

# Balanced Scorecard 2004/2005

ANNEXE 2 to HSE/04/063

## Delivering the Mission

	End 02/03	End 03/04	Quarter 1	Quarter 2	Quarter 3	Quarter 4
1) Delivering Planned Work	G	A	G	G		
2) Delivering Occupational Health and Safety PSA	N/A	G	A	A		
3) Delivering Major Hazards PSA	N/A	A	A	G		
4) Delivering Health & Safety in HSE	G	G	A	R		

## Managing Resources

5) Living Within The Budget	A	G	G	G		
6) Allocating Resources to Priorities	G	G	A	G		
7) Recruit	N/A	G	G	G		
8) Retain	G	G	G	A		

## Continuous Improvement

	End 02/03	End 03/04	Quarter 1	Quarter 2	Quarter 3	Quarter 4
9) Leadership	N/A	R	A	A		
10) Applying Science & Technology	N/A	G	G	G		
11) Applying Business Improvements	G	G	G	G		

## Reputation

12) Image & Profile	N/A	A	A	A		
13) Trust & Reputation	N/A	A	A	A		
14) Stakeholder Engagement	N/A	A	A	A		

X = NO INDICATORS YET DEVELOPED

Ownership of indicators: Justin McCracken. DDG Ops.

## Balanced Scorecard 2004/2005

<b>1 DELIVERING PLANNED WORK</b>	<b>HSE</b>	<b>HSE</b>	<b>FOD</b>	<b>FOD</b>	<b>HID</b>	<b>HID</b>	<b>RI</b>	<b>RI</b>	<b>NSD</b>	<b>NSD</b>
<b>End 2<sup>nd</sup> Quarter 2004/05</b>	<b>Plan</b>	<b>Outturn</b>	<b>Plan</b>	<b>Outturn</b>	<b>Plan</b>	<b>Outturn</b>	<b>Plan</b>	<b>Outturn</b>	<b>Plan</b>	<b>Outturn</b>
<b><u>OPM A1</u> *</b>										
Total number of safety cases etc* processed					150	125	N/A	48	49	36
Total number of safety cases etc* processed to time and Quality standards					150	125	N/A	47	49	36
% Safety cases etc* processed to time					100%	(G) 100%	100%	(G) 98%	100%	(G) 100%
<b><u>OPM A2</u> **</b>										
Total number of category 1 (or A) issues identified										
Total number of satisfactorily issues closed out										
% Arrangements for quality and timelines					100%	N/A	100%	N/A	100%	N/A
<b><u>OPM C</u></b>										
Total number of complaints reported				11,906	225	174	N/A	344	N/A	5
Total number of complaints followed up				10,771	203	169	N/A	335	N/A	5
% Complaints investigated			90%	(G) 90%	90%	(G) 97%	90%	(G) 97.4%	90%	(G) 100%
<b><u>OPM D</u></b>										
Total number of incidents reported			N/A	N/A	2,630	2,249	N/A	234	N/A	46
Total number of incidents that meet HSC criteria				2,228	150	88	N/A	234	N/A	46
Total number of incidents that meet criteria and were investigated				2,145	143	83	N/A	233	N/A	46
% Incidents that met HSC criteria investigated***			95%	(G) 96%	95%	(G) 94%	95%	(G) 99.60%	95%	(G) 100%
<b><u>OPM E</u> ***</b>										

### Balanced Scorecard 2004/2005

Number higher risk workplaces identified			N/A	600	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A
Number higher risk workplaces receiving an intervention			N/A	272	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A
% High hazard/risk workplaces receiving an intervention			100%	45%	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	100%	N/A

NSD target will be considered to have been met 100% if 95% is achieved

OPM A1\* NSD will report consents and agreements.

OPM A2\*\* this is a new OPM which will be introduced from COIN switch on when any issues tracking system will become available to all ODs.

OPM E\*\*\* This will revert to being a FOD -specific OPM and will change during the year to reflect their work with larger employers (as opposed to only higher risk duty holders) - this cannot be reported against until COIN is operational.

#### Narrative on Delivering Planned Work:

##### **RI narrative:**

OPM A1: One safety case acceptance was 5 days late due to bereavement in the team.

OPM C: Category investigation into a level crossing incident near Maidenhead on 27 September cancelled.

**NSD narrative:** Nil

**HID narrative:** Nil

**FOD narrative:** Nil

## Balanced Scorecard 2004/2005

2 Delivering Worker Health and Safety: national targets									
End 1st Quarter 2004/05	1999/00	2000/01	2001/02	2002/03	2003/04	2004/05	2005/06	2007/08	2009/10
<b>Reduce Number of working days lost/100,000 workers from work related injury and ill health by 30% by 2010</b>			<b>Baseline</b>			<b>RHS Mid-point</b>			
No of working days lost/100,000 workers from work related injury and ill health			40.2m	No new data	New data to be published Nov 2004	34m			28m
<b>Reduce incidence rate of fatal and major injury incidents by 10% by 2010</b>	<b>Baseline</b>					<b>RHS Mid-point</b>			
Incidence rate of fatal and major injury incidents	263.2	262.0	*256.4	*253.1 (95% confidence interval of 236.1 to 270.2)	New data to be published Nov 2004	250.0			236.9
<b>Reduce the incidence rate of cases of work related ill health by 20% by 2010</b>			<b>Baseline</b>			<b>RHS Mid-point</b>			
Incidence rate per 100,000 employees of cases of work related ill health			2,200	**	New data to be published Nov 2004	2000			1800
<b>Progress</b>	<b>See "Narrative on Delivering Worker Health and Safety targets" below</b>								

