

Health and Safety Executive Board		Paper No: HSE/09/26	
Meeting Date:	28 January 2009	FOI Status:	Fully Open
Type of paper:	Below the line	Exemptions:	None
Trim reference:	2009/57655		
<b>THE WAY FORWARD FOR BODIES ESTABLISHED UNDER GOVERNANCE OF THE HSE BOARD</b>			

### **Purpose of the paper**

1. To summarise the further work on industry sector and topic Advisory Committees undertaken since the Board's brief consideration of this issue in April. To propose a process which will allow the Board to decide, in the context of delivering the new Strategy, the future role(s) of such groups, criteria for their establishment and the links they should have to the Board.

### **Discussion**

2. The merger of the Commission and Executive stimulated a review of the roles played by the various advisory bodies linked to the Commission, and wider consideration of HSE's future models for working with its key stakeholders. Following earlier reviews of the various tripartite Advisory Committees - seven industry committees continue with formal links to the Board, covering construction, agriculture, nuclear safety, paper and board, printing, rubber and textiles. Most of the topic committees are now designated as 'scientific advisory committees', established in line with guidance from the Government's Chief Scientific Adviser. The one exception is on toxic substances, where there is a separate scientific advisory subcommittee (WATCH).

3. The framework which resulted from officials' early thinking (HSE/08/06) did not find favour with the Board, and a meeting was arranged for a group of TU- and employer-nominated Advisory Committee members to express their views. The meeting took place in June. While there was no attempt to seek consensus, those present emphasised the valuable role the Committees could play in driving health and safety improvements in their sectors and offering agreed practical advice. They also thought the formal link to HSE carried weight with the industries covered. They did acknowledge that everyone involved, including HSE, had limited resources and needed to focus these groups on areas where they could have the greatest impact.

4. On the basis of that conversation, there seemed benefit in asking the Advisory Committees to set out the contribution they were making. With the Chair's encouragement, officials approached six of the industry advisory committees (IACs), and the topic advisory committee on toxic substances. The Nuclear Safety Advisory Committee (NuSAC) was not included, as the Board had agreed that current committee should be stood down until the new governance arrangements within HSE for its Nuclear Directorate (ND) were clear. Following the decision to create a statutory corporation for ND,

proposals for external advice will be developed in that context therefore and will be brought to the Board separately.

5. These Advisory Committees were invited to provide a short statement of their current role and purpose, and forward work plan. Statements were received at the end of September, and are attached to this paper. Not surprisingly, the statements showed groups in various stages of development. Some had essentially become action groups, driving health and safety improvements in their sectors, while others saw themselves having more diverse roles. A number acknowledged that they did not have future workplans in place

6. The Strategy consultation has given the committees a clear basis for planning their future work – and for demonstrating how this will support delivery of the Strategy’s key themes. It also provides an opportunity to give the Board some specific examples of the contribution such groups could make. Building on steers from that discussion, officials could then develop principles or criteria for how HSE-supported industry or sector committees should be established and operate in future.

7. The committees covering sectors which the Board has previously agreed to be priorities – agriculture and construction – have therefore been invited to develop workplans for 2009/10. It also made sense to take the same approach with the topic committee, on toxic substances (ACTS), which has engaged with the Board’s predecessor in recent years. These three workplans could be presented to the Board’s March residential, if it wishes to consider them before the new financial year starts. Otherwise, they would come to the April meeting.

8. Should any of these committees need to adjust their membership to deliver their contribution to the Strategy, it would be helpful if action here did not have to wait for the Board’s consideration of the workplans, **provided that** their tripartite nature is maintained. Equally, it would seem sensible if the other IACs were free to continue planning work in their sectors to deliver the aims of the new strategy

9. Finally, a further useful meeting was held in January with broadly the same group of Advisory Committee representatives. This focused on how tripartite sector specific groups could help implement the new Strategy by acting to reduce accidents and ill health in their industries. Those attending wanted to emphasise to the Board the significant potential contribution such groups could make to delivery. In addition to the points noted in paragraph 3, there was recognition that, to have a chance of success, a group needed a focus on delivery and the ability to develop appropriate consultative mechanisms, targets, intervention plans, and monitoring arrangements; also the influence across the tripartite membership necessary to drive health and safety improvements in their industry, and a level of HSE support provided for a reasonable period.

## **Conclusion**

10. The Board is invited to endorse the general approach, which encourages all advisory committees to develop action plans supporting the delivery of the new strategy, and to note that it will receive

- 2009/10 workplans from AIAC, CONIAC and ACTS in either March or April; and subsequently
- Proposals for a generic approach to industry groups supported by HSE
- Proposals for what might replace NuSAC, as part of a wider report on issues arising from the decision to move ND into a statutory corporation

## **AGRICULTURE INDUSTRY ADVISORY COMMITTEE (AIAC)**

The AIAC was the first advisory committee to be established by the Health and Safety Commission. It meets two to three times a year and is a source of independent advice and expertise. AIAC acts as a sounding board for the industry, reflecting its views and identifying barriers to improvements. It predicts future structural changes in the industry, anticipates their likely impacts on health and safety performance, and assists in the development of appropriate strategies.

Reconstituted in April 2005 to reflect the changing structure of the industry and the influence of the wider food chain, AIAC's membership is drawn from a wide range of organisations with the potential to represent, influence and motivate the industry to improve health and safety standards. The current membership is set out in the annex.

The role of AIAC is to apply their expertise to the implementation and development of the new Board Strategy for agriculture 'Agriculture Revisited'.

