommendation 8 (procurement).</p>	<p><b>HIGH</b></p> <p><b>2003/4 Staff Attitude Survey results</b></p> <p><b>Better qualified staff</b></p>	<p>Vivienne Dews (John Gould)</p>	<p>All Board Members</p>
2 B/03/25 3ii	<p><b>Board members to consider the specific actions within their divisions or directorates which are necessary to drive Recommendation 1 messages forward.</b></p>				

<u>No.</u>	<u>AGREED RECOMMENDATIONS and BOARD COMMENTS (2/4/03 and 7/5/03 Board Meetings)</u>	<u>PROGRESS to end September 2003</u>	<u>PRIORITY and OUTPUTS</u>	<u>SCS LEAD</u>	<u>HSE LEADS</u>
3 B/03/25 3iii	<p>Head of RPD to consider:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>○ Moving towards a consistent map of policies, service level standards and systems of accountability;</li> <li>○ Using a desktop guide to corporate support for all staff with the essential information on each function – and signposts to the Intranet and elsewhere.</li> </ul> <p><i>Need a booklet/guidance to clarify the roles and responsibilities of RPD and relevant D/D staff, with details of limits of authority and the reasons why, eg treasury rules or tax liabilities.</i></p> <p><i>Need to shift the endorsement of value for money decisions away from RPD and onto authorising D/D line managers.</i></p> <p><i>Require a mechanism for sharing good practice between D/Ds, eg. cheaper travel options.</i></p>	<p>RPD has agreed to lead on producing the further IT-based guidance, modelled on Personnel Division's recently launched new Intranet-based guidance, which was generally well received. This will now be used as a template for the wider web-based RPD-driven guidance.</p> <p>The sharing of good practice between D/Ds has, through bringing different D/D practitioners together, become part of the work of the small cross-D/D teams working on the centralisation work under recommendations 14-18.</p>	<p><b>HIGH</b></p> <p><b>Further Intranet guidance to be launched by mid 2004</b></p>	<p>John Gould (Linda Buxton and Denis Toohey)</p>	<p>All RPD Senior Managers, with input from all D/Ds</p>

<u>No.</u>	<u>AGREED RECOMMENDATIONS and BOARD COMMENTS (2/4/03 and 7/5/03 Board Meetings)</u>	<u>PROGRESS to end September 2003</u>	<u>PRIORITY and OUTPUTS</u>	<u>SCS LEAD</u>	<u>HSE LEADS</u>
4 & 5 B/03/26 11ii/iii	<p><b>Big savings may be possible if radical solutions are followed in relation to the HSE estate.</b></p> <p><b>Support proposal for an early strategic review of London accommodation.</b></p> <p><i>Rose Court rent is likely to significantly increase in Sept 2003. HSE is committed to occupy Rose Court until 2008, but could possibly part let space in the building if space is freed up by moving some staff out of Rose Court, or reducing the space allocation per person.</i></p> <p><i>The review needs to look at who precisely needs to be in Rose Court.</i></p>	<p>Added impetus given to this work in the light of additional required savings to finance the new Merseyside HQ building, the likely increased Rose Court rent from October 2003, and the cross-Government 'Lyons' Review.</p> <p><b>The Project Team and Project Board for this work are in place, and the collection of the initial baseline data on post and functions has been completed (although the data is vary shallow, and overly supports the status quo position).</b> The Project Team is now about to commence 'teasing out' the information provided in the initial responses in order to produce a defensible picture of the HSE roles/functions that need to continue to be based in high cost locations in and around London, and the implications of relocating the remaining posts/functions out of central London to more appropriate alternative locations in and around London (which will not in itself satisfy the 'Lyons' relocation criteria) or elsewhere in the country: the cost of a 'staff work station' in London and Bootle are approximately £11700 and £4250 respectively). <b>The aim is to have a clear picture of roles/functions with the Board by the end of 2003, which will then allow the discussions on implementation to commence.</b></p> <p>The review is understandably causing anxiety amongst Rose Court staff, coming as it does on top of re-organisation and other changes. <b>In order to address this, a reassuring and informative global eMail was issued to staff in August. The Board also supported the review in its message after the 3 September Board,</b> emphasising that although there is a Government wide review of posts in London (the Lyons review) the HSE review was justified in its own right; that it was part of a broader review of estate issues generated by the need to look at our overall building needs including their costs and at operational efficiency considerations; and encouraged staff to address the review constructively.</p>	<p><b>HIGH</b></p> <p><b>Response to Lyons Review by 30/9/03</b></p> <p><b>Board Paper B/03/065 at 1/10/03 Board</b></p> <p><b>Collation of initial responses to survey (suitably teased out) by end Oct 2003</b></p> <p><b>Final output of reduced staff in high-cost offices in London</b></p>	<p>Steve Dennis (Ged Malone)</p>	<p>Vivienne Dews (Steve Dennis and Ged Malone)</p> <p>John Gould (Lyons Review)</p>

