

Health and Safety Executive Board Paper

Meeting Date:	7 May 2003	Open Gov. Status:	Fully Open
Type of Paper:	For discussion and decision	Paper File Ref:	
Exemptions:	Post Board meeting		

HEALTH AND SAFETY EXECUTIVE

The HSE Board

PROJECT INITIATION DOCUMENT FOR THE IMPLEMENTATION OF THE CORPORATE SUPPORT REVIEW

Author: Kevin Allars

Cleared by Vivienne Dews on 30th April 2003

Issue

1. Implementation of the recommendations arising from the review of HSE's Corporate Support activities.

Timing

2. For discussion on 7 May 2003, and agreement of the initial Project Initiation Document (PID) and, in particular, the recommendation/activity **Table** annexed to the PID.

Recommendations

3. **The Board is asked to**
 - i **provide any necessary comment or correction to the summary of its discussion of 2 April recorded in the third column of the Table annexed to the attached PID;**
 - ii **agree the initial PID (which at present only contains indicative priorities rather than target completion timescales);**
 - iii **subject to any changes required as a result of i) above, agree to open release, within HSE, of the table annexed to the PID;**
 - iv **consider how it wishes to be involved in the ongoing project.**

Background

4. The attached PID provides the background to the project. This Board paper simply 'covers' the PID, and asks for Board agreement to the initial programme of work.

Argument

5. It is important that messages from the Board support those from the project team. The team intends to use the table attached to the PID, updated as the work progresses, as a means of informing staff of the work programme agreed by the Board.

Consultation

6. There has been limited consultation of staff at this stage. However, after the discussion at the Board on 7 May it is intended to involve fully the relevant staff in the work, and to 'walk, talk and brief widely' on the implementation project.
7. In addition, an HSE-wide communication will be produced to advise staff of the project aims and initial work programme.

Costs and Benefits (Financial/Resource Implications for HSE)

8. The implementation will directly cost the ongoing staff resource of 1 Band 0, 2 Band 2s and ½ of a Band 3. Successful delivery of the desired outcomes can only be achieved by tasking the relevant Directorate to take specific recommendations forward using existing staff resources over and above the project team input. The use of existing staff resources will most likely require reprioritisation of other work within the Directorates involved, but the extent of this reprioritisation cannot yet be established.
9. The priorities selected for examination by the team and listed in the attached Table reflect the priorities indicated by the Board at their meeting on 2 April, as well as the potential for savings and efficiency gains that might be achievable. A benefits plan is not included in the PID at this stage, but will be developed as the work programme progresses.
10. The project team will act as a catalyst, working closely with Directorates in developing proposals and enabling change. Some implementation work will involve investing resource to achieve a potential future saving. Some other work may result in specific staff resource no longer being required on certain projects, thus freeing up that resource for other priority work. Other work may result in better working arrangements and relationships, or reduced bureaucracy.

PROJECT DOCUMENTATION

PROJECT INITIATION DOCUMENT

Corporate Support Review

Release: Draft
Date: 30 April 2003

PRINCE 2

Author: Ged Malone

Owner: Kevin Allars

Client: HSE Board

Document Number: v1.1

Project Initiation Document History

Document Location

This document is only valid on the day it was printed.

The source of the document will be found on Gmalone on 'danserv1' H:\CSR

Revision History

Date of this revision: 30 April 2003

Date of Next revision:

Revision date	Previous revision date	Summary of Changes	Changes marked
30 April 2003		First issue	

Approvals

This document requires the following approvals.

Signed approval forms are filed in the Management section of the project files.

Name	Signature	Title	Date of Issue	Version
Kevin Allars		Project Leader	30 April 2003	v1.1

Distribution

This document has been distributed to

Name	Title	Date of Issue	Version
Vivienne Dews	Project Director	30 April 2003	v1.1
Kevin Allars	Project Leader	30 April 2003	v1.1
Stuart Bullock	Project Team	30 April 2003	v1.1
Denis Toohey	Project Team	30 April 2003	v1.1
Ged Malone	Project Team	30 April 2003	v1.1
HSE Board	Board members	30 April 2003	v1.1

Project Initiation Document

Purpose of Document

The purpose of this document is to define the project, to form the basis for its management and the assessment of overall success.

