Health and Safety Executive
Making Best Use of Science Project Board

A report of proposals arising from the
Organisational Delivery workstream

A paper by Tony Blackmore and Andy Phillips

Introduction

This report is split into a summary and three main sections;

Making Best Use of Science

Organisational Delivery Workstream

Summary of Proposals

1. Introduction

1.1 This summary presents the key proposals for organisational change resulting from deliberations within the Organisational Delivery workstream.

1.2 The Organisational Delivery workstream delivered an implementation plan to the MBUS Project Board , focused on providing options that seek to create an organisational framework for optimising deployment of S&T resource.

1.3 The project has produced an approach that seeks to ensure that:

- HSE's S&T is focused on delivery;
- S&T is deployed where it is needed with optimum flexibility to meet the changing business environment;
- Line management arrangements are simplified and strengthened;
- Provision of strong professional leadership of S&T staff;
- Improved career paths for S&T staff;
- HSL are closely integrated into delivery of HSE's priority work

2. Chief Scientific Advisor's Role

2.1 The Chief Scientific Advisor (CSA) – in addition to his responsibilities to HSC and HSE - is responsible to the Government CSA for the effective implementation of his recommendations and guidance.

2.2 The CSA will be supported by a small group that address many aspects of science governance and planning, some of which will support the evolution of the long term organisational aspects of science delivery within HSE. Under the MBUS proposals the Chief Scientific Advisor will be advised by a newly created Science Sub Group of the HSE Board.

2.3 At implementation the current CoSAS team would remain within the Chief Scientific Advisor's Group (CSAG)[1], subject to an early decision by the CSA on the desired arrangement once the relationships between the STG and other parts of HSE are established.

2.4 Roles and responsibilities within the new system for science governance of the CSA, HSE Board , Science Sub Group, Chief Executive of HSL and HSE Directors are detailed in section 7.1 of "Planning, Governance and Management of HSE science – a concept for improvement."

[1] As discussed with the Chief Scientific Advisor

3. The Science and Technology Group (STG)

3.1 The establishment of a Science and Technology Group was central to the proposals under consideration within the Organisational Delivery workstream.

3.2 Business units have been assessed against key criteria to help formulate a decision for inclusion, or otherwise, within the STG. The criteria (impact on delivery, influencing, flexibility, sustainability, and cost) were based on HSE Directors' views, and have been used to assess the impact of organisational change. The criteria have been applied against individual business units or to assess the overall viability of the STG.

3.3 The proposal seeks to create a viable Division, with minimum disruption to HSE business, bringing together teams where it is a logical to do so and where there are obvious business advantages for HSE and for HSL. The STG will then provide the platform on which to build a flexible corporate S&T capability to meet future business needs.

3.4 After application of agreed criteria, it is proposed that initially the STG comprises HSL, and one further HSE-derived component under SCS command reporting to the current Chief Executive of HSL . The proposal offers the least disruption and prepares HSE for an evolutionary process to meet business need long into the future. Within the timeframe of this project it is considered important to establish the necessary structures and linking to governance processes that can evolve to meet the objectives of the Fundamental Review.

3.5 The project team proposes the HSE-derived component of the STG should initially comprise:

- FOD CHSD (excepting Corporate Medical Unit – subject to separate review)
    - Occupational Hygiene,
    - Industrial Chemicals,
    - Biocides and Pesticides
    - Radiation, Noise and Vibration, Ergonomics Pools

The Chief Scientific Advisor will need support for his role and as a result of this it is proposed the following groups are also included within the STG[2]

- Human Factors CTG (2 S&T staff)
- Electrical and Control CTG (7 S&T staff)
- Health Psychology Unit (5 S&T staff)
- Process Safety CTG (3 S&T staff)

[2] Administrative support for STG groups will be considered during the implementation phase. Some groups have minor levels of support but others, such as the Process Safety CTG have administrative support built into their cadre.

4. Managing professional needs

4.1 Managing the professional needs of those within the science and technology community in HSE extends to both the organisation and the individual. It is not intended to create a charter for raising individual expectation beyond reasonable limits - rather what is needed is a workable solution to allow HSE to address key issues such as the blend of youth and experience, individual and team competence, recruitment problems, specialist credibility, flexible deployment, career development, etc.

4.2 An option has been developed for the management of professional needs *(termed Discipline Lead in the Fundamental Review MBUS midpoint presentation).* The option intends to provide the CSA with the necessary points of contact within the S&T community. Two or three Senior Science Advisers (reporting to the CSA) will oversee the preparation and dissemination of best practice guidance with examples to support Directorates in the management of professional needs both within the context of their business and HSE's wider business needs in relation to corporate discipline capacity and capability.

5. Pooling

5.1 The Pooling Pilot Project was successfully completed and the positive elements have been fed into the new arrangements proposed within this report. If the structural change proposals from the workstream are accepted then it is proposed the formal roles of Heads of Pool will disappear. Most pool resource will be located within specific Directorates and simple line management arrangements should be adopted – it is for Directorates to manage the resource, for them to ensure all their business objectives are addressed and any informal networks developed or maintained to meet business need. The Pooling exercise did introduce complexities to the management arrangements of specialists with diffuse responsibilities spread across Directorates and Divisions.

5.2 If proposals related to creation of the STG are not adopted it is recommended that the positive lessons from Pooling Pilot exercise are taken forward but without the formal pooling arrangements. Small teams (N&V, Ergonomics, Radiation, E C&I) under simple line management arrangements appear to operate well and the necessary informal arrangements for exchange between HSE and HSL will continue to flourish. Proposals for addressing the future of the larger pools are included in the main body of the report.

6. Improving Career Paths for S&T specialists

6.1 The MBUS Board had asked the Organisational Delivery workstream to consider how those who develop their technical skills, knowledge, expertise, national and international standing could be recognised and rewarded

accordingly. Promotion to higher grades has increasingly been on the basis of greater management responsibility – which suits some and not others.

6.2 It is recognised that there are slightly different approaches to this in different parts of HSE. HSE should review the competency criteria for posts to take account of situations where the business demands high level professional credentials and reputation to deliver HSE key objectives. This needs to be done in parallel with reviewing the management spans in specialist areas so that the overall changes are cost neutral or better. Developments would need to take account of national agreements.

7. Costs

The Organisational Delivery workstream has been based on overall cost neutrality but estimated costs have not been developed for all components.

Section A

A.1 Background

1. The Making Best Use of Science project arose out of the HSE Fundamental Review. The theme leaders each made midpoint presentations to the HSE Board at the 9 June 2006 meeting. Subsequently the Making Best Use of Science Project emerged in October 2006 to progress the issues through to an implementation plan. The project has key workstreams that address:

- Governance and Finance
- Planning
- Organisational Delivery
- Communications

2. Overall, the MBUS project was to be based on increased effectiveness within an at least cost-neutral wrapper.

3. The Organisational Delivery workstream was established to consider the organisational, structural and management changes that would support the key aims. Integration with the other MBUS workstreams is an important issue and proposals try to harmonise within a structure for science governance delivering a range of functions and responsibilities arising from the role of the Chief Scientific Advisor. No specifically dedicated posts within science governance would be anticipated immediately upon implementation of any preferred option – but roles and responsibilities will be reassigned to help create a structure that is harmonised within and beyond the boundaries of the Chief Scientific Advisors Group.