<u>No.</u>	<u>AGREED RECOMMENDATIONS and BOARD COMMENTS (2/4/03 and 7/5/03 Board Meetings)</u>	<u>PROGRESS to end September 2003</u>	<u>PRIORITY and OUTPUTS</u>	<u>SCS LEAD</u>	<u>HSE LEADS</u>
4 & 5 B/03/26 11ii/iii  (cont)		<p><b>A meeting of London SCS members was held on 4 September (and detailed notes have since been distributed to staff via that forum) and an all-London-staff meeting/briefing will be organised for November/December 2003.</b></p> <p>Outwith the internal HSE CSR project on London accommodation, the Deputy Prime Minister and the Chancellor of the Exchequer recently asked Sir Michael Lyons to carry out a review to identify options for relocating 20,000 Civil Servants from London and the South East to other parts of the UK. The Review has become known as The 'Lyons' Review, and will inform the next spending review. Sir Michael Lyons has now presented his interim report to his sponsoring Ministers, and urgent discussions are ongoing in HSE to decide on the best way to address this ahead of the 30 September closing date for comments on the interim report.</p> <p>Another key part of the estates jigsaw remains the increased flexible working proposals (recommendation 6 below), which will require significant up-front investment, but should realise savings in office space and running costs in the longer term, as well as freeing up office space out of London to make room for any future dispersement.</p> <p>TU side is unhappy at any suggestion to further reduce space allocation, is significantly strengthening its negative position with respect to home-working and hot-desking pilots, and the review of future central London office requirements, and is also concerned at the pace with which the work is being taken forward (including that staff are being consulted on flexible working issues before the TU side has formally agreed the terms under which it is to be run, even as a pilot).</p>			

<u>No.</u>	<u>AGREED RECOMMENDATIONS and BOARD COMMENTS (2/4/03 and 7/5/03 Board Meetings)</u>	<u>PROGRESS to end September 2003</u>	<u>PRIORITY and OUTPUTS</u>	<u>SCS LEAD</u>	<u>HSE LEADS</u>
6 B/03/26 15iv	<p><b>A highly mobile, productive, and better equipped operational field force able to spend the substantial majority of its time interacting with duty holders. Urgent work should be put in hand to bring a paper to the Board with proposals for a fully worked up, and substantial pilot on hot-desking/home working.</b></p> <p><i>Expensive to set up, but needs to look at investing to save!</i></p> <p><i>Need to also look at the Regional HSE Offices, eg. why is the Aberdeen office so big, and why do we have two offices in Norwich?</i></p> <p><i>Could we co-locate with OGDs and/or, in particular, DWP?</i></p>	<p><b>Proposals are being put to the Board on 1 October for substantial pilots in Worcester, Bristol and to a lesser extent in London to introduce more flexible working in HSE and seek to reduce accommodation overheads (B/03/059).</b> The paper has been produced with considerable assistance from those that would be participating, and addresses as many of the practical, space and social/domestic/safety/liability issues as possible at this stage: these will be further worked up by BSD and participating D/Ds.</p> <p>The field pilots now need to start as soon as possible so that the results can feed into forthcoming property lease/rent negotiations at Luton, Newcastle-u-Lyme, Wrexham and Carmarthen.</p> <p>The proposals aim to assess empirically whether savings can be made in the cost of the estate, whilst also improving the flexibility, productivity and work-life balance of those participating in the pilots. For the purposes of the pilots, formal home working presumes that the normal work base is an individual's home, where a significant proportion of working takes place and the necessary furniture and IT kit is provided. Flexible home working is where the normal work base is an office, but a proportion of working hours are spent working at home using a remote access-enabled laptop PC.</p> <p>The TU side is likely to reject all of the proposals if the formal home-worker policy is not formally agreed with it ahead of the pilots commencing. A 'Homeworking Pack' already exists covering the vast majority of the issues that need to be addressed, but leaving some to personal discussion between the person, their Line Management and PD. The TU side has provided a number of comments on the information in the pack, and PD are arranging to provide responses on those comments. The main TU side concerns are on tax, insurance and liability issues, together with contact arrangements and security considerations, but the key issue is the reversibility and voluntary nature of the pilots.</p>	<p><b>HIGH</b></p> <p><b>Board Paper B/03/059 at 1/10/03 Board</b></p> <p><b>Pilots to start early 2004 (for 6 months)</b></p> <p><b>Cost savings from less office-based staff</b></p>	<p>Steve Dennis (Ged Malone)</p>	<p>Steve Dennis (Dave Norbury)</p> <p>Mike Owens (BEU)</p> <p>Terry Rose And Linda Williams (FOD)</p> <p>Kath Martin (Policy Group)</p> <p>John Gould (Paul Willgoss)</p>