Background

In late 2000 and early 2001 RPD undertook a review of the corporate services for HSE which it was responsible for leading or providing. The review was concluded in early 2002 and a report and implementation plan published in April 2002. Board members were consulted on the report during the Summer of 2002 and broadly endorsed its conclusions.

Complementary to the work being carried forward in RPD, HSE's Change Programme also considered the way in which HSE's corporate support was provided. The findings to date of the small team looking at the issues were presented to HSE Board in papers HSE/02/023; HSE/02/039; HSE/02/040; HSE/02/050. The Board noted that the RPD review had been largely (but not exclusively) inward looking. Consequently, whilst a range of important actions are in hand, these have not, by and large, engaged HSE as a whole.

At the HSE Board in early November 2002 it was agreed that a further review should be carried out to look more widely at the delivery of corporate support across all Divisions and Directorates (D/Ds) in HSE. In particular, within the context of the Change Programme, the Board directed the review to consider HSE's mechanisms for providing corporate support with a view to making recommendations for further improvement. In particular, to consider:

- the balance of responsibilities between divisions and directorates across and within the corporate support functions;
- the clarity of roles;
- the relationships necessary to ensure efficiency and effectiveness in delivery;
- whether the current levels of support are appropriate;
- whether the current levels of control to ensure corporate governance are right;
- the progress of RPD's implementation plan and the potential for further efficiencies within RPD.

Against this background, agreement that the project resources would be limited and the project should be a **stock take of the present position pointing to future work**, the key elements were:

- review of the Corporate Services Review undertaken by RPD in April 2002; and progress in implementation;
- interviews with Board Members; and key contacts in D/Ds;
- discussions with team leaders and staff in RPD;
- collection of management data from D/Ds and from within RPD;
- preparation and consultation on initial findings;
- revision and finalisation.

A small project team led by Stephen Williams carried out the review between mid January and the end of March 2003. The review findings and recommendations were

presented to the HSE Board on 2 April in Board papers B/03/025; B/03/026; and B/03/027, together with a separate and complementary paper B/03/029 from Kate Timms on communication issues.

Project Definition

Project Objectives

To either introduce improved processes or structures, or to initiate further longer-term work, aimed at ensuring that HSE's corporate services are being delivered in the most efficient and effective way and that HSE is receiving value for money from the services it contracts, the accommodation it occupies and the IT systems it increasingly relies upon to deliver its goals.

This work will help HSE to continue to improve all the corporate systems necessary for it to be an efficient and effective organisation and achieve its strategic aims. This is the primary focus of the wider HSE change programme.

Project Scope

The project will take forward the outcomes of the 2 April HSE Board meeting detailed in the attached **Table**.

Method of Approach

Successful delivery of desired outcomes can only be achieved by tasking the relevant D/D to take specific recommendations forward using existing staff resources (the right hand column in the attached table will be further populated after the HSE Board agrees to the PID, and once further consultation with the D/Ds has been completed). The use of existing staff resources will most likely require reprioritisation of other work within the D/Ds involved, but the extent of this reprioritisation cannot yet be established. The project team will act as a catalyst, working closely with D/Ds in developing proposals and enabling change and examine the challenge function.

Project Deliverables and/or Desired Outcomes

That all recommendations in the attached **Table** are realised as soon as practicable, using the high, medium and low banners as indicative of the required priority.

Constraints

Major constraints:

- HSE resource/funds/expertise not being made available to develop recommendations/proposals and carry through to completion.
- acceptance and agreement of D/Ds to undertake the work.
- all HSE staff embracing change.

Interfaces

Key interfaces:

- HSE Board
- Head of RPD
- Heads of D/Ds
- relevant staff in D/Ds
- HSE Change Team

Assumptions

That HSE resource and expertise will be made available to develop the recommendations/proposals.

The project team receive the full co-operation of D/Ds.

Initial Business Case

HSE is publicly accountable and operates within a framework of accountabilities agreed with Secretary of State. Within this framework HSE has responsibility, inter alia, to ensure sound management of capital assets and the allocation of resources within a Resource Accounting environment, to reduce fraud, to ensure prompt payment of bills, and to deliver sound environmental management.