AIAC's aims and objectives are to:

- Translate and disseminate the Board's priorities to its constituencies
- Reduce the number of fatalities, major injuries and days lost caused by accidents and work related ill health
- Achieve culture change resulting in an agriculture industry, which recognises and accepts that sensible risk management is an integral part of successful business practice
- Contribute to delivering PSA targets
- Promote better understanding and recognition of the risks to health and safety of farmers and farm workers
- Share information on new strategies and approaches for reducing risks;
- Build partnerships and commitment for future work

It is responsible for developing its own work plan that directly contributes to the delivery of the key targets and work streams. The current work plan has not been revised following the introduction of the new Strategy and is located at: <http://www.hse.gov.uk/aboutus/hsc/iacs/aiac/workplan2005.pdf>

Members set up the following project groups to address industry specific issues:

- The Arboriculture and Forestry Advisory Group (AFAG)
- Transport
- Casual, temporary and migrant workers
- Child Safety
- Worker involvement; and
- Musculoskeletal Disorders
- Training and Education

Five of the Working Groups are active.

### **AFAG**

AFAG's original work programme and terms of reference agreed with the AIAC in 2005, have been amended to take account of recent developments in the sector. Several research projects are ongoing and/or proposed. Progress has been made since 2005 in most of the projects by 'task and finish' working groups. Further information is available at:  
<http://www.hse.gov.uk/aboutus/hsc/iacs/aiac/afag/index.htm>

### **Transport**

The aim of group is to encourage the exchange of information between HSE and stakeholders, to promote joint working and to co-ordinate publicity initiatives. The group is notable for its joint working. Further information is available at: <http://www.hse.gov.uk/aboutus/hsc/iacs/aiac/transport.htm>

### **Casual, Temporary and Migrant Working Project**

The aim of this group is to reduce the levels of risk, injury and ill health experienced by casual, temporary, migrant or other vulnerable workers in agriculture and related food sectors through targeted interventions. The work of the group has stimulated development of a number of products: an advisory pocket card summarising migrant workers' rights and responsibilities; guidance for employers and a migrant workers website. It also has a communications strategy involving stakeholders, and agencies including the Border and Immigration Agency, ports of entry, Jobcentre Plus etc. developed to disseminate the guidance.

### **Child Safety**

The group is scoping the problems based on the principle that 'what is safe for children visiting farms will be safe for children living on farms' with a view to targeting future priorities, initiatives and activities. The group is also reviewing the scope for giving greater prominence to child safety in SHAD's.

### **Worker Involvement**

The group is working to analyse and apply the outcomes of research over the past 10 years on roving safety representatives within the context of developing strategy on worker involvement. Generic guidance on worker involvement is being developed and the group will consider whether this can be applied to agriculture.

### **Training**

AIAC members volunteered to reconvene a project group for promoting Vocational Qualifications. Work is needed to identify sources of funding for VQ's e.g. through the Regional Development Agencies (RDAs).

### **MSDs in agriculture**

Work on MSD can be done independently and, for the time being at least, the group can be stood down.

## ANNEX

Name	Organisation	
Marcia Davies	HSE: Head of Injuries Reduction Programme	Chair
Nick Sangha	HSE: Agriculture & Food Sector	Secretary
Andrew Clark	National Farmers Union (NFU)	NFU
Marcus Themans	NFU	NFU
Pat Stanley	NFU	NFU
Reuben Evans	NFU Mutual Risk Management Services Ltd	NFU
Chris Kaufman	Unite the Union - TGWU Section	UNITE
Ian Beeby	Unite the Union - TGWU Section	UNITE
Ivan Monckton	Unite the Union - TGWU Section	UNITE
Roger Lane-Nott	Agricultural Engineers Association (AEA)	AEA
James Brown	Arboriculture and Forestry Advisory Group (AFAG)	AFAG
David Knowles	Institution of Safety and Health (IOSH) Rural Industries Specialist Group	IOSH
Madge Moore	Lantra Sector Skills Council	LANTRA
Geoff Gregory	Plumpton College / Landex (land based colleges aspiring to excellence)	LANDEX
James Eckley	National Federation of Young Farmers Clubs (NFYFC)	NYFC
Jill Hewitt	National Association of Agricultural Contractors	NAAC
Caroline Bedell/ Helen Shipsey/ Harriet Flanagan	Country Land and Business Association (CLA)	CLA
Chris McCann	ASDA	ASDA
Zad Padda	Ethical First	

The committee and its subcommittees and working groups are supported and in many cases chaired by staff from HSE's Agriculture and Food Sector.

## **CONIAC – role and purpose of the Construction Industry Advisory Committee**

### **General**

The Construction Industry Advisory Committee (CONIAC) advises on the protection of workers and members of the public from health and safety risks in the construction industry. It has three meetings each year which are open to the public. Its 17 Members are representative of the full spectrum of construction stakeholders, including contractors, suppliers, professionals, clients, Local Authorities, Trades Unions and Other Government Departments (see Annex). At present CONIAC has five sub-groups supporting work in key areas: SMEs; Vulnerable Workers; Safety; Occupational Health; and Working Well Together (steering a long-term joint HSE/industry/trades union campaign encouraging co-operative and safer working on sites). CONIAC's current term formally ends on 31 December 2008 but it is intended that it continue until the Review of IACs is completed.

### **Review of IACs**

With the approach of the end of CONIAC's, and in light of the review of advisory committee arrangements following the merger of HSC and HSE, CONIAC members were asked for their views on the future role of the committee. In general Members felt that the CONIAC forum should continue in some form. They particularly stressed its uniquely inclusive mix of stakeholders and the value to them of having direct access to the Regulator and policy formation. It should be noted that Construction Division has frequently received representations from organisations wishing to have seats on CONIAC.

For its part, Construction Division particularly values CONIAC's wide-ranging representation and the connection it provides with the crucial smaller end of the market especially with reference to the Construction Programme. CONIAC has been invaluable as a sounding board and as a means of gaining and validating industry consensus on particular policy proposals. More particularly, CONIAC has provided valuable input in relation to:

- the construction regulatory regime;
- European proposals that may affect the industry; and
- other regulations that could affect the industry.

