

<b>Health and Safety Executive Board Paper</b>		<b>HSE/05/033</b>	
<b>Meeting Date:</b>	25 May 2005	<b>FOI Status:</b>	Fully Open
<b>Type of Paper:</b>	Above the line	<b>Paper File Ref:</b>	
<b>Exemptions:</b>	None		

## **HEALTH AND SAFETY EXECUTIVE**

### **The HSE Board**

## **IMPROVING SCIENCE & TECHNOLOGY GOVERNANCE ARRANGEMENTS**

### **A Paper by John Ewins**

**Advisor(s): John McGuinness, Brian Fullam, Richard Clifton**

**Cleared by Paul Davies on 18 May 2005**

#### **Issue**

1. Improving the governance arrangements for resources used for science and technology (S&T), both internal staff resource and spend on commissioned research and support.

#### **Timing**

2. Routine.

#### **Recommendation**

3. The Board is asked to consider and endorse:
  - (i) re-establishing a science co-ordinator and project officers in the Fit3 programme with appropriate skills and competencies (para 7) which will entail some additional costs (para 19);
  - (ii) creating a science network to ensure cross-cutting research needs are identified and addressed (para 9);
  - (iii) reconstituting the Science Strategy Committee so that it can (i) consider and decide on competing priorities for non-programme science and (ii) fulfil the expanded remit of the Key Facilities Club Board (paras 11 & 13).

#### **Background**

4. The Board/RDG determine high-level spend on S&T advised by the Chief Scientist and Science Strategy Committee. Their decisions about resource allocation between strategic programmes are informed by advice from the Strategic Programme Directors.

There is nothing comparable to inform decisions on allocation between programme and non-programme work. There is also no clear mechanism for advising them about allocation of resources on internal S&T staff.

5. The current arrangements for managing spend on external research and support were introduced in 2002 (see B/01/36 *S&I Strategy: Implementation of New Management Arrangements*). These established the principle that research should be planned and managed to address strategic priorities rather than the needs of particular directorates. A Science Co-ordinator was appointed for each of the (then) Strategic Blocks supported by full-time Project Officers. Their task was to formulate, manage and monitor research activity and, with the help of science programme advisory groups, ensure co-ordination across the blocks.
6. The system was realigned with the strategic programmes in June 2004. The arrangements have not lived up to expectations, being particularly weak in identifying and addressing cross-cutting issues and longer-term research projects. The main problems have been first our failure to recruit staff with the appropriate science skills, competencies and aptitudes into key posts, limiting the 'informed customer' capability in some programmes. Second, neither the policy staff leading the advisory groups nor the S&T staff involved felt able to advise outside of their areas of responsibility or expertise and the groups were wound up in December 2003 as ineffective. More recently, research commissioning has been managed for Fit3 by the programme office. They are handling the administrative side of the work well but are not equipped to provide the necessary science input, this burden falling increasingly on the already-stretched programme management teams.

## Argument

### Governance within programmes

7. A review last year by the Chief Scientist Unit suggested there was nothing fundamentally wrong with the system for managing research within a programme. For example it works reasonably well for the major hazards programme and the new team (under Michael Topping) in the disease reduction programme is already making a difference. **We therefore recommend that the science co-ordinator (at Fit3 level) and project officers (for other Fit3 programmes) be re-established with the appropriate skills and competencies.** Annex 1 gives our detailed recommendations for managing Fit3 research and support. Similar arrangements will also be needed in the other strategic programmes and action is already underway, e.g. a science co-ordinator and project officer being appointed for the Local Authority Strategic Programme. For the strategic enabling programmes S&T support needs are likely to be predominantly for analytical science. The following paragraph describes how this is being handled.
8. For analytical science we are already going a step further by embedding staff from the main disciplines (social science, economics, statistics and risk policy) in the programme teams. Annex 2 describes the roles and responsibilities of these 'programme support teams' in more detail. These staff will enhance the 'informed customer' capability of the programmes and, for example, take responsibility for the design and management of surveys to collect evidence. We still need to determine the

best way for these staff to work with the science co-ordinator/project officers but they are likely to fulfil parts of these roles.