Within the context of HSE's Change Programme and the increasing pressure to apply resources to the delivery of goals in the Strategic plan and in particular the PSA targets, the level and delivery of all our corporate services is subject to rigorous review.

Project Organisation Structure

The project team will comprise Kevin Allars, Band 0 (Project Leader); Stuart Bullock, Band 2; Denis Toohey, Band 2; Ged Malone, Band 3. All will be working full time on the project, with the exception of Ged Malone (50%). The project team will report to the Director RPD. Support arrangements, if needed, will be developed once the project gets underway.

Communications Plan

To be developed.

Project Quality Plan

To be developed.

Initial Project Plan

To be developed

Project Controls

- Project Team review meetings every 3/4 weeks.
- Project Team review meetings with Head of RPD every 6 weeks.
- Papers to HSE Board meetings every 2 months (with that in June 2003 indicating the timelines for at least the key high priority recommendations).

<u>No.</u>	<u>PREVIOUS REVIEW TEAM RECOMMENDATIONS</u>	<u>BOARD COMMENT (2/4/03 Board Meeting)</u>	<u>PRIORITY (H, M, L)</u>	<u>TEAM LEAD</u>	<u>HSE LEADS</u>
1 B/03/25 3i	Endorse broad messages: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ○ Make corporate support matter within HSE's values; ○ Ensure professional management of corporate support is achieved; ○ Move towards a consistent map of policies, service level standards and systems of accountability; ○ Colleagues leading or delivering corporate support to engage and communicate more with those they are supporting. 	<p>The support 'organisation' must be seen as valued and enabling, and must be supported in its task, especially the junior staff. <u>All Board Members to emphasise this to their staff.</u></p> <p>More line management responsibility needs to be exercised on ensuring value for money decisions.</p> <p>See also the outcome required from Recommendation 3.</p>	HIGH	Kevin Allars	All Board Members
2 B/03/25 3ii	Board members to consider the specific actions within their divisions or directorates which are necessary to drive Recommendation 1 messages forward.		HIGH	Kevin Allars	All Board Members
3 B/03/25 3iii	Head of RPD to consider: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ○ Moving towards a consistent map of policies, service level standards and systems of accountability; ○ Using a desktop guide to corporate support for all staff with the essential information on each function – and signposts to the Intranet and elsewhere. 	<p>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.</p> <p>Need to shift the endorsement of value for money decisions away from RPD and onto authorising D/D line managers.</p> <p>Require a mechanism for sharing good practice between D/Ds, eg. cheaper travel options.</p>	HIGH	Kevin Allars	All RPD Senior Managers, with input from all D/Ds
4 B/03/26 11ii	Big savings may be possible if radical solutions are followed in relation to the HSE estate.	<p>Rose Court rent increases from £1.6m to £5.5m/yr in Sept 2003. HSE is committed to occupy Rose Court until 2008, but could possibly part let space in the building if space was freed up by moving some staff out of Rose Court, or reducing the space allocation per person.</p>	MEDIUM	Ged Malone	Steve Dennis
5 B/03/26 11iii	Support proposal for an early strategic review of London accommodation.	<p>The review needs to look at who precisely needs to be in Rose Court.</p>	MEDIUM	Ged Malone	Steve Dennis

<u>No.</u>	<u>PREVIOUS REVIEW TEAM RECOMMENDATIONS</u>	<u>BOARD COMMENT (2/4/03 Board Meeting)</u>	<u>PRIORITY (H, M, L)</u>	<u>TEAM LEAD</u>	<u>HSE LEADS</u>
6 B/03/26 15iv	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.	Expensive to set up, but needs to look at investing to save! 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? Could we co-locate with OGDs and/or, in particular, DWP?	HIGH	Ged Malone	Steve Dennis
7 B/03/26 15 new		All staff should move to the standard space allocation and work station/storage package within a few years.	MEDIUM	Ged Malone	Steve Dennis
8 B/03/26 18v	Note and endorse the direction of emerging findings from the HSE Procurement Review, that: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ○ There should be more authoritative strategic control of purchasing and central signing of contracts to better control the risks; ○ The existing mixed mode procurement regimes involving purchasing professionals and D/Ds should continue; ○ There are regular thorough reviews of each area of external spend to ensure there is a clear business strategy and supporting contract management plan; ○ The opportunities which exist to reduce transaction costs, and improve supply chain management, are grasped. 	BSD review is still in progress. We must better check with 'recipients' of goods and services that what is procured is fit for purpose, eg. hire car contract. 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).	HIGH	Denis Toohey	Steve Dennis