\* In 2002/03, to allow for changes in the rate of reported major injury relative to the rate of reported over-3-day injury to employees, a revision was made to the methodology used for the calculation of the estimate of major injury reporting used in the indicator. This revision was also applied retrospectively to 2001/02. For **2002/03**, the unrevised indicator shows a rise of 5.7% from 1999/2000, the base year. On a revised basis, the indicator falls by 3.8%. Both these estimates are subject to statistical uncertainty of 5-6%. These alternative estimates represent two interpretations of the relative changes in the rates of reported major and over-3-day injury. **There is insufficient evidence to choose confidently between these alternatives, and the true position is likely to lie somewhere in between, leading to the conclusion that there is no clear evidence of change, which is also in line with the flat trend in the Labour Force Survey.** HSE will carry out an analysis and commission research on the reporting of major injuries. The indicator depends heavily on estimates of the level of major injury reporting. The value for 2002/03 will be updated with a finalised estimate of reporting next year when the results of the 2003/04 LFS are available. . (Note: 95% confidence interval: the range within which we are 95% confident that the true value lies.)

## Balanced Scorecard 2004/2005

*\*\* The balance of evidence suggests that the overall incidence of work-related ill health is likely to have risen since 1999/2000. This is essentially because the latest information suggests work-related stress is rising, while musculoskeletal disorders – the other major cause of ill health – show no change (though there is some evidence of improved risk control). A reduction in asthma, and hints of a reduction in dermatitis, are not enough to offset the stress increase.*

### **Narrative on Delivering Worker Health and Safety targets:**

*Note: Change to targets. Up to this point, we have been reporting on the workplace health and safety PSA arising from SR2000 (end point: 31 March 2004). No workplace health and safety targets were set for SR2002 and those for SR2004 will take effect from April 2005. For this interim year 04/05, HSE will report against national 2010 health and safety targets as described. Previous reports have assessed progress via delivery of Priority Programme and compliance/externalities plans. With HSE's move in 2004/05 to full Strategic Programme working, delivery will be assessed via progress with four of HSE's five Strategic Programmes.*

At this stage, it is not possible to make a full assessment of progress with the targets. Health and Safety statistics for 2003/04 will be published on 18 November 2004 at which time the assessment will be made. Current indications are that progress towards some of the RHS targets so far has been disappointing; however steady progress has been made in meeting milestones in Strategic Programmes in Q2.

There has been encouraging progress in many areas (although it is more difficult to assess our outcomes on the ground given the patchiness of reliable information and the time lags concerned, but we are working to address this). Three of the SPs have improved their overall status compared with Q1. The majority of milestones in each SP have been met. Highlights include the launch of the Local Authority Statement of Intent in September; the Occupational Health pilot covering construction in Leicester and the management stress standards. All were drawn up in wide partnership with external stakeholders, which undoubtedly contributed to their success. The Local Authority SP has made good progress, but there is still much to be done to further engage LAs to contribute to the Programme priorities. The Sector SP has moved to a Green status having made good progress in all of its constituent Programmes – although recently reported figures for sickness absence in the Civil Service show a rise (the Sector SP includes the Government setting an example (GSE) Programme). Consideration is currently being given to both the scope of the GSE programme and what further help Ministers can give to help delivery of the targets. All SPs still need to develop trajectories and work to this end continues, most recently by exploring the use of the Intervention Logic Model (ILM) *(a performance management tool, based on the different stages of the delivery chain (i.e. input > output > initial outcome > intermediate outcome > final outcome)).*

## Balanced Scorecard 2004/2005

Ownership of indicator: Justin McCracken. DDG Ops.

3 Delivering Major Hazards PSA	Base Year	End year	End year	2004/05				
				Quarter 1	Quarter 2	Quarter 3	Quarter 4	End year
End 2nd Quarter 2004/05	2001/02	2002/03	2003/04					
<b>Rail indicators</b>								
SAFETY RISK INDEX	100	101.7	(G) 90.1	(A) 84.54	(R) 91			
<b>Nuclear indicators</b>								
Reports made to HSE by licence holders which indicate a challenge to nuclear safety	143	156	(G) 101	(G) 32	(G) 31			
<b>Offshore indicators</b>								
Major and significant hydrocarbon releases	113	85	(R) 113	* (A) 16	(G) 17			
<b>Onshore indicators (COMAH)</b>								
Relevant RIDDOR reportable dangerous occurrences, e.g. unintentional explosions, failure of pressure systems	177	155	(G) 154	* (G) 37	(G) 41			

**End Year 04/05 targets: Rail 72.9 = Amber/Green. Nuclear 137.6 = Green. Offshore 82.4 = Amber/Green. Onshore 170.9 = Green**

### Narrative on Delivering Major Hazards PSA:

\*The Rail Safety and Standards Board (RSSB) model has been adjusted and new values now apply to historical data and the latest data – and, as usual, rail data lags by one quarter due to the reporting arrangements within RSSB.

The Q1 values for Offshore and Onshore have been altered to reflect data refinement after they were first reported. Q4 03/04 data for onshore and offshore have also altered but, due to an oversight, this was not reflected in the Q1 04/05 report.

### Narrative on Delivering Major Hazards PSA

\*With the exception of the Rail index, the traffic light statuses for Q2 (04/05) have been determined using projected trend lines based on real data from previous years.