<u>No.</u>	<u>AGREED RECOMMENDATIONS</u> <i>and BOARD COMMENTS</i> <i>(2/4/03 and 7/5/03 Board Meetings)</i>	<u>PROGRESS to end September 2003</u>	<u>PRIORITY</u> <u>and</u> <u>OUTPUTS</u>	<u>SCS</u> <u>LEAD</u>	<u>HSE</u> <u>LEADS</u>
7 B/03/26 15 new	<b>All staff should move to the standard space allocation and work station/storage package within a few years.</b>	<b>All relocated staff will be allocated the standard package, with no more than 17m<sup>2</sup> (and probably closer to 14 m<sup>2</sup>).</b> Merseyside new HQ space will also be allocated accordingly, and decluttering exercises are already in place in Bootle. Rose Court is largely already applying this principle.  Important to recognise the need for some flexibility in approach to account for disabilities or special needs.	<b>MEDIUM</b>  <b>Space saving reducing overall costs</b>	Steve Dennis (Ged Malone)	Steve Dennis (Dave Norbury)
8 B/03/26 18v	<b>Note and endorse the direction of emerging findings from the HSE Procurement Review, that:</b> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>○ <b>There should be more authoritative strategic control of purchasing and central signing of contracts to better control the risks;</b></li> <li>○ <b>The existing mixed mode procurement regimes involving purchasing professionals and D/Ds should continue;</b></li> <li>○ <b>There are regular thorough reviews of each area of external spend to ensure there is a clear business strategy and supporting contract management plan;</b></li> <li>○ <b>The opportunities which exist to reduce transaction costs, and improve supply chain management, are grasped.</b></li> </ul> <p><i>BSD review is still in progress.</i></p> <p><i>We must better check with 'recipients' of goods and services that what is procured is fit for purpose, eg. hire car contract.</i></p> <p><i>Need to ensure that contracts are sufficient and suitable (solicitors are concerned that they do not see enough of the contracts, and that too many individuals are signing contracts).</i></p>	The BSD Procurement Review draft report is with RPD for comment.  The CSR team has established a link with the BSD review/implementation team in order to ensure that the CSR team can assist in implementation of the resulting recommendations as early as possible.  <b>Staff resource in the RPD procurement function is already being managed down, and all procurement finance work is in the process of transferring to Bootle</b> (staff retraining being looked at – finance and contract work)	<b>HIGH</b>  <b>Reduced Staff and more efficient processes</b>	Steve Dennis (Alan Brown and Denis Toohey)	Alan Brown