A.2 Aims of the Organisational Delivery workstream

4. The Organisational Delivery workstream aimed to deliver an implementation plan to the MBUS Project Board, by mid May 2007, focused on providing options that sought to create an organisational framework for optimising deployment of S&T resource

5. The project has sought to produce a range of viable options that ultimately ensure:

- HSE's S&T is focused on delivery;
- S&T is deployed where it is needed with optimum flexibility to meet the changing business environment;
- Line management arrangements are simplified and strengthened;
- Provision of strong professional leadership of S&T staff;
- Improved career paths for S&T staff;

- HSL are closely integrated into delivery of HSE's priority work

A.3 Scope and Exclusions

6. The scope of this project included:

- Addressing the recommendations of the Fundamental Review MBUS team to consider options based around the creation of a Science and Technology Group (STG).

- All S&T resource in HSE and HSL was to be considered within the context of the project. This includes all scientists, regulatory scientists and inspectors in specialist roles, sector-based and embedded specialist resource, statisticians, social scientists and economists. The work also covered those with a science and specialist role operating within policy and programme teams.

- What resources/actions/timescales might be needed to implement the described options

Excluded:

- There are no areas of the S&T delivery function that were excluded from this project

A.4 The Steer from the Fundamental Review Team

7. The Fundamental Review team provided a steer on the issues to be addressed and the manner in which they may be addressed. This was encapsulated in the presentation to the HSE Board on 9 June 2006.

8. The main issues were identified as;

- Using in-house scientific expertise better
- Scientific research and support is not delivering as much as it could
- How to make better use of HSL

9. An additional issue was identified as the need to end uncertainty, review and experimenting fatigue.

10. Some questions were posed that have particular relevance to the considerations of the Organisational Delivery workstream.

- What steps are necessary to make more effective use of scientific and other specialist resource?

- How can we develop better arrangements to ensure that business needs for specialist input are properly defined and specified?

- How can we ensure that specialist skills are used as productively as possible to support front-line delivery?

- How can we be more flexible in meeting priorities and skill shortages?

- How can we bring HSL's expertise to bear early in the problem solving process?

- How can we close HSL's trading deficit?

11. The vision arising from the Fundamental Review Team stated:

- All Delivery Functions are responsible, accountable and budgeted to deliver their products(s) business;

- Application of science is seen as part and parcel of that delivery & that responsibility;

- S&T resource is either embedded in Delivery Function or in the Science and Technology Group (STG - to include HSL);

- Delivery Function work in partnership with an STG and each other;

- Overarching robust corporate governance with Chief Scientist "holding the ring".

12. The implications for HSE science arising from the Fundamental Review MBUS team were expressed as:

- Internal science/technical resource required a simpler structure (either embedded in the Delivery Function or in the STG.)

- A system of binding agents (Discipline Leads[3]) that cross cut HSE (including HSL).

13. Some issues to consider that impact on the delivery of MBUS were communicated. All of these issues were, to a greater or lesser degree, considered relevant to the deliberations of the Organisational Delivery workstream. The issues are:

- People
- Management capability
- Planning, resourcing and managing the change
- Governance of change
- Pace of change
- Role of the Chief Scientist (Chief Scientific Advisor)

[3] The term "Discipline Leads" arose from discussions within the original Fundamental Review MBUS considerations and has been taken to refer to Heads of Discipline and latterly developed into the concept of "managing professional needs". Managing professional needs has been used in this paper.

- Identifying Delivery Functions and Support Functions
- Splitting some specific S&T resource/work between “embedded” & “STG”
- Developing metrics for success
- Developing a “Science Needs Analysis” capability

A.5 **Organisational Delivery workstream – the process**

Phase 1

14. The Organisational Delivery workstream aims and specific objectives were established and agreed with the MBUS Project Board during December 2006 and January 2007. At an early stage key internal stakeholders were consulted to raise awareness of the work and to tease out specific issues that were important within those constituencies (Appendix 1). Discussions took place with:

FOD SG S&T managers
FOD CHSD
HID senior managers
NSD management team
HSL management team
Policy Group representatives (specifically FIT3)
CoSAS ASD

15. Other informal discussions took place with specific teams with specific interests. These included Mechanical Engineering, Human Factors and Biological agents.

Phase 2

16. The Organisational Delivery workstream was directed to develop a range of structural options. These were to be further refined, and broadly costed, to provide the MBUS Project Board with a viable range of options, assessed against clear criteria. The Organisational Delivery Working Group (ODWG, Appendix 6) was established to provide stakeholder representation and to assist progression of this phase of the work through to a set of options for consideration by the MBUS Project Board.

17. The Working Group met on three occasions to promote generation of viable options for further iteration and refinement.

Consultation during the process

18. The Organisational Delivery workstream consultation processes included:

- Formal monitoring of progress and steer by the MBUS Project Board;
- Consultation with HSE Directors;
- Consultation within constituencies via the ODWG;
- Ad hoc discussions at key stages of the process;
- TU consultation throughout

A.6 Development of Options

19. At an early stage the working group were given clear direction leading to a narrowing of the focus on preferred structural options. Following the 22 February 2007 meeting of the MBUS Project Board, an ad hoc meeting of HSE Directors met on 28 February to clarify important issues that would provide a clear steer for the ODWG. This was necessary to address the aims of the project workstream and to focus attention on achievable models that could deliver HSE's business imperatives with minimum risk of disruption and short term reduction in effectiveness.

20. The meeting of HSE Directors on 28th February supported the establishment of a Science and Technology Group and gave a clear steer on those parts of HSE that were, at the outset, to be considered within scope of the STG , those that were to be considered as embedded resource, and those to be looked at further.

21. As a result of this meeting a set of criteria were developed by which it would be possible to assess the business benefit for inclusion within the STG. Ultimately the business benefit of creating the STG and associated structures needed to support delivery of science into HSE's business that could also be adjudged.

22. As a consequence of the steer, five issues were identified for resolution linking back to the original requirements from the Fundamental Review team. These were:

- Creation of a robust governance arrangement with the Chief Scientific Advisor holding the ring
- Creation of a viable Science and Technology Group
- Creation of a system of "binding agents" (Discipline Leads) that cross cut HSE (including HSL)
- Resolution of the "Pooling" issue
- Improving career paths for S&T specialists

Section B

23. Five issues were identified for resolution linking back to the original requirements from the Fundamental Review team. These were:

1. Creation of a robust governance arrangement with the Chief Scientific Advisor holding the ring
2. Creation of a viable Science and Technology Group
3. Creation of a system of "binding agents" (Discipline Leads) that cross cut HSE (including HSL)
4. Resolution of the "Pooling" issue
5. Improving career paths for S&T specialists

B.1 The Chief Scientific Advisor's Role

24. This section describes the roles and functions of the Chief Scientific Advisor, and indicates the initial resources to reside within the Chief Scientific Advisors Group (CSAG).

