

<b>Meeting Date:</b>	9 June 2006	<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****Minutes of the HSE Board meeting held on Friday 9 June 2006 in  
Bedford House, Edinburgh****Present**

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

**Also attending**

Phil Scott (item 2)  
Nick Ville (item 2)  
Vic Coleman (whole meeting)  
Steve Dennis (whole meeting)  
John Gould (whole meeting)

**Apologies**

Alison Scott

**Minutes**

Peter Buckley

**1 Minutes of the HSE Board held on 3 May and the Action Points**

1.1 The minutes of the last meeting were agreed without amendment.

**2 Update on the Fundamental Review**

2.1 Geoffrey introduced this agenda item by observing:

- a. This was an opportunity to take a collective rain check on progress to date;
- b. There was also an opportunity for the Board to feed in views and help spot difficulties;
- c. The Board would then need to consider how the individual work streams looked as a package; and
- d. How the progress to date could be best communicated to colleagues.

2.2 Geoffrey then asked Nick Ville to set the scene for the Board discussions. Nick remarked that:

- a. The Fundamental Review was beginning to shape up;
- b. The theme teams were up and running and showing good commitment;
- c. The work was building on what was already underway rather than trying to unnecessarily reinvent wheels;

- d. The theme teams were also having thoughtful and challenging discussions which now needed to crystallise out into firm proposals which should be as specific as possible and prioritised to make the most difference;
- e. During each of the subsequent presentations it would be necessary to:
  - i. Test that the teams are addressing the questions set;
  - ii. Decide if the travel and direction are right; and
  - iii. Consider how best to communicate what is being done and the consequences that flow.

## 2.3 **Update on the Fundamental Review**

### i. Freeing up time

2.3.1 Kevin went through the slide presentation which he augmented with the following comments:

- a. There is insufficient hard data which allows identification of the time stealers – mechanisms need to be put in place to obtain this intelligence;
- b. The team were clear at this stage they wished to create a spring Board from which to move on rather than identify all the possible solutions;
- c. A useful test of where we wanted to be was to have sufficient intelligence to enable cross-charging each other for the work we do – although there was no suggestion that we should do that;
- d. There was a clear overlap with the Delivery Theme Team which Giles and Kevin were actively managing;
- e. The team wanted to make use of Logica\CMG using the call off contract with those consultants;
- f. So far the team had identified the following areas for further work:
  - i. How HSE's culture impacts on time – for example, was a work recording/resource management system (WR/RMS) a part of a command and control culture or is it an opportunity for staff and managers to see clearly where the time was going and what it was contributing;
  - ii. Development of a Resource Management System – as already agreed in principle by the Board;
  - iii. The planning and recording system needed simplifying so that HSE people can plan once, record once and report once;
  - iv. Whether the transactional costs of programme management outweigh the added value programmes bring to HSE's work;
  - v. An agreed lexicon on productivity and what, for example, constitutes "front line work";
  - vi. Proposals for fewer better meetings;
  - vii. A zero based approach to internal forms.

2.3.2 The Board discussed the presentation and the issues arising from it during which the following points were made:

- a. The direction of travel was right;
- b. It might be useful to look at the relative priority and sequencing of the various workstreams particularly from the perspective of where HSE might be in five years time;
- c. Progress had been made in programme working but now was a good time to take stock as there were issues around the cost of what is planned through programme working, the use of resources and whether or not HSE had too many programmes;
- d. Fewer and better meetings must be right but:
  - i. A mechanism needs to be in place to communicate across HSE internal boundaries; and
  - ii. Any method of costing needed to be less time consuming than the meeting itself; and
  - iii. Speaking to each other more often using the phone can be just as good as meeting; and
  - iv. Meeting to discuss and reach transparent decisions was important to a lot of people in HSE.
- e. Planning required agreement on what were the key interventions necessary to achieve health and safety outcomes which was then translated into a coherent business plan – previous attempts to achieve this two stage process had failed;
- f. The use of management information was a two way process – it both helped managers better manage and helped staff see where their time went and what was achieved;
- g. The slides needed some adjustment to clarify some of the language and to take account of the above discussion.

## 2.4 **Update on the Fundamental Review**

### ii. Delivery

- 2.4.1 Giles went through the slide presentation which he augmented with the following comments:
- a. Underpinning this workstream was the challenge to strengthen buy in and to make the best possible use of the expertise available across the organisation;
  - b. The team had already worked up a statement of the four key businesses of HSE and now needed to go on to consider how much activity might take place within each;
  - c. The four business streams were – securing health and safety outcomes, support for the justice system, support to Ministers/HSC and public accountability;
  - d. The team had already commissioned HSL to draw together the existing evidence base on what works and what works best in terms of health and safety interventions;
  - e. The proposed workstreams that were emerging from the theme teams discussion were:
    - i. What needed to be done to be a credible enforcer;
    - ii. How best to segment and then maximise the effectiveness of HSE's interventions with duty holders;
    - iii. Programme design and customer friendliness;
    - iv. Whether HSE had enough information on businesses to be

- able to target its interventions to maximum effect;
- v. How to best support Ministers etc, by improving the quality and timeliness of briefings etc.
- vi. The theme team had also linked its thoughts on consistency and efficiency of work on the justice business to the work of the Enforcement Strategic Enabling Programme.