### Governance across and between programmes

9. Improving co-ordination across and between programmes is probably the more difficult task. Experience suggests that formal structures, particularly standing committees and groups, are not the answer. The key is regular information sharing and exchange between the people involved. Therefore **we recommend the creation of a science network as a straightforward mechanism for information exchange and discussion**. Its main purpose would be to ensure that cross-cutting research and support needs are identified and referred to the OURS (Overarching and Underpinning Research & Support) programme. The network should include the programme managers and specialist staff embedded in the programmes. It should also include members of the Horizon Scanning Intelligence Group so that emerging issues requiring external research can be played-in and linked, where appropriate, to current concerns and priorities. To ensure good overall coverage of physical science in the network we need to extend membership to people with expert knowledge in the Corporate Topic Groups and the specialist pools.
10. Each area of science, e.g. economics, fire and explosion, human factors, would need a network member responsible for instigating and overseeing discussion and being accountable for successful identification and referral of cross-cutting issues. Much of the information exchange could be IT-based, e.g. through an intranet community, with meetings kept to a minimum. But such a network will only be successful if individual members 'live the values', particularly being open and honest and trusting others, and experience suggests that this will require some face-to-face contact. The network would still need to be managed and CoSAS can provide the secretariat for this. To help you envisage such a network, Annex 3 gives more detail of our ideas about the handling of analytical science.

### Governance outside the programmes

11. There are no formal arrangements to assess priorities (across HSE) for using S&T resource outside the programmes and hence for advising the Board/RDG. Early indications from the OST Review are that they are concerned that our S&T work focuses too much on the strategic programmes to the detriment of longer-term science needs. The absence of clear governance arrangements for non-programme science is likely to exacerbate this concern. **We recommend that the Science Strategy Committee be reconstituted to fill this gap**. The new 'committee' would probably be at a slightly lower level and involve stronger external representation. It should include people from the Intelligence Group, Policy Group, Operations Group, Communications Directorate and CoSAS (to represent analytical science and the CTGs/specialist pools).
12. The Science Strategy Committee's current remit looks across all HSE science, including the programmes. It is important that we avoid introducing (or maintaining) unnecessary 'management' layers, and the governance arrangements for programme science set out above do not really need this extra layer. But the Board/RDG needs comprehensive advice about the balance of S&T resource between programmes and non-programme areas. We therefore think it sensible for the reconstituted committee to retain at least an oversight across the piece.

13. With the aim of simplifying arrangements as much as possible **we believe that the reconstituted committee should also inherit the broader remit (agreed by the RDG) of the Key Facilities Club Board.** In essence this remit is to ensure that HSL maintains both the critical facilities and teams needed to enable HSE to respond to foreseeable events.

## **Consultation**

14. The paper has been informed by extensive discussions in CoSAS and with the Fit3 programme. PEFD and Communications Directorate have also been consulted.

## **Presentation**

15. There is not likely to be much, if any, media interest in the proposed changes. Key stakeholders in the external science community will be interested, particularly in the context of our recently revised Science Strategy. They are likely to welcome moves to improve governance of non-programme science if they believe it redresses the balance with and (in their view excessive focus on) research for the programmes.
16. The changes should play well with OST and hence with ministers (if we are seen to be acting promptly to address concerns arising from the OST review). DWP are also likely to welcome the changes if they lead to better management of our research budget (in the sense of not repeating recent substantial underspend).
17. We will ensure that these changes are properly communicated throughout HSE, so that staff are clear about roles and responsibilities under the proposed arrangements, and the benefits that will flow from them.

## **Costs and Benefits**

18. There are no particular wider costs. The benefits are not financial, except in so far as the changes enable us to manage the research budget more effectively. The main benefit should be better targeted, co-ordinated and managed research by better-equipped staff both for programmes and non-programme areas and more large scale, cross-cutting research projects, essential for maintenance of HSL's science base.

## **Financial/Resource Implications for HSE**

19. The resource implications will not be substantial. In the main we are proposing changing like for like (e.g. progressive replacement of existing staff in key posts with a better skill/competence match) or like for less (e.g. reduction in committees and groups by coalescing/combining). Additional resources will be needed to fund the new science coordinator role, the money for which transferred along with the previous post holder to his new job. There will also be some transitional costs, e.g. getting new project officers into some Fit3 programmes before existing staff have been redeployed, and additional

costs from replacing B4 with B3 staff but these are not likely to be significant. There could be minor savings depending where new project officers are based.

### **Environmental Implications**

20. None.

### **Other Implications**

21. N/A

### **Action**

22. If the Board endorses the proposed changes CoSAS will continue to work with the main internal and external stakeholders to develop an implementation plan.