\*\* The Rail Safety and Standards Board's Precursor Indicator Model – a risk-weighted model of different types of precursor incident. The Model has been modified substantially during Q2 with the introduction of Network rail's own data so that there is a single model supported by the whole industry, introducing significant changes to the Index. On current performance, the target has been assigned a red.

\*\*\*The Q1 values for Offshore and Onshore have been altered to reflect data refinement after they were first reported. Q4 03/04 data for onshore has also altered but, due to an oversight, this was not reflected in the Q1 04/05 report.

## Balanced Scorecard 2004/2005

Ownership of indicator: Justin McCracken. DDG Ops.

<b>4 Delivering Health and Safety in HSE</b>	<b>End Year</b>	<b>End Year</b>	<b>End Year</b>	<b>Target</b>	<b>Quarter 1</b>	<b>Quarter 2</b>	<b>Quarter 3</b>	<b>Quarter 4</b>
<b>End 2nd Quarter 2004/05</b>	<b>2001/02</b>	<b>2002/03</b>	<b>2003/04</b>	<b>2004/05</b>				
<b>HSE's Board health and safety targets for HSE staff</b>								
Number of DSE related IH1 forms received by Personnel.	N/A	N/A	50	<45	(A) 20	(A) 14		
Number of reported injuries due to slip or trip incidents.	N/A	N/A	34	<30	(A) 11	(A) 9		
Total number of RIDDOR* reportable incidents involving HSE Staff.	12	13	10	<10	(A) 3	(R) 8		
<b>Notification of Accidents and ill Health including non HSE staff</b>								
Fatal injuries	0	0	0	N/A	(G) 0	(G) 0		
Dangerous occurrences	2 [2 RIDDOR]	0	0	N/A	(G) 0	(G) 0		
Major injuries	2 [2 RIDDOR]	1 [1 RIDDOR]	3 [3 RIDDOR]	N/A	(G) 0	(A) 1 [1 RIDDOR]		
Over 3 Day injuries	9 [8 RIDDOR]	13 [10 RIDDOR]	9 [8 RIDDOR]	N/A	(G) 2 [2 RIDDOR]	(A) 9 (2) [8 RIDDOR]		
Minor injuries	114	148	128	N/A	(G) 39 (4)	(G) 37 (6)		
Near misses including verbal abuse and possible accidental exposure to asbestos	72	85	90	N/A	(G) 16 (2)	(G) 32 (1)		
Ill Health cases	129	158	101	N/A	(A) 38 [1 RIDDOR]	(A) 30 [1 RIDDOR]		
<b>Total reported incidents</b>	<b>328</b>	<b>405</b>	<b>331</b>	<b>N/A</b>	<b>(G) 95 (6)</b>	<b>(G) 109</b>		
<b>Sickness Absence</b>								
Number of instances of absence during quarter	6534 (Total)	7152 (Total)	(A) 6672 (Total)	N/A	(G) 1298	(A) 1332		
Average days absence per staff year per quarter	8.06	8.36	(A) 7.97	N/A	(G) 8.07	(A) 9.02		

**\*Reporting of Injuries, Diseases and Dangerous Occurrences Regulations 1995.**

Note: The figures for non-HSE staff are included and shown in brackets (\*)

The figure for RIDDOR reports is shown in square brackets [\*]

Continues...

## Balanced Scorecard 2004/2005

### Narrative on Delivering Health & Safety in HSE:

RIDDOR reports:

#### **DSE related**

- Carpal Tunnel Syndrome exacerbated by high level of keying/mouse use

#### **Major injury**

- Injured Person rode over pothole whilst cycling on site road and fell, sustaining a fractured collarbone.

#### **>3 days, HSE Personnel**

- Tripped on slightly raised floor tile and fell, spraining hand and wrist.
- Moved furniture into meeting room when chair got caught on trailing wire-causing IP to jerk back.
- Strained shoulder muscle pulling boxes on a trolley at a Safety and Health Awareness Day.
- Attempted to move crate, unaware of weight, and strained back.
- Helped to erect large tent and suffered muscle spasm in lower back.
- Walked up stairs, caught foot on one of steps, stumbled and wrenched knee.
- Road traffic accident. (Non - RIDDOR)

#### **>3 days, non-HSE personnel**

- Stack of plastic pallets fell onto delivery driver - grazes and bruises to multiple parts of body
- Slipped on wet floor of kitchen, fell backwards, hit head on floor, and suffered concussion

Justin McCracken, Board Champion for H&S held an urgent Corporate Health and Safety Committee (CHSC) meeting on 11 Oct to address the number of RIDDOR reports received to date.

An action plan was discussed at the meeting (including a communications campaign), which will be further discussed and finalised at the CHSC meeting to be held on 11 November.

A global message has been sent to all staff from the Board Champion and TU vice chair of the CHSC on H&S.

### Sickness Absence in HSE:

Figures do not contain ongoing absences. The total absence is counted in the period in which the absence ends, regardless of when it starts. Therefore, the ending of a long-term absence may distort quarterly figures.

Quarter 2 figures contain two absences of approximately 400 days ending in the quarter and one absence of 614 days. These three instances account for 1,447 of the total days lost in the quarter – contributing 1.45 days average absence per staff year to the quarterly total.

## Balanced Scorecard 2004/2005

Ownership of indicator: Vivienne Dews. Director of resources and planning directorate.

Completed by Patricia Williams and Dave Thomas (FMT).