25. The CSA – in addition to his responsibilities to HSC and HSE - is responsible to the Government CSA for the effective implementation of his recommendations and guidance. For example the CSA currently has responsibilities for the OSI Review of HSE Science, Guidelines 2005, Code of Practice for Scientific Advisory Committees, Universal Ethical Code & the Sustainability of HSL.

26. The Chief Scientific Advisor (CSA) will be advised by a newly created Science Sub Group of the HSE Board.

27. The emerging functions of the CSA[4] are:

- Advice and challenge on the analysis and use of evidence in planning, policy making and implementation. At a lower level the challenge function extends into assessing the necessity, quality, scope, timeliness and cost of science;
- Head of Profession role;
- Oversight of science planning;
- Assessing capability and capacity to deliver current and future science needs;
- Value for money from total science spend

28. A role of the CSA, in consultation with the Science Sub Group, amongst other things, will be to commission work and consider reviews and

[4] As discussed with the Chief Scientific Advisor and the MBUS Board

reports to resolve S&T issues that have been identified at Board level as of concern to HSE.

29. At implementation it is proposed the current CoSAS team would remain within the CSAG, subject to an early decision by the CSA on the desired arrangement once the relationships between the STG and other parts of HSE are established.

30. The MBUS paper *"Planning, Governance and Management of HSE science – a concept for improvement"* in section 7.1 details the roles and responsibilities of the HSE Board and senior managers in the new governance arrangements. This work impacts on the developing options within the organisational delivery workstream.
(TRIM reference: 2007/70124)

B.2 The Science and Technology Group

31. This section describes the thinking behind the establishment of a Science and Technology Group and its initial composition.

32. This report proposes an arrangement by which business units have been assessed against key criteria to help formulate a decision for inclusion, or otherwise, within the STG. The criteria, largely based on HSE Directors' views, has been used to assess the impact of organisational change. The criteria have been applied against individual business units or to assess the overall viability of the STG.

33. The proposal seeks to create a viable Division, with minimum disruption to HSE business, bringing together teams where it is a logical to do so and where there are obvious business advantages for HSE and for HSL. The STG will then provide the platform on which to build a flexible corporate S&T capability to meet future business needs.

The criteria are:

a. Delivery – the proposals should show improved productivity and improved arrangements to meet HSE's business needs including customer needs. Productivity should also reflect how HSE corporately achieves benefits from its S&T. The arrangements should improve transparency to enable effective corporate governance.

b. Influencing – the proposals should show improvements that enable S&T staff to play a full part in developing and influencing HSE's business. This is also important in maintaining our credibility externally.

c. Flexibility – the proposals should show improved arrangements to meet changing business needs, to balance S&T resource across HSE/L and to meet the overall corporate need.

d. Sustainability – the proposals should show improved arrangements to ensure HSE has the appropriate overall S&T capacity for its business needs

e. Cost

34. The Fundamental Review team were clear *"S&T resource is either embedded in Delivery Function or in the Science and Technology Group (STG - to include HSL);* additionally it was envisaged *"Splitting some specific S&T resource/work between "embedded"*[5] *& "STG"* and this was considered within the ODWG.

[5] Embedded resource - see Appendix 2

35. The ODWG received a clear steer leading to proposals for an initial reorganisation of business units within HSE.

- Frontline delivery S&T (embedded resource) was identified and a strong steer was given that this should not be considered for inclusion within the STG.

- Business units were identified with a strong steer for inclusion within the STG.

- A final group were identified for further consideration.

36. Each group to be considered for inclusion within the STG was assessed against the set of criteria above and the ODWG determined the business risk and advantage from any proposed move. The ODWG also considered other groups that could form part of the corporately-focused STG but where functional elements were currently delivered from across Operational Directorates.

Functional Requirements for the STG

37. The list reflects discussion at the MBUS Project Board though it is acknowledged that the functions will change as HSE business needs develop. These functions are considered important if HSE is to make the best use of its science and engineering resources in the delivery of its priorities. The STG will have 3 main functions:

A Provides a consultancy function to support delivery by HSE's operational and policy business areas, which may include (on demand)

- Contributing to forensic investigations
- Undertakes research and providing scientific support (as part of, and in response to defined requirements of HSE's businesses)
- Working with delivery and policy to develop research proposals, and acting as the technical customer for some of this
- Contributing to the development of corporate strategy and Programmes
- Providing technical advice and support
- Provide advice on where expertise is available for flexible deployment
- Providing scarce discipline support
- Supporting the CSA in his role as Head of Profession for HSE's scientists and engineers and in his oversight of science and science governance, including advising on the long term development of HSE's science resources.

B Technical service delivery - administers the regulatory schemes for chemicals and biocides/pesticides

C Delivers the CTG's corporate activities including 'horizon scanning', knowledge management, and the delivery of cross-cutting initiatives in response to demands from the CSA.

38. The HSE Board Science Sub group will have an active oversight role in the development of the STG and its contribution to the effective use of science in HSE.

39. The following points emerged from discussion of STG function

- The challenge function resides with the Chief Scientific Adviser. On occasions the CSA will need to seek support from the STG to assist with that challenge function – the STG has no role in initiating any challenge and the modus operandi is the same as for supply of expertise to assist business needs within operations and policy.

- To make the above bullet viable the STG would need to contain representative discipline groupings to be able to support the CSA when required to do so.

40. After application of the agreed criteria, it is proposed that initially the STG comprises HSL, and one further HSE component under SCS command reporting to the current Chief Executive of HSL. The proposal offers the least disruption and prepares HSE for an evolutionary process to meet business need long into the future. Within the timeframe of this project it is considered more important to establish the necessary structures and linking to governance processes that can evolve to meet the objectives of the Fundamental Review.

41. The ODWG proposes the HSE component of the STG should initially comprise:

- FOD CHSD (excepting Corporate Medical Unit – subject to separate review)
  - Chemicals Assessment Schemes Unit (55) – CHSD 1
  - Chemical Risk Management Unit (32) – CHSD 3
  - Radiation, Noise and Vibration, Ergonomics Pools – CHSD 4

The Chief Scientific Advisor will need support for his role and as a result of this it is proposed the following groups are also included within the STG

- Human Factors CTG
- Electrical and Control CTG
- Health Psychology Unit (not to move until April 2008)
- Process Safety CTG

42. Each of the above units has been assessed against criteria for delivery, influencing, sustainability and cost (see Appendix 3) and the functional requirements. The strongest case can be made for FOD CHSD. There are clear advantages in placing FOD CHSD into the STG. It delivers potential business advantage, business focus on programmes, corporate roles and responsibilities, improved working relationships with the HSL arm of the STG and a simple resolution to the pooling issue. The move also provides a simple pre-existing management structure within which an embryonic STG can establish itself. Working relationships will not be disturbed and indeed they can be strengthened.