## SCIENCE GOVERNANCE FOR THE FIT3 STRATEGIC PROGRAMME

### Issue

1. To devise fit for purpose arrangements for science governance, that accord with the overall governance arrangements for the FIT3 Strategic Programme (SP).

### Present position

2. The FIT3 SP is managed at a number of levels: the SP Director – assisted by a small support team & advised by an SP Board, the five Band 0 Programme Directors and a number of sub-programme managers. RDG has agreed a 2005/06 allocation of about\* £11m for commissioned science for the FIT3 SP and asked that this be used flexibly (\*to be finalised following changes to the programme structure). A small team in the SP support office, headed by John Grant, manages this allocation & provides a Project Officer (PO) resource. None of these POs has a science background. The Disease Reduction Programme has an informed customer (for research) and dedicated PO resource (Michael Topping's team), which the other Programmes do not. The commitment of internal S&T resource is managed through the programme planning process and appears in the resource commitment plans seen by the RDG. But its use reflects, in general, the historical associations with former programmes and in some cases is patchy.

3. A number of reviews have identified that the ability of the Programmes & sub-programmes to act as informed customers for science, both analytical and physical, is limited. A key factor is that the number and quality of Science Co-ordinators and POs recruited to implement the present S&I Strategy is significantly lower than originally agreed by the Board (B/01/036). It was envisaged that Science Co-ordinators (Bands 1/2) and POs (Band 3 scientists & Band 4 scientists in career development posts) would fulfil these roles. However, it has proved difficult to recruit such people in Rose Court. It is therefore not surprising that the science allocation for the FIT3 Programme (and its predecessors) has been consistently underspent and the research strategies of the sub-programmes are of variable quality (and have primarily been driven by the interests of in-house S&T resource committed to the programmes). Knock-on effects include the commissioning of few long-term programmes of research and the failure of the original arrangements for establishing priorities within and between Programmes & sub-programmes, for co-ordinating similar research needs & for identifying cross-cutting issues – the SIAGs.

4. Experience over the past four years is that using full time POs with a scientific background to manage research projects is the most successful approach. This is reinforced by experience in OGDs who have used both internal and external resources to manage S&T programmes. The use of POs without a scientific background has been questioned in the OST scoping study and will be investigated further in the main review. The management of some research projects by staff who have not been trained as POs has often been unsatisfactory.

5. CoSAS is establishing Programme Support Teams (PSTs) to provide an informed customer capability for analytical science. It is intended that there will be a PST with a lead co-ordinator for each sub-programme. It is important to emphasise that the PST will be embedded in the team as an informed customer for analytical science not just to provide advice. Hence, it will be the responsibility of the PST co-ordinator to advise on and agree the analytical science that the sub-programme needs. This science would then

be provided directly by CoSAS or commissioned from external sources with the outputs monitored by the PSTs. This is in contrast to other HSE specialists, e.g. in the CTGs & topic pools, who individually provide advice across the full range of 'physical science' disciplines (defined broadly to cover all those disciplines where the PSTs will not provide the expertise) but this is in a largely un-coordinated manner and is dependent upon the historical associations that have grown up between the resource and the programmes.

6. There is a clear need to establish a physical science informed customer role analogous to that of the analytical sciences. This could be provided by one or more persons embedded within the programmes who would advise on the physical science requirements of the programmes working with the network of HSE S&T resource. Alternatively the role could be delivered by a team, made up of a limited number of disciplines where the demand from the programme(s) is high, directly analogous to the PST. The role would cover both identifying commissioned research and the direct provision of science and engineering expertise from HSE specialists and external sources.

### **Possible way forward**

7. As an organisation we want to improve our evidence base. Key to this is being able to define the questions and gaps associated with the Strategic and Enabling Programmes and to use scientific expertise to develop 'researchable' questions to be answered through individual projects and/or research programmes. The Science Strategy states that we will draw on external advice and partnerships to help ensure we are framing sensible questions and developing coherent programmes of research. New procedures need to provide a framework to assist this process.

8. First, a Band 1/2 Science Co-ordinator is needed in the FIT3 SP structure to ensure that the range of science input to the SPs is appropriate and to ensure that the SP's £11m science allocation is used to the best effect to support delivery of its business objectives. This post is essential to ensure that decisions are based on scientific considerations with budgets used flexibly. Ideally, this post would be located in R/C but it is more important to get the right person and remote location should not be discounted. The Major Hazards SP, which has an experienced Science Co-ordinator, Shaun Welsh, would be a useful model.