<b>5 Living within the Budget (2004/05)</b>	<b>2003/04</b>	<b>Budget</b>	<b>Outturn</b>	<b>Variance</b>	<b>Budget</b>	<b>Forecast</b>	<b>Variance</b>	<b>Estimate</b>	<b>Forecast</b>	<b>Variance</b>
<b>HSE (excluding HSL)</b>		<b>To Date</b>	<b>To Date</b>	<b>(+Or-)</b>	<b>For Year</b>	<b>Outturn</b>	<b>(+Or-)</b>		<b>Outturn</b>	<b>(+Or-)</b>
	<b>£K</b>	<b>£K</b>	<b>£K</b>	<b>£K</b>	<b>£K</b>	<b>£K</b>	<b>£K</b>	<b>£K</b>	<b>£K</b>	<b>£K</b>
<b>Admin cost: is spending in line with plan?</b>										
Pay	132,767	65,764	65,253	511	135,034	133,585	1,449	146,731	133,585	13,146
GAE	69,476	38,258	36,594	1,664	81,838	81,860	-22	67,114	81,860	-14,746
<b>Admin Costs</b>	<b>202,243</b>	<b>104,022</b>	<b>101,847</b>	<b>2,175</b>	<b>216,872</b>	<b>215,445</b>	<b>1,427</b>	<b>213,845</b>	<b>215,445</b>	<b>-1,600</b>
Admin Other	5,745	2,613	2,578	35	5,882	6,172	-290	8,064	6,172	1,892
<b>Total Admin Costs</b>	<b>207,988</b>	<b>106,635</b>	<b>104,425</b>	<b>2,210</b>	<b>222,754</b>	<b>221,617</b>	<b>1,137</b>	<b>221,909</b>	<b>221,617</b>	<b>292</b>
<b>Programme: is spending in line with plan?</b>										
<b>Programme</b>	<b>50,005</b>	<b>25,422</b>	<b>22,905</b>	<b>2,517</b>	<b>57,075</b>	<b>56,862</b>	<b>213</b>	<b>61,524</b>	<b>56,862</b>	<b>4,662</b>
<b>Net Resource Budget: is expenditure and income within net resource limit?</b>										
Admin Income	-51,923	-24,250	-24,666	416	-50,833	-50,361	-472	-51,024	-50,361	-663
Programme Income	-5,721	-2,303	-2,081	-222	-4,454	-4,456	2	-4,454	-4,456	2
<b>Total Income</b>	<b>-57,644</b>	<b>-26,553</b>	<b>-26,747</b>	<b>194</b>	<b>-55,287</b>	<b>-54,817</b>	<b>-470</b>	<b>-55,478</b>	<b>-54,817</b>	<b>-661</b>
<b>Net Resource</b>	<b>200,349</b>	<b>105,504</b>	<b>100,583</b>	<b>4,921</b>	<b>224,541</b>	<b>223,662</b>	<b>879</b>	<b>227,955</b>	<b>223,662</b>	<b>4,293</b>
<b>Capital: is spending in line with plan?</b>										
<b>Capital Spend (excl capital sales)</b>	<b>3,750</b>	<b>1,849</b>	<b>1,324</b>	<b>525</b>	<b>4,729</b>	<b>4,729</b>	<b>0</b>	<b>6,502</b>	<b>4,729</b>	<b>1,773</b>

Continues...

### Balanced Scorecard 2004/2005

<b>5 Living within the Budget (2004/05)</b>	<b>2003/04</b>	<b>Budget</b>	<b>Outturn</b>	<b>Variance</b>	<b>Budget</b>	<b>Forecast</b>	<b>Variance</b>	<b>Estimate</b>	<b>Forecast</b>	<b>Variance</b>
<b>HSE including HSL</b>		<b>To Date</b>	<b>To Date</b>	<b>(+Or-)</b>	<b>For Year</b>	<b>Outturn</b>	<b>(+Or-)</b>		<b>Outturn</b>	<b>(+Or-)</b>
		<b>£K</b>	<b>£K</b>	<b>£K</b>	<b>£K</b>	<b>£K</b>	<b>£K</b>	<b>£K</b>	<b>£K</b>	<b>£K</b>
<b>Admin cost: is spending in line with plan?</b>										
Pay	143,559	71,531	70,973	558	147,163	145,515	1,648	160,192	145,515	14,677
GAE	74,954	40,803	39,143	1,660	91,729	91,499	230	76,197	91,499	-15,302
<b>Admin Costs</b>	<b>218,513</b>	<b>112,334</b>	<b>110,116</b>	<b>2,218</b>	<b>238,892</b>	<b>237,014</b>	<b>1,878</b>	<b>236,389</b>	<b>237,014</b>	<b>-625</b>
Admin Other	8,980	3,797	3,716	81	9,647	9,841	-194	11,677	9,841	1,836
<b>Total Admin Costs</b>	<b>227,493</b>	<b>116,131</b>	<b>113,832</b>	<b>2,299</b>	<b>248,539</b>	<b>246,855</b>	<b>1,684</b>	<b>248,066</b>	<b>246,855</b>	<b>1,211</b>
<b>Programme: is spend in line with plan?</b>										
<b>Programme</b>	<b>54,181</b>	<b>27,598</b>	<b>24,915</b>	<b>2,683</b>	<b>62,274</b>	<b>62,061</b>	<b>213</b>	<b>66,723</b>	<b>62,061</b>	<b>4,662</b>
<b>Net Resource Budget: is expenditure and income within net resource limit?</b>										
Admin Income	-77,796	-38,107	-38,568	461	-81,816	-80,796	-1,020	-77,181	-80,796	3,615
Programme Income	-5,722	-2,305	-2,082	-223	-4,456	-4,457	1	-9,653	-4,457	-5,196
<b>Total Income</b>	<b>-83,518</b>	<b>-40,412</b>	<b>-40,650</b>	<b>238</b>	<b>-86,272</b>	<b>-85,253</b>	<b>-1,019</b>	<b>-86,834</b>	<b>-85,253</b>	<b>-1,581</b>
<b>Net Resource</b>	<b>198,156</b>	<b>103,317</b>	<b>98,097</b>	<b>5,220</b>	<b>224,541</b>	<b>223,663</b>	<b>879</b>	<b>227,955</b>	<b>223,663</b>	<b>4,293</b>
<b>Capital: is spending in line with plan?</b>										
<b>Capital Spend (excl capital sales)</b>	<b>5,645</b>	<b>2,190</b>	<b>1,042</b>	<b>1,148</b>	<b>62,854</b>	<b>62,854</b>	<b>0</b>	<b>71,100</b>	<b>62,854</b>	<b>8,246</b>