- 2.4.2 The Board discussed the presentation and the issues arising from it during which the following points were made:
- a. The direction of travel was right but the Board was clear that it did not want the theme team to delve into the procedures for dealing with complaints received about duty holder behaviour;
  - b. The balance between central direction of delivery programmes and local autonomy was difficult to get right to the satisfaction of all;
  - c. The Local Authority contribution to delivery was important and thought should be given to how best to engage them in the next stage of the theme team's work;
  - d. Maintaining public confidence in HSE's delivery system was an important success criteria;
  - e. There was a need for the delivery and freeing up time theme teams to work closely on workstreams around efficient planning and programme management;
  - f. Jane and Sandra could make a contribution on the above issue building on their experience of making the current planning process work;
  - g. Was major hazards a separate business that needed adding to the list of four?

**Action Point 66** Giles to liaise with Kevin on how best to take the work forward on planning and programmes.

**Action Point 67** Giles to circulate the draft description of the four businesses HSE is engaged in.

2.5 **Update on the Fundamental Review**  
 iii. Procurement Make or Buy

- 2.5.1 Alex went through the slide presentation which she augmented with the following comments:
- a. Before a decision to make or buy, a prior step was to establish whether the product was needed or repeated products or knowledge was already in existence;
  - b. The team had made progress on the criteria which they hoped to have available for consultation before the end of phase 2;
  - c. The team was focussing its efforts in three key areas – communications and publicity, training and science;
  - d. The team emphasised that it was important to understand what level of service is promised by contracts with external contractors;
  - e. Staff need to be clear how to get help if needed and what to do if they are not satisfied with the service provided;
  - f. The team also wished to better articulate what the

characteristics were of a good user\contract manager relationship, which could then be applied to existing contracts such as IS\IT, facility management and travel;

- g. Finally the team were looking at how better to manage the process of procuring Solicitor Agents.

2.5.2 The Board discussed the presentation and the issues arising from it during which the following points were made:

- a. The travel and direction were right but in managing expectations of staff it was important to be clear about what was in any contract and what was not;
- b. There could be differences in the levels of service provided between the split headquarters and other buildings in the HSE estates;
- c. Contract specification had evolved during the time HSE has been contracting out work so current contracts contain such things as service credits or penalties.

## 2.6 **Update on the Fundamental Review**

### iv. Making Best Use of Science

2.6.1 Mike went through the slide presentation which he augmented with the following comments:

- a. The theme team had already concluded that there was no need for further information gathering or analysis;
- b. Rather that the underlying message was about effective management underpinned by a clear vision and strategy to achieve it;
- c. That vision was around the theme of Aligned Managed Integrated Delivery;
- d. The team had some initial ideas about how changes could be made to both deliver the strategy and improve the management of science in HSE.

2.6.2 The Board discussed the presentation and the issues arising from it during which the following points were made:

- a. The ideas for change would need to be discussed with staff affected and with their Trade Unions, even if this meant some continuing uncertainty for the staff and their work;
- b. Consideration needed to be given to the phasing of change rather than proceeding on all fronts at the same time;
- c. Identification of all those staff who might be involved would be necessary, along with a clearer picture of the precise implications before the Board could reach any definitive conclusions – the team had an amber light to proceed on the various fronts;
- d. There was broad support for the concept of a Board sub-group on science although how that was supported and keeping it discussing issues at a strategic rather than detailed level would be important;
- e. It was also important to preserve the challenge function of the Chief Scientist within any science governance arrangements;
- f. The strategic relationship between HSE and HSL needed to be better defined as a part of this workstream along with the concept of a “Risk Technology Grouping” that included HSL;

- g. Accountability for delivery of products and to budget was also a key issue;
- h. Any plans to devolve budgets in this area would need to be trialled first so that the main budget holder and the accounting officer could be assured as to the robustness of the budgetary control regime.

2.6.3 Geoffrey summed up the discussion by observing that the Board generally supported the thrust of the proposals. The specific issue regarding expert staff would be mentioned at the Whitley on 14 June. If subsequent proposals were agreed by the Board, they would need full discussion with the Trade Unions.

## 2.7 **Update on the Fundamental Review**

v. Working with others

2.7.1 Jane, Colin and Phil gave a slide presentation which they augmented with the following comments:

- a. The challenge was influencing the right people in the right way and some of these people were difficult to engage;
- b. The theme team had developed an Influencing Model based on existing good practice in HSE which it now proposed to test out on a wider audience;
- c. The team also planned to identify three or four other regulators, including perhaps an economic regulator, to see what scope there was for joint agendas for greater impact;
- d. On the partnership arrangements with Local Authorities, it was important to agree with LA colleagues what success might look like, when it might happen and how we will know;
- e. It was also important to begin to think about the next stage of the partnership arrangements – for example, developing joint delivery plans with LAs or handling field issues such as complaints together rather than separately to give a better service whilst realising efficiency gains.