<u>No.</u>	<u>PREVIOUS REVIEW TEAM RECOMMENDATIONS</u>	<u>BOARD COMMENT (2/4/03 Board Meeting)</u>	<u>PRIORITY (H, M, L)</u>	<u>TEAM LEAD</u>	<u>HSE LEADS</u>
9 B/03/26 20vi	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.	<p>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.</p> <p>Look again at the self certification process for T&S requests and claims to examine whether this should be extended (to reduce bureaucracy) or reduced (to assist in value for money checking).</p>	HIGH	Denis Toohy	Pat Williams (George Aughton)
10 B/03/26 20vii	Commission further work to consider the full implications of moving from an allowance based T&S system to one of capped actuals.	<p>Whilst the levels of resulting costs and benefits are unclear at present, this is seen as a modernisation improvement.</p> <p>Need to check the policy across Government, look at pros and cons and the produce a Board paper with recommendations.</p>	LOW	Denis Toohy	John Gould (Brian Whitnell)
11 B/03/26 24viii	Endorse work to develop HSE's future IT system, to avoid duplication of the planning, finance and personnel management systems used throughout HSE.	<p>Requires an HSE corporate project, involving resources from each directorate to enable us to move towards a common, fully effective system.</p> <p>Improvements to PARIS should be a priority.</p>	HIGH	Stuart Bullock (and Ged Malone)	All RPD Senior Managers

<u>No.</u>	<u>PREVIOUS REVIEW TEAM RECOMMENDATIONS</u>	<u>BOARD COMMENT (2/4/03 Board Meeting)</u>	<u>PRIORITY (H, M, L)</u>	<u>TEAM LEAD</u>	<u>HSE LEADS</u>
12 B/03/26 28ix	Endorse the broad direction concerning the problems that occur from HSE having 1200 managers, and having to provide for their training needs.	We need <u>fewer, better trained</u> managers. Also need a better definition of what is expected of different managers, eg. not all managers may need to undertake Performance Appraisal activities.	MEDIUM	Stuart Bullock	John Gould (Brian Whitnell)
13 B/03/26 28x	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.	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, which of course is substantially easier with fewer in number. Also need to improve the Performance Appraisal System to recognise and reward the contribution of good managers.	MEDIUM	Stuart Bullock	John Gould (Brian Whitnell)
14 B/03/27 11iii	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.	Operational D/Ds are concerned at moving too quickly before the IT, skills and competencies have been established. Policy Group has already largely moved towards the required output of this recommendation. Finance managers <u>must</u> work as a single team, and to common systems.	MEDIUM	Stuart Bullock (and Ged Malone)	Jane Willis
15 B/03/27 11iv	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.	<u>NOT fully agreed</u> – the DGs view was that all D/Ds should move towards the centralised system asap (see also recommendations 14, 15, 16, 17 and 18).	HIGH	Stuart Bullock (and Ged Malone)	Justin McCracken
16 B/03/27 11v	Agree to pursue economies as far as possible in the meantime, including work to look across the permissioning regimes in relation to Finance Management.	Requires a Board paper with milestones for change (see also recommendation 18).	HIGH	Stuart Bullock (and Ged Malone)	Justin McCracken