43. The case for the other four groups depends on the need for them to provide resource, when requested to do so, to support the CSA in his role to deliver the challenge function. In most cases managers and staff perceived benefits to the business arising from inclusion within the STG, although not all commentators considered the options in the light of the full set of aims. The Process Safety CTG had concerns that inclusion in the STG would result in a decline in the currency of their operational knowledge – CTG resource needs should be considered urgently, and in line with proposed governance arrangements, to assess the capability required within the STG .

The initial proposed STG will comprise:

Current host (S&T staff)	Business unit	Estimated S&T staff numbers in STG
HSL (297)	Hazard Reduction Human Factors Health Improvement	94 81 122
FOD CHSD[6] (117)	Chemical Assessment Schemes Unit Chemical Risk Management Unit Radiation Noise and vibration Ergonomics + FOD Cranfield 5	55 32 10 8 12
ND (7)	Electrical and Control CTG	7
HID (5)	Process Safety CTG Human Factors CTG	3 2
Policy Group (5)	Health Psychology Unit (April 2008)	5
	Total	**431**

Embedded resource – see over page

[6] FOD CMU are subject to a separate review of corporate medical capability and fall outside the scope of the current proposals related to MBUS

Embedded resource:

Embedded S&T resource	Estimated S&T staff numbers (Dec 2006)
FOD SG	86
FOD CDTU	7
HID CI	72
HID SI	66
HID OSD	72
ND	145
CoSAS	45
Total	**493**

B.3 Managing Professional needs

44. This section proposes arrangements for managing professional needs in the context of HSE's business.

45. Managing the professional needs of those within the science and technology community in HSE extends to both the organisation and the individual. It is not intended to create a charter for raising individual expectation beyond reasonable limits - rather what is needed is a workable solution to allow HSE to address key business issues such as the blend of youth and experience, individual and team competence, recruitment problems, specialist credibility, flexible deployment, career development, etc.

46. The key functions associated with the management of professional needs have been determined in earlier work (presented to the OMT in March 2006). These were recognised as:

a) Maintaining an overview of discipline corporate capability and supporting continuous professional development (CPD)

b) Developing an overview of discipline pressures and usage

c) Alignment of a longer-term view of business requirements for the discipline linked to the planning process

d) Consistency and issue resolution *(rare and now seen as a facilitation role)*

e) Provision of advice on career development - *(to line managers on the co-ordination of job swaps, job moves and other pastoral issues when requested).*

47. An option has been developed for the management of professional needs *(termed Discipline Lead in the Fundamental Review MBUS midpoint presentation).* The option intends to provide the CSA with the necessary points of contact within the S&T community. Two or three Senior Science Advisers (reporting to the CSA) will oversee the preparation and dissemination of a best practice guidance with examples to support Directorates' management of professional needs both within the context of their business, and HSE's wider business needs in relation to corporate discipline capacity and capability. .

48. The intention is to create a framework for delivery of better professional and career management that supports and complements current systems, provides points of contact across HSE and facilitates constructive debate on HSE needs.

A detailed description and analysis of the developed option is presented in Appendix4.

49. The MBUS Project Board has accepted the value of a model where there is flexibility in the arrangements to deliver the functions through the line management chain supported by a small team of science advisers responding to the CSA. The CSAG role is a minority function and just one of a number they will be expected to deliver arising out of the new science governance arrangements. Directorates and Divisions will assess their current position and when necessary develop arrangements to manage professional needs.

B.4 Pooling

50. This section proposes a means to resolve issues arising out of the Pooling Pilots Project.

51. The Organisational Delivery workstream has been directed to resolve the issues arising out of the Pooling Pilot Project. The Pooling exercise has reached a conclusion following the changes made during the Science and Technology Implementation Programme. The S&T community should capitalise on the positive lessons learnt from 'Pooling' regardless of the structural arrangements proposed within the workstream. IRIS consulting evaluated the pooling exercise and reported in March 2006.

52. The IRIS "Evaluation of the Specialist Pools" presented conclusions on the pooling exercise. In particular, there were some positives from the greater engagement within the small pools, particularly where line management arrangements were simple. The IRIS report can be found at TRIM record 2007/91554 and the Executive Summary at TRIM record 2007/91541.

53. The Pooling Pilot Project established 7 S&T discipline pools. Details of existing pools can be found in Appendix 5.

54. Positive elements have been fed into the new arrangements, as proposed within this report. If the structural change **proposals from the workstream are accepted** then it is proposed the formal roles of Heads of Pool will disappear. Most pool resource will be located within specific Directorates and simple line management arrangements should be adopted – it is for Directorates to manage the resource, for them to ensure all their business objectives are addressed and any informal networks developed or maintained to meet business need. The Pooling exercise did introduce complexities to the management arrangements of specialists with diffuse responsibilities spread across Directorates and Divisions.

55. If proposals related to creation of the **STG are not adopted** it is recommended that the positive lessons from Pooling Pilot exercise are taken forward but without the formal pooling arrangements. Small teams (N&V, Ergonomics, Radiation, E C&I) under simple line management arrangements appear to operate well and the necessary informal arrangements for exchange between HSE and HSL will continue to flourish. Proposals for resolving the issues within the larger pools are made in the table below.

The specific recommendations can be compared in Table 1;

Table 1: Comparison of Proposals for resolution of Pooling arrangements with STG and non-STG option

Pool	Proposal for resolution on creation of STG	Proposal without STG creation
Control and Instrumentation	C&I Pool is formally dissolved and the staff involved continue to work within their line management framework. Lessons learnt on closer team-working should be applied to developing informal working relationships with colleagues (who will all be in the STG)	C&I Pool is formally dissolved and the staff remain within current units. Lessons learnt on closer team-working should be applied to developing informal working relationships between HSE and HSL colleagues.
Ergonomics	All those staff formerly in the pool will be within the STG. Informal arrangements should continue as the former FOD CHSD Ergonomics team will be within the STG along with HSL colleagues.	Retain the current line management arrangements but create informal arrangements to replace the formal pool- continue support of informal exchange between HSE and HSL. FOD may consider combining their "Cranfield" staff with other human factors specialists if suitable management arrangements can be developed.
Noise and vibration	The small team will be within the STG and informal networking arrangements should replace any formal arrangements	Retain the current line management arrangements - continue support of informal exchange between HSE and HSL
Occupational Hygiene	The OH pool should be disaggregated and the Offshore Occupational Health team (currently 3 people) returned to their former location, embedded within HID OSD. Although formal arrangements may cease, it will fall to the STG CTG component to facilitate dispersion of topic lead issues to best address HSE's business needs. A key part of the STG role will be to lead on cross cutting corporate roles to support maintenance of the discipline and	The OH pool should be disaggregated and the Offshore Occupational Health team (currently 3 people) returned to their former location, embedded within HID OSD. Other than this the line management arrangements will be retained. Although formal arrangements may cease, it will fall to the CTG corporate element to facilitate dispersion of topic lead issues to best address HSE's business needs. A key part of the CTG role will be to lead on cross-cutting