<b>No.</b>	<b>AGREED RECOMMENDATIONS and BOARD COMMENTS (2/4/03 and 7/5/03 Board Meetings)</b>	<b>PROGRESS to end September 2003</b>	<b>PRIORITY and OUTPUTS</b>	<b>SCS LEAD</b>	<b>HSE LEADS</b>
9 B/03/26 20vi	<p><b>Work should be put in hand to look in more detail at the processes and controls governing the expenses and allowances system with a view to moving to IT based processes and risk based controls.</b></p> <p><i>Urgently pursue computerised expense claims, with line manager's role strengthened to endorse value for money decisions (eg. At OV1 stage of international travel, rather than after that travel has been completed and costs incurred), thus requiring less RPD checking.</i></p> <p><i>Look again at the self certification process for T&amp;S requests and claims to examine whether this be extended (to reduce bureaucracy) or reduced (to assist in value for money checking).</i></p>	<p><b>Electronic A/C34 is now a priority in the DIAS/BEU 'forms programme'. Staged implementation approach proposed:</b>  <b>Stage 1</b> (by March/April 2004): Electronic A/C34, with auto formulae, submitted electronically with electronic signatures and receipts pre-verified by line manager (probably not submitted to RPD), the ability to save and store a developing A/C34, and then maybe stored electronically by RPD. [the reason for the longer than originally signalled timescale is that the earlier stage of a paper version of the form has been dropped] <b>The project is now about to engage the potential users in order to fully address the process and management issues.</b>  <b>Possible Stage 2</b> – Electronic A/C34 with no verification/ checking, everyone self-certificating, and limited audit function. Stage 2 will be covered by a Board paper in November. If followed through, the RPD verification process will be greatly reduced (Band 6 staff savings), but line manager's role in 'value for money' travel and receipt verification enhanced.</p> <p>Contact has been made with Environment Agency, Cabinet Office and Office of the Deputy Prime Minister, which have all implemented varying electronic systems.</p> <p>As a spin-off, use of the new A/C34 should also improve the electronic staff directory database in that, for instance, it needs that database to record accurate line manager roles before the form can progress for payment.</p>	<p><b>HIGH</b></p> <p><b>Paper to Board in Nov 2003</b></p> <p><b>New electronic A/C34 and process by April 2004</b></p> <p><b>Reduced Staff</b></p>	<p>Jane Willis (Denis Toohey)</p>	<p>Pat Williams (George Aughton)</p> <p>Heather Bolton (Rena Evans)</p> <p>Mike Owens</p>
10 B/03/26 20vii	<p><b>Commission further work to consider the full implications of moving from an allowance based T&amp;S system to one of capped actuals.</b></p> <p><i>Whilst the levels of resulting costs and benefits are unclear at present, this is seen as a modernisation improvement.</i></p> <p><i>Need to check the policy across Government, look at pros and cons and the produce a Board paper with recommendations.</i></p>	<p>Visits have been made to the Environment Agency, Cabinet Office and Office of the Deputy Prime Minister (which all work to varying degrees of actuals arrangements). The National Audit Office and Audit Network have also been consulted.</p> <p><b>The case for a move to actuals is not strong, but other options for streamlining the domestic, international and general travel and subsistence systems will be brought to the Board in November.</b> TU side insisting on full consultation on any proposed changes.</p>	<p><b>LOW</b></p> <p><b>Paper to Board in Nov 2003</b></p> <p><b>Reduced Staff and possible financial savings</b></p>	<p>Jane Willis (Denis Toohey)</p>	<p>John Gould (Brian Whitnell)</p> <p>Jane Willis</p> <p>Richard Sutherland</p>

<u>No.</u>	<u>AGREED RECOMMENDATIONS and BOARD COMMENTS (2/4/03 and 7/5/03 Board Meetings)</u>	<u>PROGRESS to end September 2003</u>	<u>PRIORITY and OUTPUTS</u>	<u>SCS LEAD</u>	<u>HSE LEADS</u>
11 B/03/26 24viii	<p><b>Endorse work to develop HSE's future IT system, to avoid duplication of the planning, finance and personnel management systems used throughout HSE.</b></p> <p><i>Requires an HSE corporate project, involving resources from each directorate to enable us to move towards a common, fully effective system.</i></p> <p><i>Improvements to PARIS should be a priority.</i></p>	<p>This has a clear link to some finance issues. <b>PARIS updates have now been raised up the BEU work programme, and some good work is about to be trialled on 'power cube' technology for data storage and retrieval which should allow much more powerful search and display arrangements.</b></p> <p>The IT, databases and systems required to implement the more centralised corporate functions (recommendations 14-18) are being looked at by the task groups established to take those recommendations forward, and <b>BEU is already tasked with developing an HSE-wide 'vision' for IT requirements.</b> The key is D/Ds having the right tools and systems to undertake effective support, and in particular D/Ds using common systems to ensure consistency and avoid duplication of effort.</p>	<p><b>HIGH</b></p> <p><b>Better IT systems (feeds into several other recoms)</b></p>	<p>Steve Dennis (Ged Malone)</p>	<p>All RPD Senior Managers</p> <p>Mike Owens</p>

