

Meeting Date:	5 September 2006	FOI Status:	Fully Open
Type of Paper:	Above the line	Paper File Ref:	
Exemptions:	None		

HEALTH AND SAFETY EXECUTIVE**Minutes of the HSE Board meeting held on Tuesday
5 September 2006 in Conference Room 7, Redgrave Court, Bootle****Present**

Geoffrey Podger
Jonathan Rees
Justin McCracken
Alex Brett-Holt
Sandra Caldwell
Vivienne Dews
Colin Douglas
Giles Denham
Patrick McDonald
Kevin Myers
Eddie Morland
Jane Willis

Also attending

For Agenda items 2, 3 and 4
Steve Dennis
Alison McKenzie-Folan
Amanda Shaw
Patricia Williams
Sarabjit Purewal

Apologies

Mike Weightman
Bill Gunnyeon

Minutes

Peter Buckley

- 1 Minutes of the HSE Board held on 2 August and the Action Points**
- 1.1 The minutes of the last meeting were agreed without amendment.
- 2 Finance – current position - (Paper B/06/82)**
- 2.1 The minutes of this part of the meeting are closed.
- 3. Agenda item 3 – Performance and Risk Management 1st Quarter 2006\2007 (Paper B/06/72)**
- 3.1 Vivienne Dews introduced the paper as follows:
- a. This was the first revised presentation of the Balanced Scorecard;
 - b. It was hoped that the revision was an improvement, but suggestions from Board Members for further improvements were most welcome;
 - c. It was intended that the balance scorecard would prompt a series of questions about HSE's performance – and some questions were posed in the body of the paper;
 - d. The balanced scorecard and the risk register would be brought further together as opportunities presented themselves.
- 3.2 During the subsequent discussion, the Board focussed on the questions posed in the paper and made the following comments:
- a. The Board agreed that it was right to reconsider the target of

investigating 90% of complaints received. Complaints investigation should be on the basis of risk and tied in to HSE's sensible risk campaign. Jonathan Rees and Sandra Caldwell would work together to produce a revised set of investigation criteria by the end of the calendar year for introduction at the start of the next financial year, advising the Commission as appropriate;

- b. On the Enforcement Programme it was decided that the indicator should remain at amber/green and for the Delivery of PSA targets (nuclear metric) it should also remain at amber/green.
- c. The metric on the indicator Right people, right skills, right place, right time needed to be reviewed to see if it was possible to better capture how HSE was performing against this target;
- d. The Board noted the current amber/red status on efficiency, effectiveness and productivity.

3.3 In summing up the discussion Geoffrey thanked Vivienne and the team for the paper and all the work that had gone in to preparing it. Geoffrey asked that the actions above be taken forward.

Action Point 93 Jonathan and Sandra to take forward the work on revising the complaints investigation criteria by the end of the calendar year for introduction at the start of the next financial year.

Action Point 94 HR to review the indicator for the HR Strategy.

4 **Agenda item 4 – The way forward in the light of our current financial position (Paper B/06/80)**

4.1 The minutes of this part of the meeting are closed.

5 **Agenda item 5 – Corporate Governance**

5.1 The minutes of this part of the meeting are closed.

6 **Agenda item 6 – Options for the merger of the Gangmaster Licensing Authority with HSE (Paper B/06/77)**

6.1 Giles Denham introduced the paper with the following comments:

- a. The paper was presented in advance of it being taken at the Commission Meeting in October;
- b. The timing was driven by a Cabinet Office deadline on consultations about Hampton mergers – there was no intention of bringing forward the proposed merger date of 2009, which would follow a three year review of the GLA's performance;
- c. The recommended options for merging the GLA Board and GLA itself into HSC/E entailed the minimum necessary change in this sensitive area;
- d. DEFRA had agreed to consult on the options for the GLA merger.

6.2 During the subsequent discussions the following points were made:

- a. The Board accepted the recommendations in the paper;
- b. The merger proposals, once implemented, could be changed over time if the benefits justified this.

Action Point 95 Giles Denham to arrange for the paper to be taken to the Commission for its October Meeting.