Table 1: Comparison of Proposals for resolution of Pooling arrangements with STG and non-STG option

Pool	Proposal for resolution on creation of STG	Proposal without STG creation
	retain close links with OD colleagues.	corporate issues and to play support maintenance of the discipline and retain close links with SG and OSD colleagues.
Process Safety	The Process Safety resource should remain within HID. A key requirement will be the establishment of a Service Level Agreement for provision of resource back to FOD. The management arrangement of the resource falls to HID.	The Process Safety resource should remain within HID. A key requirement will be the establishment of a Service Level Agreement for provision of resource back to FOD. Implementation of this agreement would need to ensure delivery of agreed needs for all stakeholders irrespective of organisational location. The management arrangements of the resource fall to HID.
Psychology	The IRIS evaluation of Pooling identified little progress with this pool and as such pre-existing arrangements should be adopted with simple line management.	The IRIS evaluation of Pooling identified little progress with this pool and as such pre-existing arrangements should be adopted with simple line management.
Radiation	All the resource should reside within the STG and local arrangements for discipline management should continue.	Retain the current line management - continue support of informal exchange between HSE and HSL

Annex 1: Organisational Delivery Final Report

Section B – outputs from the project workstream

B.5 Improving Career Options

56. The purpose of this section is to propose possible ways for improving career paths for S&T specialists.

57. The MBUS Board has asked the Organisational Delivery workstream to consider how those who increase their value to the organisation through development of technical skills, knowledge, expertise, national and international standing could be recognised and rewarded accordingly. Promotion to higher grades has increasingly been on the basis of greater line management responsibility – which suits some and not others.

58. HSL has introduced a proposal by which careers could develop through the management route and/or the technical route – this, potentially, through to Band 1. These proposals would be supported by the creation of fewer larger teams. This process releases some higher grade posts, without the need for grade enrichment, competed for on the basis of technical merit and individual performance. The HSL model frees up experienced scientists so more of their time can be used on higher rate chargeable work. The proposals are currently the subject of negotiation between HSE/HSL management and staff representatives. FOD are proposing the introduction of “national expert” specialist posts – this is currently under discussion.

59. It is recognised different parts of HSE operate differently. For example within ND the Band 2 role is seen as mainly technical, whereas within FOD and HID the Band 2 role is managerial or hybrid. A shift towards fewer better managers and larger teams provides opportunities to make subtle changes in the work profile, releasing some highly qualified and experienced specialists to concentrate more on key, business critical technical areas, without their time being significantly diverted by management issues. Project management skills can be nurtured and effort applied to coordinating the full range of available specialist resource both within and outside HSE.

60. This is already happening to an extent because there are examples across HSE, at Band 2 and Band 3 where specialists address mainly technical functions, act almost purely as managers or act in a hybrid fashion.

61. It may be necessary for the business area/HR to review competency criteria for posts to take account of situations where the business demands high level professional credentials and reputation to deliver HSE key objectives. Developments would need to take account of national agreements with Trades Unions."

B.6 Costs associated with this workstream

62. Outline costs associated with delivery of MBUS are discussed below. These will be developed further as part of the benefits realisation process.

Governance arrangements

63. The governance arrangements will incur costs centrally, in developing and administering the system, and in marshalling the challenge function. Cost will also be borne by the Directorates in developing the science plans.

64. Costs in developing the science plans may be considered in two phases i.e. in the first phase, costs associated in developing science plans for commissioned work and in later phases costs associated with developing science plans for delivery of all of HSE's S&T capability.

65. For phase one costs, it would be reasonable to expect that costs for developing and challenging science plans for commissioned work will be broadly equivalent to those currently experienced. At a later phase when HSE's S&T resource is included in the planning process there will be additional costs dependent on the degree of detail required for the challenge. In order to get a reasonable handle on the detail, contributions for science plans would be required at Discipline Lead level (usually B2) and aggregated. It is estimated that HID would require around one staff year at B2 with an equivalent loss in chargeable income. Costs for policy and programmes have not been determined

66. Costs will also be incurred in developing the case for challenging the science plans. Resources, drawn from sources independent of the business unit, will be required to understand the science plans and provide the challenge arguments. These resources may be drawn from the STG should it be set up, and/or from COSAS. The magnitude of the resources have not been calculated but will be of the same order as those deployed in developing the science plans in the first place

67. The development costs are being borne by COSAS. The system administrative costs will be borne by CSAG and whilst these have not been calculated in detail they are considered to be small and will be absorbed within existing COSAS resources at Bands 1, 2 and 3 level.

Managing Professional needs

68. Costs associated with setting up and running the two-tier model proposed are listed in Appendix 4 and amount to approximately one staff year each for set up and for running, across HSE.

Setup and Running the STG

69. Provided the changes were implemented at the beginning of the staff year additional costs are considered trivial. Performance management

arrangements would take care of setting objectives etc. Some costs would arise in communicating the change.

Pooling

70. Provided the changes were implemented at the beginning of the staff year there would be little in the way additional costs. Some costs would arise in setting up service level agreements and in communicating the change but in the majority of cases it would be business as usual. Band 1 staff time currently applied to pooling activities, along with the associated administrative support costs, would offer the potential for savings.

Main Issues arising from discussions - **Organisation**	
• Need for flexibility • Structural alignment for greater coordination • S&T voice currently muted • Avoidance of self-tasking	FOD CHSD
• Medium to long term plans often overtaken • Affordability issues • Control of resource • Reciprocation (FOD happy to centralise resource but want to see same from others) • Corporate discipline focus desirable	FOD Field
• Beware of change for change sake • Lessons from Pooling • Process safety pool issues must be addressed no matter what happens • Define S&T community • Limitations on supply of resource	HID
• Number of SCS commands • Financial position • Simplification	FIT3
• Current climate for change and risk • Senior management arrangements • Communicating throughout the matrix • Chief Scientist v Chief Scientific Advisor roles • Positioning of CoSAS teams and functions • Support for Science Sub Group	CoSAS
• Role of Nuclear Inspector within NSD and how business is delivered • Sensitivities of role • Gearing up for new build • International Agreements important	NSD
• Financial arrangements HSE/HSL – Programme v GAE • Alignment with HSE • Partnership arrangement	HSL

Appendix 1: Main Issues arising from discussions with internal stakeholders:

Main Issues arising from discussions - **People**	
• Customer contractor feel to current relationships for S&T • Need to maintain and develop inspection skills across community • Deliver business and career management • S&T have felt marginalised	FOD CHSD
• Need for corporate discipline leadership (Head of Discipline role) • Career development via technical and managerial routes desired • Maintenance of core capabilities • Local timely delivery and affinity • Concerns over loss of resource • Don't divorce from FOD mainstream • Avoid isolation	FOD SG and CDTU
• HID networks of vital importance • Team working often key to successful delivery	HID
• Corporate behaviours needed • Concern over HSL's abilities to deliver in some areas • Behaviours of HSL as a primary supplier without competition driver • Provision of support to LAs • Avoidance of anarchic behaviours	FIT3
• Design of jobs and definition of roles • Concern over HSL's abilities to deliver in some areas	CoSAS
• Issues covered elsewhere	NSD
• Pooling issues • Attitudes roles and responsiveness of HSE	HSL

Main Issues arising from discussions - **Process**	
• Partnership working at all stages of the process • Avoid complicated structure • Challenge function important • Impact of loss of sectors on S&T interventions	FOD CHSD
• Explore greater use of Band 2 managers • Managing dispersed teams • Success of OHI model • Meeting programme needs • Upskilling regulatory specialists • Consistency of advice • Common recording systems	FOD Field
• Pros and cons of change – 70 % rule? • SI and OSD embedded resource delivers the business • Priorities across Divisional (Directorate) boundaries • Response to Big Bang events • Immediate response v long term planning • One size does not fit all	HID
• Responsibility and authority • S&T involvement in early stages of planning • Robust evaluation • Confidence in contingency arrangements • Focus on business need • Decide business need before how to deliver	FIT3
• Simplification of management arrangements • Consultancy function • Challenge • Independence for analytical science • Governance arrangements that demand analytical science input	CoSAS
• S&T not a separate entity • Planning should not be intrusive • ECI group are corporate	NSD
• Conceptually delivery of Head of Discipline role is a group issue • Management and IT alignment between HSE and HSL • HSL administrative arrangements	HSL

Appendix 2: Embedded resource

Embedded resource – a definition

1. Embedded resource resides within host Directorates, where the HSE business need requires that the majority of functions support the delivery of work within that part of HSE. At an extreme, that specialist resource works solely for the host Directorate, but at another point on the spectrum specialist embedded resource is routinely made available to other parts of HSE either by informal arrangement, or where deemed necessary, through a more formal service level agreement cleared at Director level. Embedded resource is often characterised by deep expertise applied consistently over time within a specific sector.

2. Steer from HSE Directors determined that the majority of frontline resource, based within the three Operational Directorates was out of scope for inclusion within the STG. This embedded resource has a majority function (80:20 principle) to deliver the regulatory outcomes demanded of HSE. Some elements within this embedded resource do address wider corporate needs (policy, cross-cutting, other external stakeholder) but generally the focus, for both individuals and business units, is on influencing specific duty holders and securing their compliance.
.

3. The roles and types of interactions of embedded groups vary. The variations include:

- Application of regulatory skills with a prerequisite S&T background (e.g. ND)
- Primary inspection roles in specialised areas (e.g. HID SI roles)
- Team regulatory inspection (HID OSD)
- Support for frontline regulatory inspectors (FOD SG, HID CI)
- Interventions to support strategic programmes (FOD SG, HID CI)

Appendix 3(a) Views on STG functions – a note to Directors on 24th April 2007

Organisational Delivery Working Group (ODWG)
Note for Directors on emerging conclusions on composition of STG

Purpose

1 The purpose of this note is to advise Directors of the emerging conclusions from the ODWG on the composition of the STG so that they can alert the working group to any potential showstoppers. It is not to provide a comprehensive rationale for the conclusions; this will be available in the final report.

Background

2 The notes from the Directors' Meeting of 28th February provided the ODWG with a steer on:

- Broad proposals on who should be considered for inclusion in the STG
- Criteria for assessing the impact of any change (annex 1)
- Functional requirements for the STG (listed below)

3 A review of the MBUS paper on Planning, Governance and Management of HSE Science, coupled with further consultation, provided additional potential functional requirements for the STG (listed below)

4 Consultation with a sample of relevant staff within the HSE constituencies was carried out to gain their view of the impact of a move to the STG on the criteria set by Directors

Potential Functional Requirements for STG

5 The following six functions have been identified as relevant to the role of the STG.

The functions are:

A. To contribute to research and forensic investigations[7]
B. To provide scarce discipline services across HSE
C. To provide a consultancy function to support delivery by HSE's operational and policy business areas
D. To contribute to corporate strategy and programme development and delivery including pan HSE risk reduction strategies
E. To provide independent support to the CSAG to challenge HSE customers on whether the science requested was either affordable or achievable[8]

[7] From the notes of Directors' meeting

[8] From the paper on Planning, Governance and Management of HSE Science. Some or all of these functions could be delivered with the CSAG

F. To provide independent support to the CSAG to formally challenge and peer review Outline science plans from each business area to look at balance, overall coherence and achievability of the emerging consolidated plans.

6 The importance of independence in the challenge functions E and F is a crucial issue. The greatest degree of independence will be achieved by staff that are resident in the CSAG. However the demand on resources for independent advice is likely to be cyclical and so where there is spare capacity the groups will need to do other work. The will be best placed to do this work from within the STG but with the potential to compromise independence. A judgement on this issue has been made in the emerging conclusions below.

Emerging Conclusions

7 The following conclusions have emerged from the analysis

i) There is the strongest business case for the groups listed in rows 1 to 4 in the table below, to be part of the STG as they could deliver against all the functions specified. There would need to be clear arrangements to procure work from the small disciplines on the basis of HSE's need. When measured against the Director's criteria for impact of change these groups show either neutral or a positive trend. These groups where considered by the directors to be 'in scope' or 'requiring further consideration'. ***Therefore we recommend their inclusion in the STG***

ii) The groups in rows 5 to 8 are not scarce disciplines so the business case for their inclusion into the STG depends more heavily on the importance of the challenge functions E & F. Process Safety, Occupational Hygiene and Human Factors will be central to S&T governance in HSE and the CSA will need independent advice to support the challenge function. It is likely that demands associated with the challenge function will be cyclic and demands arising as a result of the consultancy function will be unpredictable. On the basis that the Project Board has given a strong signal to the independence requirements in the Governance papers ***we therefore recommend that these groups are included in the STG.***

These groups were considered by the Directors to be 'in scope' or 'requiring further consideration'. In the shorter term, FOD management believes that the Ergonomics team will be better placed in the STG while the team gels. In this role they can deliver some 'small discipline' functions. The ODWG agrees with this view but for this and other reasons recommends that a review of Human Factors be carried out within a year. **We recommend the Ergonomics team within CHSD are included within the STG.**

iii) HID's Biological Agents team have a main role in primary inspection and can deliver functions C to E. ND Radiation Protection could deliver functions C to E but their loose association and the narrowness of the topic would make their inclusion within the STG unviable. Similar arguments could be applied to ICU/BP but their close links with CHSD 3 would make it sensible for them to go into the STG as an entity as their businesses are merging. It is recommended the merged FOD CHSD 1,2 and 3 are included in the STG. HID's Biological Agents and ND Radiation

protection were in the Director's original list for further consideration.