<u>No.</u>	<u>AGREED RECOMMENDATIONS and BOARD COMMENTS (2/4/03 and 7/5/03 Board Meetings)</u>	<u>PROGRESS to end September 2003</u>	<u>PRIORITY and OUTPUTS</u>	<u>SCS LEAD</u>	<u>HSE LEADS</u>
12 & 13 B/03/26 28ix/x	<p><b>Endorse the broad direction concerning the problems that occur from HSE having 1200 managers, and having to provide for their training needs.</b></p> <p><b>Confirm that the Board would like the policy on this matter to be worked up on the basis of the information from the trial exercises and in discussion with HSE trade unions are brought back for final endorsement.</b></p> <p><i>The Board wants to have better trained managers with wider management spans.</i></p> <p><i>Also need a better definition of what is expected of different managers, eg. not all managers may need to undertake Performance Appraisal activities.</i></p> <p><i>Based on staff in post on 30.9.02, 1200 managers gives a ratio of about 1:3 overall. A move to say 1:6 would therefore halve the number of managers and could halve the training costs, maybe saving around £84k/year. The matter is not simply one of saving money: there is also considerable concern that we need to get managers better trained.</i></p> <p><i>Also need to improve the Performance Appraisal System to recognise and reward the contribution of good managers.</i></p>	<p>The RPD pilot work on increasing management spans has unfortunately faltered. This has now been reinvigorated following a thought provoking note produced by the CSR team, which looked at the issue from first principles, and then, with input from RPD, looked to what is achievable within HSE, how best to trial those concepts (which will probably involve three separate pilots in RPD), and how to take forward the issues of generally improving management skills. However, because of CSR team resource losses, this work is still in its infancy.</p> <p>Discussions planned with Vivienne Dews later in September.</p> <p>TU side has insisted on early conceptual discussions on any findings or proposals.</p>	<p><b>MEDIUM</b></p> <p><b>Too soon to say</b></p>	<p>Vivienne Dews (Denis Toohey)</p>	<p>John Gould (Brian Whitnell)</p> <p>Other RPD Managers</p>

<u>No.</u>	<u>AGREED RECOMMENDATIONS and BOARD COMMENTS (2/4/03 and 7/5/03 Board Meetings)</u>	<u>PROGRESS to end September 2003</u>	<u>PRIORITY and OUTPUTS</u>	<u>SCS LEAD</u>	<u>HSE LEADS</u>
14 B/03/27 11iii  and	<p><b>Move in the direction of a small cadre of finance managers across HSE (residing in D/Ds) – but with very close links to or managed by RPD – providing a service function to D/Ds based on a common core of accurate and timely management information accessible to staff in both the D/Ds and RPD.</b></p> <p><i>Policy Group has already largely moved towards the required output of this recommendation.</i></p> <p><i>Operational requirements are more complex, and further improvements to systems, skills and competencies are required before similar changes would be effective in these D/Ds.</i></p> <p><i>Meanwhile, finance managers <u>must</u> work as a single team, and to common systems.</i></p>	<p>Recommendations 14 and 17 now cover <u>ALL</u> corporate support functions, as required by implementing recommendation 15.</p> <p><b>Policy Group has now formed a corporate support team, which also acts for the Solicitors. OPD and CoSaS are working together on corporate support issues. RPD is also forming a Directorate corporate support team later in 2003.</b></p> <p>Whatever the outcome in the individual D/Ds, it will be important that RPD gets itself in shape to deal with a potentially wider and leading role in corporate support functions within HSE.</p> <p>Meeting chaired by CSR team in June, attended by RI, NSD, FOD, HID, CoSAS, Policy Group and RPD, agreed what work needs to be taken forward and from what common baseline; who will take it forward and how; and the required timescales.</p>	<p><b>MEDIUM (14)</b></p> <p>and</p> <p><b>HIGH (17)</b></p> <p><b>Progress Report to Vivienne Dews by Oct 2003</b></p> <p><b>Forward Intent ‘map’ to Board by Nov 2003</b></p>	<p>Vivienne Dews (Ged Malone)</p>	<p>Jane Willis (Pat Williams)</p> <p>John Gould</p> <p>Task Group Chairs: Pat Williams; John Gould; David Porter; Roy Mayne; Dave Sowerby; Chris Tolley</p>
17 B/03/27 11vi	<p><b>Further work should be put in hand to move towards a more corporate approach to human resource management.</b></p> <p><i>The relationships between RPD and the D/Ds are important.</i></p> <p><i>D/Ds have built up their own resources to manage HR issues locally. This has led to some duplication of activity; “post boxing” of messages and some second-guessing of Personnel’s advice.</i></p> <p><i>Some local D/D resource will still be necessary, eg. to service local career development arrangements. However, the Board is keen for this more corporate approach to move forward</i></p>	<p>Task groups were agreed for the following functions: Managing payroll and cadre; Managing business improvements/risks; Recruitment and vacancy filling; Training administration; IT/IS strategy and administration; and Accommodation. <b>A separate cross-D/D group is looking directly at finance issues, and is moving towards developing an HSE Head of Corporate Function.</b> The task groups first met over the summer, although holiday commitments have caused some availability problems. <b>Their work is progressing well, and there is much discussion of brigading tasks across D/Ds; of developing and using common systems, spreadsheets and databases; of streamlining processes; and of reducing self-tasking of work in D/Ds. The task groups are usefully becoming ‘Families’ of cross-D/D skill teams, and are starting to work together to identify economies of scale, better cross fertilisation of ideas, and thus better and more economic working practices.</b></p>	<p><b>All D/D Corporate Support levels below 4% by March 2004</b></p>		