### **CONIAC Strategy 2004-2008**

CONIAC's strategy is to assist in the delivery of HSE strategy by promoting closer partnerships, more effective health and safety management and a sensible health and safety culture. It aims to focus attention on where the industry performs poorly, promote greater worker involvement, contribute to making information and advice clearer and championing the involvement of all stakeholders.

### **CONIAC Work Plan**

CONIAC's workplan is intended to assist the industry to deliver its Revitalising Health and Safety targets by supporting Construction Division's Business Group Delivery Plan 2008-2009. CONIAC is committed to hold a specified number of meetings (all of them open to the public) through which it will:

- Provide a high level forum to discuss health and safety issues in the construction industry;
- Support the Construction Programme and its projects;
- Share and report best practice developments; and
- Address issues requiring IAC input and support, eg delivery of the benefits realisation plan for the Construction (Design and Management) Regulations 2007.

### **List of CONIAC Members**

<i>Name</i>	<i>Representing</i>
Shelley Atkinson-Frost	Construction Confederation
Bill Rabbetts	Construction Confederation
Alan Muddiman	Construction Confederation
Phil Russell	Federation of Master Builders
Robert Sayers	Home Builders Federation
Richard Ash	Engineering Construction Industry Association
Bill Belshaw	Specialist Engineering Contractors Group
Clive Johnson	National Specialist Contractors Council
Peter Caplehorn	Construction Industry Council
James Preston-Hood	Construction Clients' Group
Kevin Fear	ConstructionSkills
John Tebbit	Construction Products Association
Peter Kent	Local Authorities
Paul Hayward	Association of British Insurers
Rob Miguel	UNITE
Bob Blackman	UNITE
Alan Ritchie	UCATT
Observers from BERR, CLG, OGC and HSENI	

17 Members and 4 Departmental Observers

CONIAC's Chair is Stephen Williams, Chief Inspector of Construction

CONIAC's Secretary is Anthony Lees, Head of Construction Policy

Construction Division

1 October 2008

## **Proposals on the future of ACTS**

- A. ACTS is a tripartite committee, decisions of which represent the views of a broad constituency. HSE can take comfort from having such an arrangement if their decisions are challenged externally.
- B. ACTS will deal with broader strategic and policy issues and oversee the work of its various subcommittees. ACTS works in close collaboration with its internationally renowned Scientific Sub-Committee, WATCH.
- C. ACTS will continue to act on behalf of HSE Board on all issues relating to substances at work and whether they have the potential to be harmful to health.
- D. With its broad constituency, ACTS functions as an enabling body, supporting the HSE in delivery of projects related to substances and health in the workplace.
- E. ACTS can support the HSE by ensuring that in the formulation of strategy and policy, all the necessary features for effectiveness are in place at the outset.
- F. ACTS can advise the HSE in preparing, evaluating and promoting a UK position in the development of European Directives and other standards. With the support of WATCH, this advice can span all aspects of the effects of substances on worker health from planning and evaluation of scientific research through policy development and information provision to strategy for control and evaluation of effectiveness. ACTS and WATCH together can support, monitor and complement the work of bodies such as SCOEL.
- G. ACTS is proud of its past record of achievement and cites as examples: COSHH Essentials and input to HSE policies on carcinogens, respiratory diseases and other long latency diseases as well as local exhaust ventilation. ACTS stands ready to consider emerging workplace health issues such as nanotechnology, recycling operations and the implementation of REACH and its implications for standards of worker health protection. ACTS has proposed, with HSE support, review of the health impact and effective control of low toxicity particulate (formerly referred to as nuisance dust).
- H. ACTS seeks to optimise its effectiveness. Whilst recognising that resources are necessary for meeting preparation, ACTS will fully support reducing administrative load and costs. ACTS is proud of its history of capacity and willingness to evolve and adapt to needs. Timely support to HSE may entail new ways of working. Flexibility and capability to respond are the keys.
- I. ACTS recognises that for clarity, some of its former informal relationships and processes will benefit from better systematic

definition, provided that this can be achieved without unnecessary bureaucracy and without inhibiting the ability to respond promptly to requests for advice and support.

- J. ACTS believes the follow-up of Chemicals Policy implementation requires more attention. This should address the effectiveness of programmes and standards and also generate learning points for future work.
- K. ACTS' Terms of Reference were updated in 2003 and again in 2006. Further slight update is now recommended to reflect current needs.

**L. Proposed Terms of Reference:**

- 1. The Committee will consider workplace chemical strategy and direction and advise HSE on behalf of the HSE Board. Recommendations made by ACTS will be referred to the Board for endorsement or modification on:
  - a) Matters relating to the prevention, control and management of hazards and risks to the health and safety of persons arising from exposure to substances at work potentially hazardous to health, with due regard to any related risks to consumers, the public and the environment
  - b) The strategic direction of HSE's work on such substances
  - c) Specific matters referred to it by the HSE Board or HSE officials
- 2. The Committee's work plan aims to stop people being made ill by exposure to substances at work and it focuses on the development, implementation and delivery of the Chemicals Strategy. In accordance with its work plan the Committee shall additionally:
  - a) Assist the HSE Board in support of its contribution to Government targets and programmes for Health and Wellbeing
  - b) Promote the HSE Board's overall Chemicals Strategy, for instance to relevant Board Advisory Committees and external stakeholders.
  - c) Continue to meet its statutory obligations to advise as appropriate

- d) Periodically carry out forward looks to identify future issues that need to be addressed

### **Current membership and affiliations**

Les Philpott	Chair (HSE)
Dr Ian F Carney	CBI (small firms' representative)
Roger J Alesbury	CBI (BP plc)
Robin Chapman	CBI (BASF plc)
Prof. Alastair M Hay OBE	TUC
R A Hudspith	TUC (Unite the Union)
Susan Murray	TUC (Unite the Union)
Robert Miguel	TUC (Unite the Union)
David Tolley	LGA
Elsbeth Metcalfe	Independent (public interest member)
Dr Ian Brown OBE	Independent
Dr Leonard S Levy OBE	Independent

There are currently also two vacant positions, for an 'Industry' member and an 'Independent' member.