9. However it is probably unrealistic to expect the Science Co-ordinator to undertake all of the question framing and challenge single-handed and support will be needed to assist with these initial stages. This process should help the Strategic Programme Director by resulting in a plan setting out the questions to be addressed, the timescales and the risks associated with not undertaking the research. COSAS (CSU/CSKU) and/or the emerging Science Network might provide this support. Involving the latter will help to ensure that where possible good research questions are developed to meet cross cutting needs (e.g. human factors/behavioural questions).

10. Once the projects have been identified then experience demonstrates the value of full time POs with a scientific background. All research projects should be managed in this way. There are no such POs in the FIT3 SP support office and urgent action is needed to rectify the position. This raises a number of questions: how many such POs are needed, how can they be provided (previous attempts to recruit such staff in R/C have been largely unsuccessful); could they operate from a distance, e.g. Bootle, and what should the relationship be between the POs and members of PSTs?

11. Experience with the OURS programme is that the equivalent of 3 POs are needed to manage an allocation of £8.5m (which includes a coherent communications research programme and a number of large surveys, all with informed customers). Hence, on a pro rata basis, a total resource of up to 4/5 POs would be needed to manage the £11m FIT3 SP allocation. This is about half of the resource agreed in 2001 and depends on an informed customer input, and the development of large coherent programmes of work.

12. It is intended that members of PST should be the informed customers for analytical science for the SPs and as such they would work appropriately with the POs to ensure that there is a quality approach to defining and sourcing the evidence/research needs, designing the research, assuring the emerging research findings and the interpretation, evaluation and utilisation of the research. Training and development needs on both sides would be dealt with as part of the collaboration. The disciplines engaged in the analytical science support required by the SP should be reflected in the make-up of the Research Co-ordinator/POs team. It is anticipated that the larger share of the £11m referred to above would be spent on analytical science and this too might have bearing on the composition of the POs team.

13. In the light of previous experience and the location of most of HSE's physical scientists outside of London, options are to recruit London-based POs for physical science externally or to base the posts where the most suitable candidates are available. It is proposed that the former option should be pursued in the first instance.

14. The component Programmes and sub-programmes of the FIT3 SP need to be informed customers for physical science, as it will be their responsibility to ensure that the input from HSE specialists and research results are used to the best effect to support delivery of the SP's objectives. Proposals for the competences & capabilities needed and the training to provide these have been drawn up by CSU and should be finalised in discussion with John Ewins & the FIT3 SP. CoSAS will be developing parallel arrangements to provide scientific advisers with a better understanding of the needs of policy makers

## **Responsibilities**

15. The SP Director is responsible for development of the 3-year SP Plan. The Science Co-ordinator should provide scientific input, advised by their POs.

16. The Science Co-ordinator should work with sub-programme managers to develop costed 3-year science strategies for the sub-programmes & with Programme Directors to amalgamate these into prioritised 3-year science strategies for the Programmes. Support should be provided if necessary from COSAS to assist with development of the individual sub-programme and Programme science strategies in line with the HSC Science Strategy.

The Science Network should advise on opportunities for synergy and crosscutting work.

17. The PSTs, HSE “physical science” specialists and CSU/CSKU should advise on how the evidence needed by Programmes & sub-programmes can best be provided, i.e. directly by HSE staff or through commissioned research. The following Table lists the various tasks needed to develop a project when a need for research is identified. The respective roles of PO and informed customer are proposed for each of these tasks.

<b>Task</b>	<b>Project Officer (PO)</b>	<b>Informed Customer</b>
Develop scope for work & draft ROAMEF	Lead	Technical input & advice
Identify opportunities for collaboration	Lead	Advice
Decide whether or not work should be tendered	Advice	Lead (or delegate to PO)
Agree the scope	Advice – seeking help from specialists, as appropriate	Lead (or delegate to PO)
Gain approval to proceed	Lead	Support
Prepare ITT	Advice	Lead (or delegate to PO)
Assess tenders	Support	Lead
Negotiate technical scope and deliverables	Lead	Advice
Manage project	Lead	As considered necessary, e.g. meetings of project board
Review draft & final deliverables	Overview & compliance	Lead on review
Disseminate & use results	Lead on publication of report	Use results, having regard to ROAMEF (& subsequent developments, if appropriate)
Evaluate impact	Ensure compliance	Lead on evaluation