<u>No.</u>	<u>AGREED RECOMMENDATIONS</u> <i>and BOARD COMMENTS</i> <i>(2/4/03 and 7/5/03 Board Meetings)</i>	<u>PROGRESS to end September 2003</u>	<u>PRIORITY</u> <u>and</u> <u>OUTPUTS</u>	<u>SCS</u> <u>LEAD</u>	<u>HSE</u> <u>LEADS</u>
	<i>urgently, but only to clear targets and milestones, and after consideration of efficiency benefits.</i>	<p>A progress report will be prepared for Vivienne Dews for mid October, but the future cross-D/D resources 'map' will not now be ready until November, so it is unlikely to be possible to start moving resources in order to achieve that collective end point in each of the Directorates until late 2003, although <b>the CSR team reading of the situation is that the indicative 4% target should be met in <u>all</u> Directorates by March 2004, at the latest.</b></p> <p>Any efficiency savings in D/Ds will be declared to the CSR project and surrendered to the appropriate budget holder for reallocation, as appropriate, with D/Ds factoring efficiency savings into their forward plans, and highlighting where appropriate any possible impact on other D/D's.</p> <p>The slightly late presentation of the resources map will mean retaining the moratorium on offering staff permanent postings to corporate support posts within the areas covered by the CSR (see Vivienne Dews' message to Board members, dated 25 July) until probably December 2003.</p>			
15 B/03/27 11iv	<p><b>Agree that at present, the threat to careful management of key HSE business risks of radical change does not suggest wholesale change in the operational directorates.</b></p> <p><i>The Board agreed to go further than had been suggested in the paper, and that there should be an objective to move towards a more corporate/centralised system for <u>all</u> corporate support functions (see also recommendations 14, 16, 17 and 18).</i></p>	The response to this recommendation has been incorporated into the work under recommendations 14, 17 and 18.	<b>HIGH</b>  <b>See other recoms</b>	-	-
16 B/03/27 11v	<b>Agree to pursue economies as far as possible in the meantime, including work to look across the permissioning regimes in relation to Finance Management.</b>	The response to this recommendation has been incorporated into the work under recommendation 14.	<b>HIGH</b>  <b>See recom 14</b>	-	-

<u>No.</u>	<u>AGREED RECOMMENDATIONS and BOARD COMMENTS (2/4/03 and 7/5/03 Board Meetings)</u>	<u>PROGRESS to end September 2003</u>	<u>PRIORITY and OUTPUTS</u>	<u>SCS LEAD</u>	<u>HSE LEADS</u>
18  B/03/27 11 new	<p><b>Whilst the end point of recommendations 14 to 17 are being implemented, in one years time there should be an indicative target of no more than 4% of D/D staff resource in each of the D/Ds (based on salary comparisons) working on corporate function work.</b></p> <p><i>Based on information provided by D/Ds, the present figures in each D/D are approximately: RI 8.6%, FOD 5.3%, HID 5.2%, NSD 3.8%, COSAS 3.5%, OPD 3.0%, SOL 2.3%, Policy 1.5% (ALL since revised and rebaselined).</i></p>	<p>The 4% figure in recommendation 18 will remain as the indicative 'backstop' target for end March 2004, with any higher deviation needing to be fully justified.</p> <p>At the meeting held with D/Ds in June 2003, relevant D/D staff agreed more detailed baseline criteria against which the percentages can be measured. D/Ds rebaselined their Directorates, but <b>the key forward programme is to systematically address recommendations 14 and 17, and to only consider the indicative 4% backstop later on.</b></p>	<p><b>HIGH</b></p> <p><b>See recoms 14-17</b></p>	<p>Vivienne Dews (Ged Malone)</p>	<p>All Board Members</p>