## **PABIAC - Role and Purpose of the Paper and Board Industry Advisory Committee**

### **1. Introduction**

PABIAC represents three distinct groups: a) paper and tissue manufacture (44 organisations, representing 65 out of a total of 74 mills in the UK); b) corrugated packaging manufacture (27 companies with 129 sites representing 75% of output for this sector) and; c) the recovered paper industry, which is rather more fragmented. In all, of 402 companies in the sector, 104 are within the 'Making a Difference' scheme i.e. 26%.

### **2. Role and purpose**

PABIAC differs from traditional IACs in that it operates as a tripartite *strategic health and safety delivery partnership* for the paper and board and allied industries. The partnership comprises employers associations, trades unions and HSE and is committed to the principles set out in the HSC Strategy for Workplace Health and Safety in Great Britain to 2010 and beyond. This model is characterized by greater 'ownership' of the process by members who agree strategic targets, defined in terms of outcomes to achieve, by way of published three-year strategic action plans – see below for details

### **3. Aims**

As an IAC PABIAC's primary aim has been to reduce injuries and ill-health caused by work in the paper and board and allied industries. It has also aimed to promote acceptable standards of working conditions and welfare in conformity with legal requirements.

In pursuing these aims, PABIAC considered and advised the Commission on:

- the protection of people at work from hazards to health & safety arising from their occupation within the paper & board and allied Industries and the protection of the public from related hazards arising from such activities; and
- other associated matters referred to them by the Commission or HSE.

### **4. Consultation with Members**

As part of this exercise, members' views were sought on the following questions:

- What value does PIAC provide to your organisation?
- Does the existing format of PIAC work well – is it effective?
- Are there any ways it could be improved?
- Does it tackle the right issues in the right way?

Members were generally content and supportive of PABIAC as it currently operates. They recognized the good work done by the committee and the influence and credibility that HSE 'badging' brings to the work of PABIAC. Suggestions for improvements include greater involvement and facilitation for 'lay reps' to attend (from TU side)

## **5. Recent developments**

With the advent of “Revitalising Health and Safety” and, more recently, the publication of the HSC “Strategy for Workplace Health and Safety in Great Britain to 2010 and beyond” the focus of PABIAC’s work shifted from delivery of “outputs” (guidance documents, publicity campaigns etc) to achievement of “outcomes” (reducing levels of injury and ill health and improving control of risks) and promotion of the principles set out in the HSC strategy.

## **6. Strategic programme of work**

PABIAC operates as a strategic delivery partnership. The current strategy is set out in “Making a difference - PABIAC’s Strategic Direction Statement 2008-2011” See <http://www/hse.gov.uk/paper/pabiac08-11.pdf>. The mechanism for delivery of targeted outcomes is illustrated at Appendix 1 of “Making a Difference”. Essentially, PABIAC sets the strategic targets and these are then taken forward by way of specific annual objectives prepared by the employer’s associations’ national industry sector H&S committees in discussion with member companies and consultation with the trades unions. In turn, individual employers are invited to set their own in-house annual H&S improvement plans, achievement of which contribute to the targets prepared by the employers associations which, in turn, contribute towards achievement of PABIAC’s overall strategic objectives.

Meetings of PABIAC focus on setting targets and monitoring and challenging progress towards achieving them. PABIAC also supports the partners by developing and providing appropriate tools to help employers in implementing their H&S improvement plans. In addition PABIAC provides support and resource for projects, led by the employer’s association’s sector health and safety committees, which are designed to tackle specific health and safety issues in the relevant sector.

## **7. Success to date**

Sharing of information through PABIAC on industry-specific hazards has enabled industry and HSE to challenge the accepted status quo and drive improvements, especially in difficult areas such as machinery safety. Research undertaken in 2007/08 by Greenstreet Berman Ltd on behalf of HSE (RR620 Review of targeted initiatives in the manufacturing sector) suggests that the PABIAC approach has been successful in achieving substantial reductions in injury incidence rates and improving health and safety management performance.

The research revealed no evidence to suggest that the approach has so far achieved significant improvements in health and safety culture. For this reason PABIAC’s current strategy includes a strategic objective aimed specifically at driving improvements in health and safety climate. The research also suggested that future targeted initiatives may benefit from a formal “sign up” by Chief Executive Officers (CEOs) of employer companies and, for this

reason, PABIAC has invited CEOs to commit their businesses to PABIAC's 2008-2011 strategy by way of signed, formal pledges.

## **8. Commitment to continuous improvement**

Since the recovered paper industry joined PABIAC, we have seen a significant improvement in their accident performance as compared to the wider waste recycling sector. However, PABIAC believes that past successes must not lead to complacency and considers it essential to continue to drive forward on the basis of continuous improvement. The most recent quarterly accident statistics for one of the sectors, the paper manufacturing sector, suggest an increased number of reportable injuries over the reporting period.

It is too soon to conclude that this represents a fundamental reversal of the downward trend in injuries recorded over recent years in the sector concerned. Nevertheless, PABIAC is treating the figures as a warning sign, has renewed its commitment to continuous improvement and will follow up the launch of its latest strategy with a determined effort to ensure that injury rates in papermaking return to a downward trend in order to achieve the target set in the strategy document i.e. to bring overall injury incidence rates to below that of the all manufacturing average.