iv) Statistics and Epidemiology have made a strong claim that they provide independent advice and should be co-located with social researchers and economists who are resident in the CSAG. On balance, if independence is important, and given the uniqueness of their position, then the ODWG recommends these groups should be located in the CSAG. But the Chief Scientist should have a principle say on this matter.

v) Engineering is not well represented in the STG and yet the disciplines have a similar standing to Electrical & Control and Process Safety. If present it would deliver functions E & F. With other major disciplines being represented in the STG the absence of an engineering focus could be viewed as an anomaly. The ODWG recommends that a focus be created for engineering issues should the Directors support the recommendation in (ii) above.[9]

Andy Phillips / Tony Blackmore
24th April 2007

Key to Table shading:

Desire to join STG
No strong views
Arguments offered against

[9] Extract from MBUS Project Board meeting 16 May 2007: *"Point 7v – With regard to an engineering focus in the STG, the group felt that although there was a need for corporate functions for engineers, the S&T Governance process (HSE Board Science Subgroup) would address this and that there was no need to create an engineering focus in the initial STG."* As a consequence, this original ODWG proposal does not appear in the body of the report.

Appendix 3(b) The Science and Technology Group

		Functions						Stakeholder Comment	Impact on performance in STG when measured against Director's criteria
		A	B	C	D	E	F		
1	Electrical and Control CTG		✓	✓	✓	✓	✓	Consultation – unclear of benefits and would seek reassurance over management arrangements to promote wider corporate use of resource if in the STG	Potential improvement in influencing, sustainability and delivery, but no perceived improvement in flexibility. No cost impact
2	Radiation		✓	✓	✓	✓	✓	Preference to remain together as a group. The team deliver a wide range of functions but mainly aligned to delivery of corporate functions.	Mainly positive against all criteria. No cost impact
3	Noise and Vibration		✓	✓	✓	✓	✓	A small discipline providing a wide range of functions. Given the proportion of time devoted to corporate and programme activity it appears appropriate to keep the team together. Mixed views on preferred destination.	Some lost influence with main customer (FOD) but some benefits in sustainability and flexibility. Neutral on delivery and no increased costs.
4	Health Psychology (BHAW)		✓	✓	✓	✓	✓	Part of HF focus – increases flexibility and has potential to improve delivery options. See positive advantages from move to STG.	Improved sustainability, influence and flexibility. Neutral on delivery and no increased costs
5	Process Safety CTG			✓	✓	✓	✓	Concerns over effective delivery of CTG functions for Process Safety if they do not retain an overview of the resource. Therefore they should not be separated from the pool	Potential improvement in influencing, sustainability and delivery, but no perceived improvement in flexibility. No increase costs

Appendix 3(b) The Science and Technology Group

		Functions						Stakeholder Comment	Impact on performance in STG when measured against Director's criteria
		A	B	C	D	E	F		
6	Occupational Hygiene Unit FOD CHSD 3			✓	✓	✓	✓	FOD consultation: CHSD3 - Undergoing some reorganisation. Work of team predominantly cross cutting or to support programme development, therefore well matched to STG and quite happy to be located in STG. Because of close relationship with regulation of chemicals, believed there were benefits in newly merged CHSD1, 2 & 3 being located in the same part of HSE.	Improved sustainability, flexibility, delivery and influence. No increased costs.
7	Human Factors CTG			✓	✓	✓	✓	Different perceptions of benefit of joining STG. Allows focus to develop on human factors issues rather than focus on individual disciplines. They have produced three organisational models for deployment of HSE HF resource	Improved flexibility, sustainability and influence (when grouped with other HF professionals) Neutral on delivery. No increased costs. The organisational models do not align with management steer for simple structures. They may form the basis for discussion after implementation phase of MBUS.

Appendix 3(b) The Science and Technology Group

		Functions						Stakeholder Comment	Impact on performance in STG when measured against Director's criteria
		A	B	C	D	E	F		
8	Ergonomics			✓	✓	✓	✓	Ergonomics - FOD management view is that the CHSD resource should be located in STG whilst it balance of tasks stabilises. The position could be reviewed in 2 - 3 years to see if parts of the team could be more effective when embedded. In the first instance the 'Cranfield 10' should remain embedded within their home Directorates, but FOD are considering their management options.	Improved flexibility, sustainability and influence (when grouped with other HF professionals) Neutral on delivery. No increased costs.
9	ICU/BPU (FOD CHSD 1&2)			✓	✓			CHSD1, 2 and 3 undergoing a reorganisation to deliver the regulatory chemicals and programme related business. Chemicals businesses merger and the unit to house the REACH Competent Authority. Work is a mixture of crosscutting, consultancy and competent authority (revenue generating) activities. No strong feelings either way, but work would fit well inside STG.	Improved flexibility and delivery. Neutral on delivery and sustainability. No increased costs. Potential business spin-off advantage for HSL and funded deployment of regulatory toxicology expertise for OGDs.

Appendix 3(b) The Science and Technology Group

		Functions						Stakeholder Comment	Impact on performance in STG when measured against Director's criteria
		A	B	C	D	E	F		
10	HID Biological Agents			✓	✓	✓	✓	Shift of emphasis away from CTG activities towards primary roles. Consolidated team would predispose towards embedded.	No business benefits identified for such a small team with a primary regulatory focus.
11	NSD Radiation Protection and Health Physics							Loose association of colleagues across operational divisions within ND – main role to deliver nuclear safety regulatory outcomes.	No obvious coherent team and no business advantage identified – not a practicable option to move into STG
12	Epidemiology (CoSAS)			✓	✓	✓	✓	Strong desire to remain with other colleagues currently within ASD. Concern over the independence of the challenge function operating from within STG.	Negative views on influencing. No likely impact on sustainability and delivery but some possible improved flexibility in some areas of work. No cost impact.
13	Statistics Branch			✓	✓	✓	✓	Issues raised of impartiality if the group reside within the STG as they may need to challenge the STG (HSL). Seen as important that all "analytical sciences" remain together but if the challenge function from within the STG is a problem for them this may mean establishing the group within the CSAG in the first instance to allow consideration and resolution of the issue.	Negative views on influencing. No likely impact on sustainability and delivery but some possible improved flexibility in some areas of work. No cost impact. Independence may be compromised.