<u>No.</u>	<u>AGREED RECOMMENDATIONS</u> <i>and BOARD COMMENTS</i> <i>(2/4/03 and 7/5/03 Board Meetings)</i>	<u>PROGRESS to end September 2003</u>	<u>PRIORITY</u> <u>and</u> <u>OUTPUTS</u>	<u>SCS</u> <u>LEAD</u>	<u>HSE</u> <u>LEADS</u>
19 & 20 B/03/27 20vii and B/03/29 6 & 7  and  21 B/03/27 20viii and B/03/29 8	<p><b>Confirm the key action identified in the work on HSE's communications strategy to review DIAS' delivery mechanisms and whether some of its current responsibilities might be best managed elsewhere.</b></p> <p><b>Complete the work underway by SID/DIAS on communication gaps, but in parallel to:</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>o <b>Improve our high level focus on communications;</b></li> <li>o <b>Better equip staff to be effective communicators for HSE;</b></li> <li>o <b>Develop a strategy to improve internal and external communications.</b></li> </ul> <p><i>This work to be taken forward <u>urgently</u>, but only after the completion of the Star Alliance work on the communications strategy (due in June 2003), when the scope can be better defined.</i></p> <p><i>Some views from the Board included that:</i></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>o <i>We produce too many 'glossy leaflets/magazines, and too many unnecessary reprints;</i></li> <li>o <i>Our external image is poor and misunderstood, and our internal communication tools are poor.</i></li> </ul> <p><i>Appropriately experienced consultants will be required (starting from a 'blank piece of paper' ie. a fundamental review is required of what we do and how we do it).</i></p> <p><b>Consider whether HSE needs a Director of Communications.</b></p> <p><i>This decision to be reconsidered once the work on recs 20/21 have progressed further, ie. when we should be better able to understand what we need and at what skill and experience level.</i></p>	<p>The CSR implementation team deferred to Kate Timms and Star Alliance on this work and the consultants with whom the CSR team had made initial contact (Delliott &amp; Touche, KPMG and PA), with a view to further scoping the recommendation outputs, were stood down.</p> <p>Vivienne Dews is on the Project Board, and has been provided with briefing by the CSR team.</p> <p><b>The external advert for a new HSE Director of Communications has been placed (Sept 2003).</b></p> <p>TU side has stated its unease at using Star Alliance on this work (it met separately with Peter Graham to discuss).</p> <p><b>Heather Bolton will move to DIAS at the end of September to take forward the necessary review and potential reorganisation of DIAS.</b></p>	<p><b>HIGH</b></p> <p><b>Not now a CSR issue</b></p>	<p>Vivienne Dews and Kate Timms</p>	<p>Kate Timms</p> <p>Vivienne Dews (Heather Bolton)</p>

<u>No.</u>	<u>AGREED RECOMMENDATIONS and BOARD COMMENTS (2/4/03 and 7/5/03 Board Meetings)</u>	<u>PROGRESS to end September 2003</u>	<u>PRIORITY and OUTPUTS</u>	<u>SCS LEAD</u>	<u>HSE LEADS</u>
22 B/03/27 24ix	<p><b>Noting the emerging findings relating to health and safety training issues, more detailed work is needed to develop a better system by:</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>○ <b>Reducing the number of geographically based health and safety committees;</b></li> <li>○ <b>Better sharing and developing of ideas cross the operational directorates to produce common policies;</b></li> <li>○ <b>Increasing the emphasis on line management of health and safety risks (and control measures) in D/Ds;</b></li> <li>○ <b>Introducing project based auditing of key activities and risk controls to give assurance that the risks are being managed.</b></li> </ul> <p><i>HSE's Corporate Health and Safety Committee is currently taking these issues forward, so there will be only a minimal need for oversight from the CSR implementation team.</i></p> <p><i>Emerging findings indicate that:</i></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>○ <i>We have too many committees; and probably too many plans;</i></li> <li>○ <i>We have too many health and safety coordinators;</i></li> <li>○ <i>We are, as in other areas, re-inventing the wheel;</i></li> </ul> <p><i>As a consequence, we are perhaps not doing as well as we should in managing the real issues where risk exists.</i></p>	<p>Work is progressing outwith the CSR remit under the stewardship of John Ives.</p> <p>A separate internal audit report in July reinforced the CSR recommendation and the Board's comments.</p>	<p><b>HIGH</b></p> <p><b>Not now a CSR issue</b></p>	<p>John Gould (John Ives)</p>	<p>Justin McCracken</p> <p>with assistance from John Gould (John Ives) and Richard Sutherland (Dave Morris)</p>