#### Narrative: Outturn to date and Forecast outturn against Budget

- HSE (excl HSL) Outturn to date compared to Budget is showing a Net Resource under spend of £4.921m which includes a £2.175m under spend on Payroll and GAE, £0.035m under spend on Admin Other, £2.517m under spend on Programme and an over recovery of income of £0.194m.

The Forecast Outturn against Budget is showing a Net Resource under spend of £0.879m which is made up of a forecast Admin under spend of £1.137m, a forecast Programme under spend of £0.213m and an under recovery of income of £0.470m.

The key points are:

- The Admin outturn to date compared to the mid-year budget to date shows the continued reduction in payroll due to the recruitment restrictions and some slippage in IT spend related to COIN. The Programme position shows lower than anticipated external research and support spend against profile.
  - The reduced forecast compared to mid-year budget shows a variance of less than 1% and again relates to reduced payroll partly offset by an associated reduction in income. This suggests either the forecasts are overstated or the profiles entered at mid-year were not accurate.
- HSL's outturn against budget is showing a surplus after the second quarter but is forecast to break-even over the full year.

## Balanced Scorecard 2004/2005

**The Traffic Light for outturn to date and forecast outturn against budget must be Green (although the forecast includes a significant increase in the rate of spend in the second half of the year which will need to be carefully managed).**

### **Narrative: Forecast Outturn against Estimate (Estimates are Parliamentary controls on income and expenditure)**

3. The Estimate is as per the Winter Supplementary and the Admin figure only includes the £2m from DfT for Cullen. The potential £4m from DWP for Cullen is not yet included and receipt is subject to on-going discussions.

The HSE (excl HSL) position is showing a forecast Admin overspend of £2.263m of which the payroll and GAE is forecast to overspend by £1.6m and Admin income is forecast to under recover by £0.6m. Admin Other (depreciation cost of capital etc) is forecast to under spend by £1.9m but options to utilise these funds in-year are being reviewed.

The forecast Programme position shows a planned under spend of £4.7m in support of the Occupational Health Pilots and the communication strategy next year.

4. The HSE and HSL forecast position compared to Estimate is manageable with EYF if the Cullen funding is not received.

**The Traffic Light for forecast outturn against Estimate must be Green.**

## Balanced Scorecard 2004/2005

Ownership of indicators: **Justin McCracken**. DDG Ops.

6 Allocating Resources to our operational priorities	End year		End year		2004/05							
	2002/03		2003/04		Quarter 1		Quarter 2		Quarter 3		Quarter 4	
	Plan	Outturn	Plan	Outturn	Plan	Outturn	Plan	Outturn	Plan	Outturn	Plan	Outturn
<b>OPM B (1) % resource (inspector time) committed to Strategic Programmes as a proportion of that planned overall*</b>												
FOD	60%	63%	60%	72%	60%	(G) 67%	60%	(G) 68%	60%		60%	
HID			100%	107%	100%	(A) 89%	100%	(G) 95%				
RI			60%	66%	60%	(A) 53%	60%	(G) 59%				
NSD			30%	32.51%	30%	(G) 30.06%	100%	(G) 100%	100%		100%	
<b>OPM B (2) Proportion of total resources spent on frontline activity in accordance with OD plans**</b>												
FOD					N/A	N/A	52%	(G) 54%		N/A		
HID					N/A	N/A	43%	(G) 45%		N/A		
RI					N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A		N/A		
NSD					N/A	N/A	55%	(G) 58%		N/A		
<b>FOD only - balance of resource committed to Proactive/reactive*</b>	60-40	51-49	54-46	59-41	54-46	(G) 56-44	54-46	(G) 56-44	54-46		54-46	

\*Target: 100% of planned figure

\*\*New OPM designed to capture productivity as agreed at OMF for the next 3 years on an OD basis.

OPSD are working up arrangements for tracking but this may not be operational until the second half of the year - there will be no report for Q1 and possibly Q3.

### Narrative on Allocating Resources to our Operational Priorities:

#### **NSD narrative:**

The only change in reporting method is OPM B (% resource (Inspector time) committed to Strategic Programmes as a proportion of that planned overall). Following advice, NSD have changed this OPM so it links to the NSD Strategic Programme.