## **9. PABIAC membership**

- Dr Martin Oldman - Confederation of Paper Industries
- Mr Andy Braund - Confederation of Paper Industries
- Mr Bob McLellan - DS Smith Packaging
- Mr Martin Millar - SCA
- Mr Mike Limb - IWPPA
- Mr Simon Weston - Smurfit Kappa Recycling UK
- Mr Stewart Begg - Managing Director, SCA Hygiene Products Ltd
- Kevin Johnston - GMB Branch President
- Mr David Watts - Amicus GPM
- Mr George Dews - Amicus - GPM
- Mr Peter Ellis - Amicus
- Mr R A Hudspith (Bud) - Amicus Unite
- Derek Simpson - Unite

**Observers**

- Andrew Wooler - M-Real
- Andy Johnson - SCA Packaging
- Mr Andrew Barnettson - Confederation of Paper Industries
- Mr Peter Seggie - Confederation of Paper Industries - Recovered Paper Sector
- Mr Roger de Toney - CPI Corrugated Sector

## **PIAC – Role and purpose of the Printing Industry Advisory Committee**

### **1. Introduction**

The printing and publishing Industry is one of the larger industries in the UK, employing approximately 300,000 workers in over 10,000 companies. A small number of large employers (~ 400) employ around 50% of the workforce; small and medium sized businesses (SME's) make up the great majority of the remaining firms. PIAC is one of the oldest IACs and is concerned with all printing and publishing processes. It was last reconstituted in 2005 and is due for reconstitution again later this year (as per GAP 2). Like other IACs, membership is tripartite, with a healthy interest from the TU side, reflecting historically high levels of unionisation in the sector. HSE provide both the Chair and secretariat role.

### **2. Why PIAC Meets - Role and purpose**

The 2005 PIAC reconstitution document indicates that PIAC is a 'project board' to lead the health and safety agenda for the industry. Like other IACs, the overall role of PIAC is to work in partnership with HSE and industry to deliver the outcomes of the former Commission's (HSC) strategy for workplace health and safety. Particular objectives include:

- work with, and through, intermediary bodies to reduce injuries and ill health caused by work in printing and publishing;
- ensure greater access to, and take-up of, authoritative industry specific guidance;
- contribute to improved employment and productivity by keeping those at work healthy and in work;
- seek to improve the management of health and safety risks; and
- Encourage the industry to realise the benefits of employers and employees working together in partnership.

PIAC seeks to leads the health and safety agenda for its member bodies by providing support and guidance for a hard-to-reach SME audience in a manner that avoids the perceived threat of enforcement. Like other IACs, PIAC was originally established to provide HSC with an additional and major source of expertise and advice on industry-specific health and safety matters. In common with other IACs, it has not done so in any formal, direct way for a number of years.

### **3. Consultation with Members**

As part of this exercise, members' views were sought on the following questions:

- What value does PIAC provide to your organisation?
- Does the existing format of PIAC work well – is it effective?
- Are there any ways it could be improved?
- Does it tackle the right issues in the right way?

It is clear from responses received (7 out of a possible 15) that members regard it a useful forum for dealing directly with HSE and understanding its priorities, as well as those of other members ('if it didn't exist you would have to invent it'). They value the opportunity PIAC provides to share information, ideas and best practice. They argue that the PIAC 'brand' still has considerable status and gives weight/ authority to member organisations to get things done. They were unanimous in their view that without PIAC, work by TUs and employers' organisations to improve health and safety standards would be undermined and it would send the wrong message to industry as a whole. In short, they thought that PIAC added value. Members were complementary about the annual Open Meetings.

Suggestions for improvement include:

- reviewing committee membership and terms of reference and objectives to maintain focus;
- exploring links with related IACs e.g. PABIAC, with similar issues to share best practice
- better and more regular stats updates from HSE, together with better use of these by industry
- greater visibility of the work of PIAC and PIAC members on the HSE printing web site
- importance of 'lay' reps on PIAC (and need for paid time-off)
- comprehensive review of risks, new technology and current guidance
- regular e-bulletins updates – on PIAC work and other matters of interest

#### **4. Value for HSE**

From HSE's point of view, PIAC performs several roles. It provides an efficient and useful conduit for promoting key HSE messages i.e. limited input from us can touch many thousands once cascaded down. In this respect, PIAC complements FOD's inspection activity – it has the potential to reach many SMEs and EMBs who would be rarely be visited by FOD. It is also a cost effective way to talk to a group of organisations about similar messages, rather than working with them on an individual basis. Dialogue with industry provides valuable intelligence about what is happening in the sector and what this means for the risk profile (and in turn where we put our resources).

#### **5. What we have achieved**

The most recent three-year work plan (2005 to 2008) as set out in the last reconstitution paper set out blocks of work in relation to the major health and safety issues facing the industry:

- Manual handling through targeted sector initiatives;
- Work- related upper limb disorders (WRULDs);
- Dermatitis through targeted sector interventions;
- New guidance in the form of COSHH Essentials for Printers;

- Developing a new PIAC Marketing Strategy – producing new health and safety ‘Packs for Printers’ and Publishers identifying key issues.

Thanks to the untiring work of the Sector Band 3 with responsibility for printing, the work plan has been delivered in full. In addition, a number of other issues have been successfully tackled over this period including slips and trips (through some specific targeted initiatives), developing a new HSE Printing web site (which is highly regarded) and developing new skin care and glove posters (again highly regarded).

Overall accident rates for printing and published are now less than 50% of the manufacturing sector average (320 per 100,000 employees, as opposed to 926 per 100,000 employees). The sector also reports about 200 *major* accidents reported each year, giving an incidence rate of 62 per 100,000 employees (2006/07). This compares very favourably with 176 per 100,000 employees for the manufacturing sector as a whole. On average we get 1 fatal accident each year. This equates to a fatal incident rate of 0.3 per 100,000 compared with 1.2 per 100,000 for the manufacturing sector as a whole.