<u>No.</u>	<u>AGREED RECOMMENDATIONS and BOARD COMMENTS (2/4/03 and 7/5/03 Board Meetings)</u>	<u>PROGRESS to end September 2003</u>	<u>PRIORITY and OUTPUTS</u>	<u>SCS LEAD</u>	<u>HSE LEADS</u>
23 B/03/27 27x	<p><b>Note the conclusions and endorse and support in D/Ds further work to revisit and streamline arrangements in relation to training, learning and development.</b></p> <p><i>We spend £6m/yr on training provision. Is this value for money?</i></p> <p><i>The key role is with the attendee and the line manager in ensuring that the training is appropriate, and that it is evaluated, and that the training procurers/providers ensure that any necessary improvements are made on the basis of the evaluation.</i></p> <p><i>Some of the generic concerns with current arrangements include:</i></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>○ <i>Ownership of content for key courses;</i></li> <li>○ <i>Whether current procurement arrangements secure best value for money;</i></li> <li>○ <i>A degree of confusion over resources needed to deliver training in D/Ds and “post boxing”/duplication of functions;</i></li> <li>○ <i>Difficulties with the central support system.</i></li> </ul>	<p>This work has started slowly, partly because of CSR team priorities and staff availability, and partly due to RPD maternity absences. However, there appears to be developing a need for a more fundamental review of training, across policy, support, specialisms and regulatory activity. This is complementary to the review of inspector training (recommendation 24).</p> <p>The starting point could possibly be the developing business strategy, the workforce strategy and the linked career development project. This, and the rest of recommendation 23, will be taken forward by Niall Miller from October 2003 (on a 3-month secondment to RPD).</p> <p>Opportunities for increased e-learning also need exploring, as does the possibility of some earlier REFIT work on training needs and analysis (BEU is the contact).</p> <p>The Policy Development Course is now being evaluated by Jackie Smith.</p> <p>The NEBOSH certificate course run for policy staff administrators is widely perceived to have been a success, and the qualification also enhances the standing of staff when dealing with professionals in industry. Whilst not cheap, such a course, or an equivalent, should probably be an essential part of any administrator’s policy training skills, but for cost reasons needs to be considered alongside other training requirements.</p> <p>Another related issue is the handling of Ministerial casework, which is clearly a priority area for improvement (see last DWP survey) and staff need appropriate training e.g. the Parliamentary Business course and appropriate mentoring. This has been discussed with the HSE Secretariat, and needs further consideration.</p>	<p><b>MEDIUM</b></p> <p><b>Report to Vivienne Dews and Justin McCracken by end 2003</b></p>	<p>John Gould (Niall Miller)</p>	<p>John Gould (Alison Warner and Niall Miller)</p> <p>Pat Williams</p> <p>Richard Sutherland</p>

<u>No.</u>	<u>AGREED RECOMMENDATIONS and BOARD COMMENTS (2/4/03 and 7/5/03 Board Meetings)</u>	<u>PROGRESS to end September 2003</u>	<u>PRIORITY and OUTPUTS</u>	<u>SCS LEAD</u>	<u>HSE LEADS</u>
24  B/03/27 27new	<p><b>A fundamental review of 'Inspector Training' should be carried out in order to ensure that it is either still fit for purpose or that it is amended to reflect what is required to produce good inspectors in optimum time.</b></p> <p><i>FoD is already taking forward a review of its Inspector training (for OMF). However, this recommendation goes wider than that in that it is expected to cover all Inspector training within HSE.</i></p>	<p>Wayne Crumpton (FoD) is leading a cross-Ops team looking at Inspector Training. At its last meeting there was general support for significantly revamping both the content and timing of the Heriott Watt training course; for moving to a more spread out training period, thus allowing periods of experience inbetween training periods; for increased elearning opportunities; for providing fewer in-house training courses for generalists in very specialized topics, e.g. the HID course on chemistry; and for changes in budgetary controls, including looking at reallocating the training budgets with Justin McCracken, Kate Timms and Vivienne Dews (thus placing the budget with the senior Board member responsible for the training programme, but also introducing appropriate audit and monitoring arrangements). Niall Miller will follow these and other ideas forward with Wayne Crumpton's group, and with the Executive and Vivienne Dews.</p> <p>John Gould (Dave Hockey) has picked up the vast majority of the recommendations from Paul Beaumont's review of specialists and their training needs.</p> <p>TU side has asked to be involved during any review of Inspector training, especially with regard to any changes proposed to the Heriot Watt course.</p>	<p><b>MEDIUM</b></p> <p><b>Wayne Crumpton report at end 2003</b></p>	<p>John Gould (Niall Miller)</p>	<p>Justin McCracken + Other Operational Board Members</p> <p>John Gould (Niall Miller)</p> <p>Vivienne Dews (Jane Willis)</p>

**Kevin Allars**  
**25 September 2003**