Appendix 3(b) The Science and Technology Group

		Functions						Stakeholder Comment	Impact on performance in STG when measured against Director's criteria
		A	B	C	D	E	F		
14	HSL	✓		✓	✓				Establishment of the STG will aid HSL in a number of business areas and create new focus in key business areas.
15	Mechanical Engineering			✓	✓	✓	✓	No current HSE Mechanical Engineering focus – suggested this should be considered as an issue to be resolved with the potential creation of a small STG corporate group.	Group needed to address corporate issues to bring about balance throughout the ME community. Potentially improving delivery, influence, sustainability and flexibility. Any costs outweighed by concentration of corporate work within small group.

Desire to join STG

No strong views

Arguments offered against

Directors' Criteria: Delivery
Influencing
Flexibility
Sustainability
Cost of Change

Appendix 3(b) The Science and Technology Group

Appendix 4: Managing professional needs

Managing professional needs - the developed option

7. In this approach to managing professional needs two separate roles can be identified:

i) Senior S&T Advisor
ii) A local S&T contact

The 'Senior' S&T Advisors role

8. The 'Senior' role will be based within the CSAG (possibly 2 or 3 people with a corporate role on managing professional needs as a minor part of their wider S&T responsibility) would interact with a number of local contacts (few in number and based in delivery groups). In this approach the CSAG would have a formal role in reviewing successful implementation of the process to manage professional needs. They will develop a corporate policy and supporting code of practice that can be easily interpreted and implemented within Directorates and Divisions. Operational Directorates will implement the arrangements supported by a limited network of local contacts, which we have termed "local S&T advisors". The network establishes a conduit for flow of intelligence between field and the centre. Operational Directorates will develop the second tier in consultation with the CSAG.

9. The intention is to ensure proportionality and appropriateness, taking account of Directorate views, CSAG guidance and HSE wider business imperatives.

10. Key tasks for the senior role will be:

- Assessment of pre-existing arrangements for professional management
- Gathering evidence to support business cases for corporate recruitment need
- Promoting introduction of a competence framework where necessary
- Facilitating career moves across boundaries
- Development of a corporate steer on professional issues
- Support reconciliation processes

The local S&T contacts

11. The local S&T contacts, identified from within their own Directorates, will have a role to consult with line management on the appropriate implementation strategy for the centrally derived policy and code of practice. Local contacts will seek to facilitate population of the competence frameworks within their areas of interest. They will do this through a process of

consultation with line managers and technical colleagues. The aim is to achieve the best fit for business need and for the process and resultant expectations to be appropriate and proportionate to that part of the business as determined by line management.

12. Local S&T contacts will respond to management requests for advice to support them in addressing responsibilities in the early phase career development of their staff.

13. The local S&T contact role offers an opportunity for senior professionals in Operational Directorates and elsewhere to take on corporate responsibilities that add weight to their position and standing within the specialist career framework. The resource for discipline focus will be found through the creation of fewer larger teams and helps to differentiate between those who develop careers with an emphasis on the technical route and those for whom managerial responsibilities are more prominent.

The 'local' role

a) Provide conduit between D/D, disciplines and centre.
b) Facilitate population of competence framework(s)
c) Responding to line management requests to support early phase career development

14. *Potential strengths of this option:*

- High likelihood of delivery of functions b and c (see main paper)
- Consistent, centrally derived policy and code of good practice and implementation recommendations for a variety of business models as agreed with D/D.
- Moderate cost
- Support for consistency in application
- Good accountability
- Promotes dialogue between ODs and CSAG
- Maintained at the centre
- Clearly identified individuals and roles within CSAG and D/D
- CSA able to influence –better engagement
- Challenge function operates through Science Sub Group
- Can be used as recognition of senior standing in a technical role

15. *Potential weaknesses of this option:*

- Need to maintain network of contacts
- Complexity of formal-looking arrangement
- Spurious authority of local S&T contacts
- Differentials in delivery of functions

- Variable responsiveness of named contacts
- Too rigid – depends on individual availability
- Perceived challenge to line management authority

Costs

16. Costs associated with this option will be those associated with development of CoP and guidance (CSAG) and establishing and maintaining the network of local discipline contacts. Extra costs arise from maintaining the dialogue, consulting on the competency framework and how to populate it. Extra lost opportunity costs may be associated with provision of advice and support to line managers. However the resource arises from that released through creation of fewer larger teams and should ultimately be cost neutral.

Costs associated with this option:

- Developing the policy and guidance (CSAG)
- Creating the network (CSAG)
- Maintaining the network (CSAG)
- Maintaining dialogue (CSAG and local)
- Consulting on competency framework(s) (local)
- Populating the competence framework(s) (local)
- Provision of advice and support to line managers when requested

Set up estimate:

CSAG – 50 days
Local – 100 days (10 x 10 days)

Running costs estimate:

CSAG - 20 days
Local – 100 days (10 x 10 days - spread across Directorates)

Appendix 5: The Pilot Pools

The Original Pilot Pools – (with S&T staff numbers)	
Pool	Comment
Control & Instrumentation (total staff = 7)	A small pool currently consisting of 4 HSE Specialist inspectors, based in ND, and 3 HSL staff. (Complicated by relationship between Pool and CTG and electrical engineering and C&I)
Ergonomics (total staff = 18)	A pool of 7 HSE staff based in FOD CHSD and 11 HSL staff
Noise & Vibration (total staff = 17)	A pool of 8 HSE Specialist Inspectors and 9 HSL staff
Occupational Hygiene (total staff = 45)	A pool of 18 HSE specialist staff in CHSD 3, 15 Specialist Inspectors in FOD SGs and approx 12 HSL staff based in SGs and Buxton.
Process Safety (total = 66)	Original membership of the pool had 28 Specialist inspectors in HID CI, 3 Specialist inspectors in HID SI, 6 Specialist Inspectors in HID OSD and 26 HSL staff. The pool was managed from HID CI and Process Safety CTG.
Psychology (total =51)	This pool failed to become active and is currently inoperative. The original pool consisted of 14 HID specialists, 4 within the Policy Group Better Health at Work team, 4 within ND, and 29 within HSL.
Radiation (total=8)	A small pool of 8 Specialist Inspectors managed within FOD CHSD

MBUS Organisational Delivery Working Group membership

MBUS Organisational Delivery Working Group – 22nd February 2007	
Nominating D/D	**Proposed working group members**
HID	Shaun Welsh (Moira Wilson deputy)
FOD	Steve Maidment (Mike Cross deputy)
NSD	Geoff Grint
HSL	Andrew Curran
RPD	Patricia Williams (+ Dave PEFD Thomas) both will attend first meeting as PW is changing jobs
FIT 3	Neil Stephens
CoSAS	John Osman (David Riley as deputy
HR	Peter Brown
CACTUS (sectors)	Tim Galloway (not at 22 Feb but to receive papers)
TU	Neil Hope-Collins (to be kept informed of options only)
Workstream manager	Tony Blackmore
Workstream facilitator	Andy Phillips
Workshop Secretary (1)	Peter Howden
Workshop Secretary (2)	Tim Fry