#### **FOD narrative: nil**

#### **RI narrative: nil**

#### **HID narrative: nil**

## Balanced Scorecard 2004/2005

Ownership of indicator: Vivienne Dews. Director of Resources and Planning Directorate.

7 Recruit	Baseline	End Year	2004/05			
	2002/03	2003/04	Quarter 1	Quarter 2	Quarter 3	Quarter 4
End 2nd Quarter 2005/06						
Occupancy of unfunded posts (the priority list)						
Total Number occupying unfunded posts in <b>Rose Court</b>	8	(G) 3	(G) 1	(G) 0		
Total Number occupying unfunded posts in <b>Bootle</b>	10	3	(G) 1	(G) 1		
Total number occupying unfunded posts across <b>HSE</b>	18	(G) 7	(G) 2	(G) 1		
Length of time on list to placement in permanent post	N/A	13 weeks	25 weeks	N/A		
Success in filling agreed number of advertised posts within agreed timeframe		(G) 100%	(G) 100%	(G) 100%		
Number of agreed posts advertised	N/A	(G) 69 (Total)	(G) 12	(G) 42		
Number of agreed posts advertised filled	N/A	(G) 67 (Total)	(G) 18	(G) 47		

### Narrative on Recruit:

The indicator measures the number of externally advertised posts within an agreed time frame.

The agreed timeframe is set out in a PD service standard. - For a campaign including an assessment centre the first person must be in post within 21 weeks, where the campaign does not include an assessment centre the first person must be in post within 14 weeks.

In the last quarter reported 42 posts were advertised and filled, a further 5 posts were filled from adverts from the previous quarter. The posts advertised and filled were:

## Balanced Scorecard 2004/2005

Ownership of indicator: Vivienne Dews. Director of Resources and Planning Directorate.

<b>8 Retain and Motivate</b>	Turnover Rate 2001/02	Turnover Rate 2002/03	Turnover Rate 2003/04	Turnover Rate Mid Year 2004/05	Turnover Rate End Year 2004/05
End 2nd Quarter 2004/05					
<b>Turnover rate by the principal 9 disciplines in HSE</b>					
Admin	9.00%	10.30%	8.48%	5.25%	
FAQ	4.60%	3.90%	3.72%	2.42%	
Nuclear	3.10%	6.00%	2.34%	1.76%	
Offshore	5.40%	3.00%	1.35%	2.01%	
Other	11.00%	12.20%	13.86%	5.16%	
Professional and Technical	5.60%	102.20%	20.00%	0.00%	
Railway	11.30%	10.40%	8.47%	5.48%	
Scientific	7.20%	8.40%	5.90%	3.29%	
Specialist	4.30%	1.50%	5.24%	4.12%	
<b>Turnover rate for all staff</b>	7.20%	8.20%	(G) 6.67%	4.04%	

Training indicators to be developed	End Year 2002/03	End Year 2003/04	2004/05			
			Quarter 1	Quarter 2	Quarter 3	Quarter 4

<b>Diversity in HSE</b>	End Year 2002/03	End Year 2003/04	Target for 2005	2004/05			
				Quarter 1	Quarter 2	Quarter 3	Quarter 4
Progress towards SCS Disability Targets 2005	1.80%	1.85%	3.70%	1.90%	1.79%		
Progress towards SCS Gender Targets 2005	25%	22.20%	29%	24.50%	21.43		

### Balanced Scorecard 2004/2005

Progress towards SCS Race Targets 2005	0%	0%	1.80%	0.00%	0.00%		
--	----	----	-------	-------	-------	--	--

Continues....

#### **Narrative on Retain and Motivate:**

An overall staff turnover rate of below 5% does indicate some degree of stagnation within HSE – hence the outturn of 4% triggers a red status this quarter.

This issue was also raised at the 6 October Board meeting during the discussion on paper B/05/045 "Workforce Planning and Pay Strategy 2004-2010". The Board will be further considering this issue at the 22 December workshop on the Workforce Strategy along with other issues such as recruitment and learning and development.

The implications of the related business risks have not yet been considered in full (they will be at the 22 December meeting), but it is possible that there may be some risk of shortage of competent staff with specific skills, which could impact on delivery. In the light of the current financial climate, however, the Board may wish to consider all options for narrowing any competence /skills gap.

## Balanced Scorecard 2004/2005

Ownership of indicator: Timothy Walker. DG.

### **9 Leadership**

End 2nd Quarter 2004/05

**Indicators are to be developed**

#### **Narrative on Leadership:**

Overall status: amber.

Leadership of HSE has continued to develop but we still look for further improvements. Governance arrangements of HSE have been strengthened and modernised. The Resource and Delivery Group, chaired by the Director General will now scrutinise HSE's Financial, Delivery and Business Improvement and Efficiency activity. The group has external scrutiny from Director of Public Sector Practice (LogicaCMG) and the DWP Director of Welfare to Work, Children and Disabled Persons Group. The Group will take coordinated decisions to ensure HSE remains in a sound financial position and that we are progressing toward our targets.

The Board also agreed on the need to strengthen our focus on delivering our 2 key PSA targets, free up time to allow those staff with accountability to concentrate on this task and reduce duplication of work. To achieve this the significant interface issues between the Hazards and the Sectors programme lead the Board to agree that both strategic programmes will be rationalised under PSA1. The strategic direction statement has given clear guidance on the allocation of resources.

In addition the Board agreed a number of pilots for new ways of managing our specialist functions again to improve both efficiency and effectiveness of this resource and is conducting a review of the future of HSL.