## 6. Challenges for the future

**Industry overview** - Printing and publishing has been hard-hit in recent years by foreign competition and ‘off-shoring’ of production. According to the British Printing Industries Federation (BPIF), the main industry trade association, there are currently 10 600 firms in the industry (down from 13 500 in 2000). We understand the trend towards further rationalisation (through mergers, takeovers or bankruptcies) is likely to continue. However, some areas, such as digital printing, are showing signs of rapid growth, although the safety and health risks involved are still emerging. Nevertheless, it seems likely the general picture of consolidation and slow decline in company and employee numbers will continue. Despite this, SMEs will continue to make up the vast majority of firms in the industry – PIAC needs to get its messages to them.

**Safety** – Manual handling, slips and trips and machinery related accidents continue to be the top three issues year-on-year, with smaller numbers of falls-from-height and workplace transport accidents. We have seen very good reductions in the numbers of accidents in all the main topic areas. Overall numbers of RIDDOR reported accident have declined rapidly by 31% over the last 5 years. In 2006/07 there were 972 RIDDOR accidents reported to the HSE and local Authorities – down from over 1,400 in 2001/02.

**Health** – There is little reliable data for ill-health in the PIAC industries. Consequently, it has been difficult to determine where HSE should focus its attention, not to mention hard to gauge the effectiveness of any interventions. However, dermatitis has been the focus of much effort and work was done to establish the extent and ‘hot spot’ areas for work related upper limb problems (WRULDs). This work has helped to prioritise and target HSE’s resources in these areas.

## **7. Possible work plan items**

- *Horizon scanning work* - by HSL of new / emerging risks in digital printing
- *Machinery Safety and safe systems of work* – felt to have been neglected in recent years, but two recent fatalities on hand fed platens have emphasised the importance of this issue
- *Noise* - proposal to carry out a small study to establish the extent of the noise problem in the industry and highlight any particular problem areas
- *FLTs & Workplace transport, including reel transportation and handling* – the latter issues are closely linked to complementary work by PABIAC in the paper industry.
- *Manual handling & WRULDs*
- *Slips and trips*
- *Health and safety training*
- *Maintenance and falls from height*

## **8. Membership**

- Bud Hudspith - Unite
- David Hoy - NPA
- Elaine Campling - BCF
- Gary Marshall - BPIF
- George Macintyre - National Union of Journalists
- Mick McGilly - NPA
- Paul Larkin - Newspaper Society
- Paul Machin - Digital and Screen Printers Association
- Phillip Adams - BPIF
- Simon Lunken - BPIF
- Terry Miller - Amicus/Unite

- Tom Usher - Amicus/Unite

## **RUBIAC - Role and purpose of the Rubber Industry Advisory Committee**

### **1. Introduction**

For many years RUBIAC was the tripartite Industry Advisory Committee (IAC) for the rubber manufacturing industries (vehicle tyre manufacture, general rubber goods manufacture and tyre retread manufacture). However, in recent years, employment in this sector had declined to less than 10 000 – as such, it was hard to justify continuing to operate an IAC for the industry. Hence, when it was last reconstituted in 2006, its scope was expanded considerably to include vehicle tyre importation, distribution, fitting and used tyre recovery and recycling sectors. RUBIAC now covers the full “supply chain” and “life cycle” of vehicle tyres. We believe there are benefits in bringing together employers associations and TUs to discuss health and safety issues right across the tyre supply chain/ life cycle.

### **2. Role and purpose**

The employers’ associations for these “new entrant” sectors and the Local Authorities responsible for regulating some of them are now represented at RUBIAC. Reconstitution of the IAC was agreed on the basis that (a) this considerably expanded coverage of employment sectors and (b) RUBIAC working as a strategic delivery partnership committed to the principles set out in the HSC strategy for Workplace health and Safety in Great Britain to 2010 and beyond. It was felt that RUBIAC needed to move further towards becoming a fully strategic delivery body, setting the broad overall strategic goals for its new, enlarged constituency and inviting the partner employer’s associations to translate these into specific targets for their own industry sectors in consultation with the trades unions represented in them.

### **3. Aims**

As an IAC RUBIAC’s primary aim has historically been to reduce injuries and ill health caused by work in the rubber products manufacturing industries. It has also aimed to promote acceptable standards of working conditions and welfare in conformity with legal requirements.

In pursuing these aims RUBIAC considered and advised the Commission on:

- the protection of people at work from hazards to health and safety arising from their occupation within rubber manufacturing and allied industries and the protection of the public from related hazards arising from such activities; and
- other associated matters referred to them by the Commission or HSE.

### **4. Consultation with Members**

As part of this exercise, members’ views were sought on the following questions:

- What value does PIAC provide to your organisation?
- Does the existing format of PIAC work well – is it effective?

- Are there any ways it could be improved?
- Does it tackle the right issues in the right way?

One member noted felt that effort and focus may be diluted by the wider, more diverse focus of RUBIAC. However, there was a general consensus on the manufacturing side that RUBIAC is an effective mechanism for ensuring buy in by CEOs to the RUBIAC strategic action plans and for effective dissemination by HSE of its strategic aims and work programmes.

Members from the new entrant sectors see considerable value in RUBIAC bringing together a cross section of people from across the breadth of the tyre industry from upstream manufacturing, downstream to retailing/fitting the product through to disposal of waste tyres in order to tackle health and safety problems. For example, manual handling of tyres gives rise to significant MSD risks right through every stage of the supply chain and implementing solutions to problems in this area requires effective cooperation between manufacturers, distributors, those who transport, retail and fit tyres to vehicles and those involved in collecting and recycling used tyres.