<u>No.</u>	<u>PREVIOUS REVIEW TEAM RECOMMENDATIONS</u>	<u>BOARD COMMENT (2/4/03 Board Meeting)</u>	<u>PRIORITY (H, M, L)</u>	<u>TEAM LEAD</u>	<u>HSE LEADS</u>
17 B/03/27 11vi	Further work should be put in hand to centralise human resource management.	<p>The relationships between RPD and the D/Ds are important.</p> <p>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.</p> <p>Some local D/D resource will still be necessary, eg. to service local career development arrangements. However, the Board is keen for this centralisation work to move forward urgently, but only to clear targets and milestones, and after consideration of efficiency benefits.</p>	HIGH	Stuart Bullock (and Ged Malone)	John Gould (Heather Bolton)
18 B/03/27 11 new		Whilst the end point of recommendations 14 to 17 are being implemented, <u>in one years time there should be no more than 5% of D/D staff working on corporate function work.</u>	HIGH	Stuart Bullock (and Ged Malone)	All Board Members
19 B/03/27 20vii and B/03/29	Confirm the key action identified by the work led by Kate Timms on HSE’s communications strategy to review DIAS’ delivery mechanisms and whether some of its current responsibilities might be best managed elsewhere.	<p>This work requires to be taken forward urgently, but only after the completion of the Star Alliance work on the communications strategy (due in May 2003), when the scope can be better defined.</p> <p>Some views from the Board included that:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ○ We produce too many ‘glossy leaflets/magazines; ○ We produce too many unnecessary reprints; ○ Our external image is poor and misunderstood; ○ Our internal communication tools are equally poor. <p>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). Board paper required once outline specification and likely costs are known.</p>	HIGH	Denis Toohey	
20 B/03/27 20vii and B/03/29 6 & 7	Complete the work underway by SID/DIAS on communication gaps, but in parallel to: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ○ Improve our high level focus on communications; ○ Better equip staff to be effective communicators for HSE; ○ Develop a strategy to improve internal and external communications. 		HIGH	Denis Toohey	

<u>No.</u>	<u>PREVIOUS REVIEW TEAM RECOMMENDATIONS</u>	<u>BOARD COMMENT</u> <u>(2/4/03 Board Meeting)</u>	<u>PRIORITY</u> <u>(H, M, L)</u>	<u>TEAM LEAD</u>	<u>HSE LEADS</u>
21 B/03/27 20viii and B/03/29 8	Consider whether HSE needs a Director of Communications.	<u>Not yet!</u> This to be reconsidered once the work on recommendations 20 and 21 have progressed further, ie. when we should be better able to understand what we need and at what skill and experience level.	HIGH	Denis Toohey	Vivienne Dews
22 B/03/27 24ix	Noting the emerging findings relating to health and safety training issues, more detailed work is needed to develop a better system by: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ○ Reducing the number of geographically based health and safety committees; ○ Better sharing and developing of ideas cross the operational directorates to produce common policies; ○ Increasing the emphasis on line management of health and safety risks (and control measures) in D/Ds; ○ Introducing a “project based” programme of auditing of key activities and risk controls to give assurance to the Board that the risks are being managed. 	Emerging findings indicate that: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ○ We have too many committees; and probably too many plans; ○ We have too many health and safety coordinators; ○ We are, as in other areas, re-inventing the wheel; ○ As a consequence, we are perhaps not doing as well as we should in managing the real issues where risk exits. 	MEDIUM	Kevin Allars	Justin McCracken with assistance from John Gould (John Ives) and Richard Sutherland (Dave Morris)

<u>No.</u>	<u>PREVIOUS REVIEW TEAM RECOMMENDATIONS</u>	<u>BOARD COMMENT</u> <u>(2/4/03 Board Meeting)</u>	<u>PRIORITY</u> <u>(H, M, L)</u>	<u>TEAM LEAD</u>	<u>HSE LEADS</u>
23 B/03/27 27x	Note the conclusions and endorse and support in D/Ds further work to revisit and streamline arrangements in relation to training, learning and development.	<p>We spend £6m/yr on training provision. Is this value for money?</p> <p>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.</p> <p>Some of the generic concerns with current arrangements include:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ○ Ownership of content for key courses; ○ Whether current procurement arrangements secure best value for money; ○ A degree of confusion over resources needed to deliver training in D/Ds and “post boxing”/duplication of functions; ○ Difficulties with the central support system. 	MEDIUM	Stuart Bullock	John Gould Pat Williams Richard Sutherland
24 B/03/27 27new		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.	MEDIUM	Stuart Bullock	Justin McCracken

Kevin Allars
30 April 2003