The SCS conference developed practical improvements for HSE's senior management team regarding the movement of resource to areas the strategy should support, how to work more effectively at a regional level and how teams combine to support and deliver our PSA target.

The second stage of the strategy road shows began on 15 November in Rose Court, engaging with staff on how the strategy is being applied in practice, listening to views on its application and practical lessons to be learnt.

## Balanced Scorecard 2004/2005

Ownership of indicator: Dr Paul Davies. Chief Scientist and Engineer.

10 Applying Science and Technology	End Year	End Year	2004/05			
	2002/03	2003/04	Quarter 1	Quarter 2	Quarter 3	Quarter 4
Implementation of Guidance from the Chief Scientific Advisor (CSA), INCLUDING Guidelines 2000 and the Code of practice for Scientific Advisory Committees.						
(i) Annual reports of reviews of at least two major policy development processes to assess how well Guidelines 2000 have been implemented.		(G)	(G)	DISCONTINUED SEE OVER		
(ii) Numbers of staff, especially policy staff, attending training on Guidelines 2000		(A)	(G)	DISCONTINUED SEE OVER		
(iii) CSA satisfied with HSE implementation of his Guidance		(G)	(G)	DISCONTINUED SEE OVER		
% Of spend on work assessed as high priority by the S&I Blocks.		(G)	(G)	DISCONTINUED SEE OVER		
% Of projects where S&I Blocks can demonstrate a link between their commissioned research/scientific support and policy/operational outputs (egg in guidance, legislation, or other activity).		(G)	(G)	DISCONTINUED SEE OVER		
% Of projects where it can be shown that the output of commissioned research and support has made a significant contribution to improved H&S outcomes		(G)	(G)	DISCONTINUED SEE OVER		

## Balanced Scorecard 2004/2005

Indicators discontinued – see new for 2<sup>nd</sup> quarter below:

Continues....

Ownership of indicator: Dr Paul Davies. Chief Scientist and Engineer.

10 Applying Science and Technology	End Year	End Year	2004/05			
	2002/03	2003/04	Quarter 1	Quarter 2	Quarter 3	Quarter 4
<b>Efficient use of S&amp;T resources</b>						
% Of resources spent on strategic programmes, core and horizon scanning compared with profile and business plan.				(G)		
<b>Effectiveness of S&amp;I activity</b>						
% Of feedback showing effective utilisation of S&I outputs and positive impact (or relevant surrogates) on associated outcomes.				(G)		
<b>Horizon scanning</b>						
Systems in place for identifying and producing intelligence on emerging H&S issues and taking forward into further research or policy programmes.				(A)		

New indicators w.e.f 2<sup>nd</sup> Quarter.

### Narrative on Applying Science and Technology:

#### Efficient use of S&T resources:

The second quarter out-turn figures for resource spend and commitment against plan are as follows:

Health & Safety hazards 15% actual v 13% plan (Green).

Sectors 4% actual v 5% plan (Green).

## Balanced Scorecard 2004/2005

**Major hazards 21% actual v 23% plan (Green).**  
**Better Health at Work Partnerships 2% actual v 3% plan (Amber).**  
**Local Authorities 0.4% actual v 1% plan (Red).**  
**Mandatory activities 42% actual v 37% plan (Green).**  
**OURS (Core Proactive) 15% actual v 13% plan (Green).**  
**Communications 0.4% actual v 5% plan (Red).**

Continues....

**Narrative:** Both BHAW and LA are new strategic programmes and are therefore still developing their strategies. There is significant project work in the pipeline for BHAW, which will bring this programme closer to plan towards the end of the year. There has been delay in starting the communications programme due to the establishment of a proper procurement route through the Government's COI. A significant number of projects have been approved for contracting. There has been increased support activity within mandatory activities in relation to the Glasgow explosion investigation.

### **Effectiveness of S&I activity**

Work has been commissioned to develop an electronic version of the Project Record form which will link to the on-line projects directory and provide HSE staff with immediate access to information on the utilisation of outputs from S&T and their outcomes in terms of meeting HSE's business objectives. Data from Project Record Forms (Utilisation) completed since the start of the year show that:

Notable outputs and outcomes from work have included: Evaluation report on 'slips road shows' showed that this approach was an extremely effective intervention for awareness raising and equipping individuals with appropriate knowledge on slips/trips risk management. Live 'outreach' events are very effective in galvanising stakeholders into action to tackle the problem.

Work commissioned to support development HSE's high-level Science Strategy - has helped HSE in producing its Science strategy for the next 3 years. The strategy should ensure that HSE's scientific resources are used to the best effect in supporting our business objectives.

Outputs from an Agriculture Sector Project provided numerous examples of good practice, which provide FOD inspectors with real-life examples of manual handling solutions. Two novel intervention approaches are to be developed - the publication of best practice manual handling solutions on the Agriculture pages of the website and Intermediaries to be involved in manual handling solutions.

The outputs from an horizon scanning review of nanoparticles fed into a major review of nanotechnology undertaken by the Royal society and have helped to inform HSE's decisions on the nature and prioritisation of future work in this area.

### **Horizon Scanning:**

A review of horizon scanning arrangements across HSE, undertaken by SID and CoSAS, showed that although current systems were in place, they need improving. They are operated essentially in an ad-hoc manner sometimes with limited co-ordination or exchange of information (except on sector issues). Cross cutting studies had recently been conducted by CoSAS. A Paper has been presented to the HSE board outlining options for a more structured formal horizon scanning system. The board decided that a dedicated horizon scanning team in HSL, reporting to CoSAS, should be established, operating to a set of defined horizon scanning principles. Work has commenced in putting this horizon scanning system in place.