## PROGRAMME SUPPORT TEAM: ROLES AND RESPONSIBILITIES

### Background

1. Programme Directors, and Strategic Programme Directors, have requirements for specific types of support for the design, performance management, performance reporting and evaluation of their three-year plans. In addition, programmes have requirements for other evidence gathering and analysis including to improve understanding of the nature of the issues and effective interventions, trends (and the reasons for trends) in the data and the lessons that can be gleaned from relevant interventions here and elsewhere.
2. The ways in which CoSAS and others have previously supported programmes in meeting their evidence requirements have provided mixed results. Some programmes have established effective working arrangements with CoSAS members, other programmes have found it more difficult to achieve the required degree of close collaboration.
3. Discussions with Jane Willis and her Programme Directors have identified a new way for CoSAS to work in support of programmes. This is based on the idea of multi-disciplinary teams drawn from across CoSAS with Programme support Team (PST) members embedded in the programme teams and working alongside programme colleagues providing an agreed level and type of support for a predetermined amount of their working week. Each member of the PST, in their particular specialism, will need to exercise a challenge function and active support in finding solutions.

### PST support

4. The types of support required by the programme teams will be largely determined by the evidence requirements identified in the initial three-year plans for the programmes. Ongoing work on plan development has identified the following generic requirements for individual programmes:
  - for the evaluation of the behavioural and organisational impacts of HSE projects and programmes: designing, commissioning, managing, delivering and discussing the implications of evidence to support the design, delivery, performance reporting and process and impact evaluation of interventions in pursuit of PSA (and other) targets, advising on specialist approaches to achieving the behavioural and organisational impacts that the HSC/E are seeking, liaising over the ethics of research conduct, maintaining social research standards and compliance with survey control procedures
  - carrying out option appraisals, cost-benefit and value for money assessments, applying Treasury Green Book and OGC principles, advising on the PSA implications of Spending Reviews, developing the economic case for health and safety, estimating the economic impacts and costs of workplace accidents and ill health, macro- and micro-economic modelling, maintaining standards of economic research, designing and discussing the implications of evidence from economic impact evaluations of projects and programmes
  - identifying high-risk sectors and occupations for targeting programmes, advising on the most relevant data, sampling and analysis from regular and other statistical, including

epidemiological, sources and their implications for programmes, analysing trends in statistical series (including RIDDOR and RCI scores), maintaining standards of statistical work

- advising programmes on the application of appropriate models for decision-making and for handling potential risks and on the development and updating of programme risk registers and the associated risk management and risk control procedures, such as The Principles of managing Risks to the Public and other guidance on the HM Treasury web site and HSE/C's own R2P2 document and risk management pages on the HSE web site.

5. The work of the PSTs will be a continuous and collaborative activity and the boundaries between roles of social researchers, economists, statisticians and others are often blurred. All for example, need to be involved in keeping programmes' evidence requirements under review and discussing with programme teams the implications of the findings from the evidence supporting performance management and evaluation. Nevertheless, the effective operation of the PSTs will require the roles and responsibilities of members to be clear and agreed. In setting out an initial proposition about who will be responsible for what this note draws on descriptions of the professional roles set out on the Government Social Research, Government Economic Service and Government Statistical Service web sites. These, taken together with the support requirements of the programmes suggest that social researchers, economists, statisticians and risk analysts respectively should be responsible for each of the blocks of support listed above. The skill sets of social researchers and economists will typically overlap in relation to some elements of the first block of support work, particularly on impact evaluation and performance management and reporting.

6. In providing these specific contributions to the work of the programme teams, PST members will work together sharing their knowledge, experience and expertise. PST members will also have joint responsibility for addressing and meeting the wider evidence needs of programmes that will, for example, contribute to the achievements of the programmes after the end of the current PSA period in 2007-08. PST members will work closely together and with programme teams in reviewing and continuing to develop programmes' three-year plans as the PSTs gather further evidence about targets, trends, performance reporting and from project and programme evaluation.

### **Nature of support: living HSE values and behaviours**

7. It is critical to the success of the programme support arrangements that CoSAS's involvement is seen as embedded, supportive, empathic, learning and yet expert and knowledgeable. We will need to work in ways that are innovative and constructively challenging, complementary, professional and team-oriented. The behaviours underpinning these values (unpacked further on HSE's intranet) need to be understood and practised by all PST members.