## **5. Strategic programme**

RUBIAC endeavours to operate as a strategic delivery partnership, agreeing medium term targets expressed in terms of outcomes to be achieved, by way of published three year strategic H&S improvement plans. The current strategy is set out in “Rubbing out the Risks – RUBIAC’s Strategic Direction Statement 2006 -2009” See:

<http://www.hse.gov.uk/rubber/pdfs/rubiactstrategy.pdf>

The mechanism for delivery of target outcomes is illustrated at Appendix 1 of “Rubbing Out the Risks”. RUBIAC sets the strategic targets and these should then be taken forward by way of specific annual objectives prepared by the employers associations for each of the industry sectors represented at RUBIAC. In turn, individual employers are expected to set their own in house annual H&S improvement plans, achievement of which contribute to the targets prepared by the employers associations which, in turn, contribute towards achievement of RUBIAC’s overall strategic targets.

## **6. Value to HSE**

This approach appears to be working very effectively for the established, traditional industry sectors whose employer’s associations have a long history of joint work with HSE and trades unions and are accustomed to three year improvement planning. RUBIAC does, however, face some challenges (see below).

Meetings of RUBIAC focus on agreeing targets and monitoring and challenging progress. But they also spawn project teams, led by the trade associations, which tackle particular problems including health-related issues.

Indeed, compared with some other stakeholder forums, RUBIAC has in the past been particularly successful in driving forward the occupational health agenda.

RUBIAC also acts as a sounding board for HSE to gauge the effectiveness of communications and the practicability of standards and targets. It is also an effective mechanism for disseminating information on HSE's strategic aims and work programmes.

## **7. Success to date**

Research undertaken in 2007/08 by Greenstreet Berman Ltd on behalf of HSE (RR620 Review of targeted initiatives in the manufacturing sector), shows that the RUBIAC approach has been successful in contributing to significant reductions in injury incidence rates and improving health and safety management performance in the traditional rubber manufacturing sectors.

The research looked at RUBIAC's three-year action plans that preceded the current "Rubbing Out the Risks" strategy. RUBIAC believes that it is too early to make judgements about the extent to which this approach is likely to be successful for the new entrant sectors. It is still early days and RUBIAC sees one of its current priorities as providing the partners representing the new entrant industries with the additional support they need to help them prepare and implement H&S action plans that are realistic and achievable for them.

## **8. Challenges**

Challenges for RUBIAC include how to retain focus and momentum while at the same time influencing a wider industry base. And, as the new entrant sectors involve substantial numbers of SMEs, RUBIAC needs to develop strategies to better connect with smaller businesses. RUBIAC also has more work to do in helping and supporting the employers associations in the new entrant sectors to prepare and implement strategies and action plans that are realistic and achievable for them. A further challenge is in securing greater representation and participation of Trades Union 'lay' members in the work of the RUBIAC partnership and greater involvement of employee safety representatives.

## **9. RUBIAC membership**

- David White - NTDA
- David Wilson - Retread Manufacturers Association
- Dr Abid Dost - British Tyre Manufacturers' Association Ltd (BTMA Ltd)
- British Rubber and Polyurethane Products Manufacturers (BRPPA Ltd)
- Dave Tovey - Michelin Tyre Public Ltd Co

- Martin Smith – Goodyear Dunlop (GB) Ltd
- Peter Taylor - ITMA and TRA
- Steve Hinks - Pirelli UK Tyres Ltd & BTMA
- (Bud) R A Hudspith - Unite
- Jim Reed - Unite
- Ken Campbell - GMB
- Margaret Armstrong - Unite
- Mark Jenkins - Unite
- Robert Taylor - Unite
- Steve Mills - Hull City Council

**Observers**

- Dr Ken Straughan - Medical Director, BTMA Ltd
- Richard Edy - National Tyre Distribution Association (NTDA)
- Darren Green – Goodyear

# **TEXIAC – Role and Purpose of Textiles Industry Advisory Committee**

## **2. Introduction**

The Textiles Industry Advisory Committee (TEXIAC) was last reconstituted in 2005 and is due for reconstitution again later this year (as per GAP 2). TEXIAC's coverage is in fact wider than the name suggests – footwear, leather, laundries and drycleaners are within its scope (although the latter two are not represented currently). In all, TEXIAC covers very roughly 150 000 employees (accurate figures are hard to come by), many of whom work in SMEs and EMBs. Like other IACs, membership is tripartite, with a healthy interest from the TU side (reflecting historically high levels of unionisation in the sector). However, unlike other IACs, it is chaired by an industry member, rather than an HSE official, although HSE still provides the secretariat role.

## **3. Why we meet**

**Stated purpose of TEXIAC** - The reconstitution document indicates TEXIAC should play a partnership role in delivering the outcomes of the Health and Safety Commission's (HSC) strategy for workplace health and safety. In particular, it was set up to:

- work with, and through, intermediary bodies to reduce injuries and ill health caused by work in the industries it represents;
- ensure greater access to - and take-up of - authoritative industry specific guidance;
- contribute to improved employment and productivity by keeping those at work healthy and in work;
- seek to improve the management of health and safety risks; and
- encourage its industries to realise the benefits of employers and employees working together in partnership.

TEXIAC leads the health and safety agenda for its member bodies by providing support and guidance for a fragmented, hard-to-reach audience in a manner that avoids the perceived threat of enforcement. Like other IACs, TEXIAC was originally established to provide HSC with an additional and major source of expertise and advice on industry-specific health and safety matters. In common with other IACs, it has not formally done so for a number of years. It has assisted HSE at an operational level to understand the industry and issues confronting it.

**Members' views** - Prior to this framework exercise, we canvassed committee members for their views about TEXIAC. Members clearly regard it as a useful forum for dealing directly with HSE and understanding its priorities, as well as those of other member industries. They value the opportunity TEXIAC provides to share information, ideas and best practice. They argue that the TEXIAC 'brand' still has considerable status and gives weight / authority to member organisations to get things done.

They were unanimous in their view that without TEXIAC, work by TUs and employers' organisations to improve health and safety standards would be undermined. In short, they all thought that TEXIAC added value. Members were particularly complementary about the annual Open Meetings.