### **Engagement with Stakeholders:**

The HSC/E Science strategy was presented to a recent open meeting of the Commission, and will now be placed on the HSE website for further consultation. A new interactive science newsletter website was launched on 5th October. The HSE research projects directory has now had over 35000 individual project entries accessed.

## Balanced Scorecard 2004/2005

**Ownership of indicator: Vivienne Dews. Director of Resources and Planning Directorate.**

11 Business Improvement	End Year	End Year	2004/05			
	2002/03	2003/04	Quarter 1	Quarter 2	Quarter 3	Quarter 4
End 2nd Quarter 2004/05						
1.) % Of D/Ds with a significant and balanced business improvement programme		(G) 100%	(G) 75%	(G) 100%		
2.) % Of strategic projects hitting key milestones whilst in development		N/A	N/A	N/A		
3.) % Of BI proposals sent to BIEB which meet the stated criteria for approval of discretionary investment		N/A	N/A	(G) 100%		
4.) % Of strategic delivered projects hitting benefit milestones		N/A	N/A	N/A		
5.) Overall "benefits" collated expressed as a %age of administrative costs equal 5% year-on-year	6.4%	(G) 6.1%	N/A	R 3%		
6.) Cash releasing BI savings expressed as a % of total benefit savings achieved		N/A	N/A	(G) 85%		

### **Narrative on Applying Business Improvement:**

Sub indicators 2 and 4 - non-reporting arise from there being no formal arrangements in place for collecting this information. BEU expect to be able to report on these sub indicators at the end of Q4.

Sub indicator 3 - a detailed approvals process has still to be agreed, however all proposals were assessed against the key principles and met interim criteria.

Sub indicator 5 - historically achievement is 'back loaded' into Q4.

## Balanced Scorecard 2004/2005

Ownership of indicator: Colin Douglas. Communications Director.

### **12 Image and Profile**

**End 2nd Quarter 2004/05**

**Indicators to be developed**

#### **Narrative on Image and Profile:**

The rail review decision to take rail safety regulation away from the HSE will be detrimental but coverage was reasonably factual and did not major on safety. A published letter from Bill Callaghan responded to a later FT piece referring to criticisms of HSE.

A good article on our approach to stress on the FT front page prompted a Daily Mail attack a year after their last one – HSE as “nanny fascists” and a page of misleading information. Neither a letter from the DDG to correct the pieces nor a Commissioner’s protest letter was published.

There have been several pieces written about risk aversion and the “nanny state”. The Sunday Times listed all the things we had “banned” - repeated by the Daily Mirror. Richard and Judy in the Daily Express, entered the fray, but did not criticise us directly. Simon Jenkins produced one of his usual pieces. A letter from the Deputy Director General was published in response. Jeremy Clarkson also did an attacking piece.

Cockling in Morecambe Bay reared up again when it appeared that 144 had to be rescued by coastguards. Coverage was quite good, despite the local MP saying we were complacent - picked up by BBC Online only - and several reports mentioned our new guidelines.

Sir John Stevens hit out at us on his retirement, saying in the Evening Standard that he almost resigned over our prosecution.

We have continued to maintain a good profile in trade magazines and regional journals.

Overall there has been a worrying increase in stories about events and activities being banned. While several have blamed “health and safety”, many have also referred to unreasonable demands by insurance companies. Is it becoming common currency that we are interfering in the fabric of British society by our “over-zealousness”?

## Balanced Scorecard 2004/2005

Ownership of indicator: Colin Douglas. Communications Director.

### **13 Trust and Reputation**

**End 2nd Quarter 2004/05**

**Indicators to be developed**

#### **Narrative on Trust and Reputation:**

For narrative on Trust and Reputation, see Image and Profile narrative above.

## Balanced Scorecard 2004/2005

Ownership of indicator: Colin Douglas. Communications Director.

<b>14 Engaging Stakeholders</b>
<b>End 2nd Quarter 2004/05</b>
<b>Indicators to be developed</b>

### **Narrative on Engaging Stakeholders:**

A recent series of interviews with senior stakeholders in 50 major organisations revealed perceptions that:

- HSE are decent people who know a lot of things; but
- There are no clear HSE messages.
- Some key organisations are keen to do more work with us

Work on key corporate stakeholders has delivered a prioritised list – ABI, MPs, journalists, RDAs, Cab Office, HMT at the top of it - and we are developing influencing plans to maximise our impact with them. Contacts with them continue meanwhile.

HSC attended the three main party conferences for the first time – plenty to learn for the future but a good start. Responses suggest HSE is recognised as having a legitimate role but we need to strike a better enforcement – advice balance and communicate more and better.

Internal feedback suggests much more work to be done to embed the strategy with internal stakeholders - staff. Board agreed a programme of action in August to take things forward. Four major new initiatives launched in this period – new Express, new e-express, new corporate cascade briefing system and a pulse panel (around 70 panellists so far). Feedback on e-express is very positive – immediacy and brevity both welcomed. Reactions to Express more mixed – concerns about size and content. Pulse Panel feedback identified locational and organisational blocks to corporate cascade briefing. Cascade extended to Band 2s in FOD/Policy following requests for it. We are also responding to feedback on quality of background information supplied. Principle of a 'no news' month was endorsed. Staff survey early 05 will test progress.