### **Levels of support**

8. The specific time commitments required from individual PST members will need to be identified in the light of discussions between Programme Directors, programme managers and the PT members, taking account of the overlap in the skill sets of PST members. For initial planning purposes, the following assumptions about the average amount of time

commitment per year from each of the four types of professionals over the whole of the three-year PSA period specifically on supporting programmes seem appropriate: social research 0.3, economist 0.3, statistician 0.2, risk analysis 0.1. In addition, the co-ordination role could take up 0.2 of a PST member's time.

### **Phasing of the work**

9. Work so far on programmes' three-year plans suggests that all PST members will be heavily engaged in the early stages of supporting the development and review of the plans. Once programmes move into delivery, issues of performance management and performance reporting will be more significant and will tend to draw more heavily on the contributions from social researchers and economists. Towards the end of the PSA period, contributions will again tend to come from the wider PST membership.

### **Co-ordinator**

10. PSTs in performing their roles will need to provide, and be seen to provide, a consistent, coherent and joined-up source of support based on a visible and dedicated allocation of their time to meeting the analytic needs of the programme teams within which they are embedded. To ensure that the work of each of the PSTs meets programmes' requirements for analytic support, and that this support, is provided in an integrated way, each PST should have one member who performs an additional role of PST co-ordinator.

11. This will be a demanding role. Co-ordinators will need a thorough understanding of the appropriate support roles, skills and competencies of other PST members and link these with the programme's needs for analytic support. Guided by discussions between CoSAS Heads of Unit, PST members will need to agree on who will take on the extra responsibility of the co-ordinator role. PSTs and Heads of Unit will want to have regard to the possible varying levels of involvement of PST members over the three-year PSA period. To assist in these discussions, Annex A sets out a set of competencies for the PST co-ordinator role.

12. For CoSAS members involved in the PSTs, many, if not most, will be supporting programmes in new ways. We need to recognise that the effective development of the PSTs will, inevitably, represent a learning process. We will need to reflect on the early phases of the work of the PSTs, especially in the light of the wider issues being addressed through the Logica CMG consultancy due to begin in mid-May and run through to mid-July.

## THE SCIENCE NETWORK : ANALYTICAL SCIENCE

*Please note that our ideas about how to operate the network are still developing and this note is therefore a working, rather than a final, document*

1. The principal objective of the Analytical Science Network will be ensuring co-ordination and coverage, across programmes, for surveys and analytical research in the field of analytical science, broadly understood (including economics, social science and statistics). It will be an HSE-wide grouping bringing together the experience of CoSAS staff in the Programme Support Teams and others across the strategic programmes. It will seek to maintain a close relationship with and involve in its work key clients such as programme Directors and programme team members. The network, through its lead members for each discipline, will make recommendations to the strategic programmes (particularly the OURS programme) and sponsor cross-cutting research.
2. The network would operate as a Community of Interest in the related, though separate, fields of evidence to support:
  - programme design;
  - programme performance monitoring and management; and
  - impact evaluation.
3. The network will have “participating members” and for much of the time act as a set of virtual groups (exchanging information and views electronically). However it may need to come together for meetings of specific sub-groups or a “core” Network group from time to time. It will have an identified Chair, John Ewins. The Network will have a role of promoting the use of evidence and sharing knowledge, but also of stimulating action (eg designing and commissioning research) where there is seen to be a need for an enhancement of current activity.
4. The network would subsume the work previously done by the Evaluation Committee and Secretariat. Its functions will include:
  - taking a strategic view as to whether the research being undertaken meets the cross-cutting needs identified in programme ‘Three Year Plans’, drawing on the views of the Programme Support Team members, strategic programme Directors and team members, and communicating any remaining gaps to the programme Directors and the RDG;
  - assessing whether the current level of resources being committed to collecting, analysing and interpreting evidence is appropriate;
  - identifying key cross-cutting information gaps and issues, and communicating identified priorities for research to the Overarching and Underpinning Research and Support (OURS) programme team;
  - supporting Programme Support Teams, strategic programme Directors and managers, and others managing core work, in disseminating the results of research work, and identifying areas within HSE which could benefit from the study results; and

- making sure connections between programmes are made and that programme-specific research is checked for wider application/relevance, at conception.

5. The network will work through the Programme Support Teams to involve key users of evidence in the Strategic Programme teams. The network will also aim to support and involve other key players, including relevant staff in the operational Directorates, SD, BEU, Communications Directorate, PEFD and other key players.

6. Different groupings of participating members would be drawn together for different purposes at different times.