Members drew a distinction between 'formal' work of the committee and the largely unseen 'informal' work done by way of networking and sharing best practice, allowing members to produce their own solutions to problems and 'below the line' issues such as fire and knife injuries. The opportunity to network with other safety professionals in a fragmented industry is valued.

**Value for HSE** - From HSE's point of view, TEXIAC performs several roles. It provides an efficient and useful conduit for promoting key HSE messages into constituent industries i.e. limited input from us can touch many thousands once cascaded down. In this respect, TEXIAC complements FOD's inspection activity – it has the potential to reach many SMEs and EMBs who would rarely be visited by FOD. It is also a cost effective way to talk to a group of organisations about similar messages, rather than working with them on an individual basis. Dialogue with industry provides valuable intelligence about what is happening in industry and what this means for the risk profile (and in turn where we put our resources). TEXIAC members are also able to produce industry specific guidance, saving HSE time and resources.

**Membership** - The appointment of a non-HSE chair has demonstrated TEXIAC's desire to take greater ownership of its work and to get more directly involved in delivery. Full membership details are contained in paragraph 7.

#### **4. What we have achieved**

The three-yearly work plan set out in the last reconstitution paper set out blocks of work in relation to noise and manual handling – the major health and safety issues facing the industry. Although there have been some successes, formal delivery has been patchy, in part due to HSE Sector resource constraints and the limitations to what members can deliver – see below.

TEXIAC has tried to fulfil its function in other ways, eg:

- by disseminating information via TEXIAC members – who ARE able to produce guidance; this also saves HSE money, time and work.
- by hosting an annual TEXIAC "Open Meeting", similar to a SHAD, that focuses on topical issues.

#### **5. Challenges for the Future**

**Industry overview** – Clothing, textiles, leather and footwear industries have been hard-hit in recent years by intense foreign competition and ‘off-shoring’ of production. However, some areas, such as medical and new technology textiles, are showing signs of growth – the safety and health risks here are still emerging. Nevertheless, it seems likely the general picture of decline will continue, albeit more slowly.

For obvious reasons, laundries are not subject to the same sort of pressures, although there has been a good deal of consolidation in the industry. We understand there is high use of migrant labour and turnover of staff is high. Laundries have an active trade association which HSE attends. Dry cleaning has been a low priority for HSE for a number of years.

**Safety** – Historically rates were high. However, long term, sustained work by employers, TUs and HSE have now seen *major* accident rates decline generally well below the manufacturing sector average (ranging from 44 to 145 /100 000, as opposed to 176/100 000 for the manufacturing sector as a whole). Fatalities are rare – the most recent was on a textile baling press in January 08. The main issues (by numbers) are slips and trips, manual handling, machinery and workplace transport.

**Health** – There is little reliable data for ill-health in the TEXIAC industries. It’s difficult therefore to determine where HSE should focus its attention or how to gauge the effectiveness of any interventions. However, we believe that the decline in the primary processing of wool and cotton fibres that used to account for much of the ill health means that many of these traditional problems are far less prevalent. Long latency periods mean that those now diagnosed reflect conditions of 20-years ago or more. Noise remains a problem, albeit with limited solutions in terms of control at source.

## 6. Possible work plan items

- *Horizon scanning work* - by HSL of new / emerging risks in the medical / technical fibre field
- *Machinery safety* (one of the topics in this year's Open Meeting); 3rd largest cause of accidents in textiles (14%) and leather/footwear (10%); 4th largest cause of injury in laundry/dry cleaning (11%); particularly relevant because of textiles fatality earlier this year; ties in with HSE's *Safe Interventions* campaign;
- *Manual handling training* - people still having accidents, counts as a health topic, as well as a safety one.
- *Knife injuries* – few are reportable, but are nevertheless remain a problem for the industry in terms of lost time, disruption to production etc.
- *Cooling towers and legionella*

- *Risk assessment* – especially for small firms and unusual situations
- *Control of contractors* – affects all areas, includes migrant / temporary labour
- *Old premises* – lead, asbestos and manual handling issues
- *Warehousing (including loading and unloading)* – changes to the industry (away from manufacturing to importation and distribution) means the risk profile has shifted to the logistics side of the industry
- *Control of dyes* – dying and finishing side of the industry

## 7. Membership / coverage

Name	Organisation
<b>Huw Jones</b> <b>TEXIAC Chair</b>	Courtaulds Also Knitting Industries Federation
Elaine Davies	British Footwear Association
Gary Dickson	Scottish Tanning Group Limited
Paul Pearson	BLC Leather Technology Centre Limited
Anne Carvell	British Clothing Industries Association (also Knitting Industries Federation?)
Tim Price	Textile Finishers Association
Chris O'Neill	Performance Textiles Association
Stephen Walsh	Lancashire Textile Manufacturers Association
Angela Worthington	Confederation of British Wool Textiles
Alan Edmund	Community (footwear and leather)
Robert Sneddon	Community
Terry Britton	Unite (formerly T & G)
Brendan Gold	Unite (formerly T & G)

Between them, it is estimated that TEXIAC represents:

- Courtaulds (UK) Ltd – around 6,000 employees;
- UK Leather – 90% of the UK tanning industry; around 30 members, with indirect links via sister organisations (BLC Leather Technology Centre Ltd) to another 200;
- British Footwear Association – 99% of footwear manufacturers, 85 member companies, of which approximately 20 are manufacturing; around 3,000 employees;
- Community - 90% of the footwear and leather industry, 40% of the textile industry and 90% of the knitwear industry;
- Unite – 40% of textile workers;
- Confederation of British Wool Textiles - approx 70% textile workers, 130 member companies with approximately 9,500 employees;

- Knitting Industries' Federation (KIF) has around 100 members and is a full sector of the British Clothing Industry Association (BCIA) which has 300 member companies. The BCIA is a founder member of the British Apparel and Textile Confederation (BATC) including textile and clothing companies has some 600 members.