2.7.2 The Board discussed the presentation and the issues arising from it during which the following points were made:

- a. The direction of travel was right;
- b. It would be necessary to paint the picture of why the influencing model was needed and how it might help operational staff in particular better deliver;
- c. The model could be applied to the larger employer interventions such as LOPP;
- d. The model could be exaltation to best practice whilst also being used to sift out those people with whom engagement was not cost effective.

## 2.8 **Next steps**

**Action Point 68** The Board discussed the next steps and agreed:

- a. **Geoffrey would put out a note to staff shortly after the Whitley to cover the Fundamental Review and Finance;**
- b. **The sort of issues arising from the Fundamental Review would be discussed at the Whitley so that the Trade Unions could point out any particular sensitivities which the Board might not be aware of;**
- c. **Each theme team leader would revise their PowerPoint**

**presentations in light of the Board discussion so that they could go on the intranet;**

- d. Each theme leader would also decide how it wanted to canvass or receive views from staff on the content of those presentations;**
- e. The theme team leaders would also provide details of team membership so if staff wanted to approach one of them individually they could do so;**
- f. One of the themes could form one of the exchange briefing topics – for example the partnership arrangements with LA's;**
- g. The Board would bring Phase 2 towards its conclusion at its video Board on 17 July which would also need to consider how best to engage with the department;**
- h. Geoffrey thanked all the theme team leaders for the quality of the work so far and asked the leaders to pass on his thanks to their teams.**

**3. Agenda item 3 – Follow up from the Board discussion on finance on 22 May to include Paper B/05/51**

3.1 The minutes of this part of the Board meeting are closed.

**4. Agenda item 4 – Follow up to Board discussion with the Commission on Governance and other matters**

4.1 The Board's discussion with the Commission on governance had gone well and there was nothing specific to discuss at this Board meeting as a result.

**5. Agenda item 5 – Report back from exchange briefing on the Board's response to the staff survey and human resources strategy - Paper B/06/48**

5.1 The Board agreed to discuss this paper at its videoconference on Monday 19 June, at which Justin McCracken, Sandra Caldwell and Eddie Morland were not present.

5.2 Colin introduced the paper with the following remarks:

- a. The feedback from the exchange on the HR strategy was supportive but staff wanted more information on the practical implications – it was proposed that HR would amend the Q & A to cover the specific issues raised during the exchange briefing and to look again at the HR communication strategy;
- b. The feedback from the exchange on the Board's response to the staff survey was:
  - i. The correct issues had been identified;
  - ii. Staff remained to be convinced that delivery on these issues was assured;
  - iii. Reporting back on progress would be an important component of credibility that things have changed as a result of the staff survey;
  - iv. The visibility of the Board needed to be improved.

- 5.3 During the subsequent discussion the following points were made:
- a. Board members got a lot out of the visits they paid to other parts and to other offices in HSE, especially on how the different parts of HSE's businesses work;
  - b. But these visits did put a disproportionate onus on FOD to organise and co-ordinate;
  - c. Visibility at these visits was dependent on the number of people seen and what else the board member did whilst on that particular visit;
  - d. Rose Court and Redgrave Court were our largest offices although the number of board visits to either might not reflect this;
  - e. The visits by board members to other parts and offices within HSE needed to be done in a different way for impact;
  - f. Participation in other directorate's events such as away days, workshops and exchange briefings was a good way for board members to meet with staff more widely in the organisation.

- 5.4 Geoffrey summed up the discussion as:
- a. The board agreed with the recommendations in the paper subject to:
    - i. Re-instating a list of which board members are visiting which parts of HSE to manage overlaps and gaps;
    - ii. Board members taking a higher profile within their own individual directorates and divisions;
    - iii. Inviting each other to individual directorate or division events.

**Action Point 69**      **Colin Douglas to take forward the action points agreed above.**

- 5.5 The Board then went on to discuss the next round of exchange briefings during which the following points were made:
- a. The planned exchange briefing on diversity would go ahead but it would be made clear that the time period for the exchange would allow staff with different working patterns to participate;
  - b. There would be a particular emphasis on getting ideas from staff about what more they would like to see done on diversity;
  - c. Future exchange briefings should reiterate that managers could opt out of one, or both, topics if they would not work as a discussion point within their teams, unless the Board specified otherwise because of the importance of the topic to the organisation as a whole. They should keep the Internal Communications team informed about such decisions.

**Action Point 70**      **Colin Douglas to take forward the actions agreed above.**

**6**      **Agenda item 6 – Improving the management of change – Ready to start - Paper B/06/49**

- 6.1 It was agreed to clear this paper by correspondence.

**7            Agenda item 7 – Any Other Business – Agenda for the July Meeting**

7.1            The draft agenda was agreed subject to removal of the item on Workplace Health Connect.

7.2            Geoffrey asked that the thanks of the Board be passed on to the Edinburgh office staff.

**Action       Peter Buckley to convey the thanks of the Board to the  
Point 71       Edinburgh office staff who had helped with the arrangements  
                  for the drinks and the Board meeting.**

I:\Strategy and Intelligence\Library\Board Meetings\2006\July\1 m - minutes of the June Meeting v4.doc