

**HEALTH AND SAFETY COMMISSION  
CONSTRUCTION INDUSTRY ADVISORY COMMITTEE (CONIAC)  
MINUTES OF CONIAC MEETING – M1/2003  
HELD THURSDAY 27 MARCH 2003  
AT ROSE COURT, LONDON**

**Present:**

Kevin Myers - Chair

Jonathon Adams

Bill Belshaw

Bob Blackman

Malcolm Bonnett

Phil Davies

Tim Dowling

Chris McEwan

Alan Muddiman

Alan Pemberton

Robin Powell

Philip Russell

Alan Smith

Andy Sneddon

David Stevenson

Craig Streak

Tony Wheel

Clive Young

Mike Cosman

Martin Thurgood – Secretary

Alex Cattan – Secretariat

Lynthia Bourne – Minutes Secretary

**In attendance:**

Liz Bennett

CIC (Item 6)

Geoff Cox

HSE CD (Item 7)

Hash Maitra

HSE CDTU (Item 7)

Stephen Wright

HSE SPD (Item 3)

Richard Boland

HSE CD (Item 10)

**Observers:**

Ashley Salandy

HSE SPD

John Freeman

HSE SPD

Trevor Allan

HSE CD

Anita Gardner

HSE Press Office

Gavin Pugh

HSE BWED

**Items 1 & 2**

**Welcome and apologies**

1.1 Kevin Myers welcomed Members in particular: Phil Davies National Secretary of the GMB informally replacing Nigel Bryson prior to reconstitution; David Stevenson attending instead of Willie O'Rourke; Tim Dowling Northern Ireland HSA; Clive Young DTI attending for Rodger Evans; Liz Bennett, CIC presenting Paper 4 on professional education.

1.2 Apologies were received from:

- Ivan Moldacwzuk

- John Varcoe
- Frazer Clement
- Rodger Evans
- Kevin Toner
- Peter Kent

### **Opening Remarks**

2.1 Kevin Myers informed the meeting that:

- He had received a letter of thanks from Nigel Bryson following the Chair's letter on behalf of CONIAC members congratulating Nigel on the award of an MBE.
- The Second Report to Ministers following on from the Summit has been submitted. The text can be found on the HSE Website.
- WWT update
  - November Conference was a great success and was attended by large and small companies. The focus is now on establishing more local networks for WWT.
  - Safety and Health Awareness Days (SHAD's) were being well attended with a further 20 planned before the end of the year 2002/03.

2.2 Meeting structure: As agreed at the previous meeting, a major focus of this meeting would be the issue of designing for health and safety. A number of papers would be presented on key issues identified by CONIAC's Steering group. There would then be a substantial discussion on the way forward.

### **Item 3            Responses to Revitalising Health and Safety in Construction.**

3.1 Steve Wright presented an update on the analysis of responses to the Discussion Document, *Revitalising Health and Safety in Construction* with an emphasis on design.

3.2 He said that 10,000 hard copies and 100,000 leaflets were distributed. 293 responses were received from all aspects of the construction industry, including general building clients, engineering, training and education establishments. Within the replies, there were 15 replies from designer trade associations. The main issues raised on design were:

- The need for better training, education & CPD
- The need for better guidance
- The role of clients in selecting suitable designers

3.3 He informed the meeting that comprehensive review of the received comments would be published on the HSE Website. Members were requested to forward any comments and ideas on how to follow up on the responses received to Steve Wright or John Freeman by 10 April 2003, so the replies could be taken to the next Steering Group meeting.

## **Action: Members**

3.4 Following the Steering Group, a paper will be presented to the Commission on 10 June 2003.

### **Item 4 Integrated Teams – Managing the Process. Paper M1/2003/2**

4.1 Tony Wheel presented the first paper on integrated teams. He said that Integrated Teams were generally only found at PFI contracts and at projects by a few enlightened clients. He made the points that:

- Adequate construction time is not an issue usually well addressed by clients;
- Whole life costing is important so that risks during maintenance can be properly addressed;
- There is a potential danger that the management of Integrated Teams may prove a burden;
- '*Accelerating Change*' has set targets for Integrated Teams and also makes mention of the possible introduction of gateways.

4.2 Members commented that various client groups tend to act in different ways. For instance, Housing Associations tend to adopt integrated systems more readily than others, such as Local Authorities, and that this might usefully influence those driving the 'integrated teams' change agenda forward.

### **Item 5 Best Practice in Design with examples of Best Value. Paper M1/2003/3**

5.1 Alan Smith presented a paper on improving health & safety through best practice in design. He presented examples of bad and good practice; and made other general observations on these.

### **Item 6 Professional Education, including CPD – Current Position. Paper M1/2003/4**

6.1 Liz Bennett presented the paper on professional education and CPD. She commented that:

- University staff are not always well placed to integrate H&S into the curriculum;
- There are a great many initiatives. This causes confusion; and some have little demonstrable value;
- 'Champion' schemes will need sensitive management.
- There was ignorance of CSCS scheme within the universities;
- CPD on H&S is variable across the professions and is not a compulsory requirement for many of them;
- Student bodies and educators should be consulted on any new initiatives;

- She suggested that:
  - a. The CIC methodology of setting out a matrix for all courses on the built environment could be adopted;
  - b. TEWP's suggestion that institutions should aim for 10% of CPD courses to have a H&S element by 2004 should be adopted;
  - c. Clearer enforcement criteria should be set so that the whole industry can understand both the contributions for improvement and the penalties for non compliance that are expected;
  - d. Proper resources should be agreed for industry wide initiatives, many currently depend on passion and commitment of individuals.

**Item 7            Designers – Current state of knowledge and current initiatives. Paper M1/2003/5**

7.1 Geoff Cox and Hash Maitra presented a paper on current HSE initiatives involving designers, including information on the Designer Awareness Day (DAD) held on the 11 March 2003 at Haydock Park.

**7.2 DAD**

In summary, they said that:

- Practising designers and HSE presented to a diverse audience of 190 people. They reported that there was a growing waiting list of people unable to attend as the venue had been fully booked;
- Post event evaluation indicated that attendees had been encouraged to find out more on health & safety in design and that overall they found the DAD beneficial.

**7.3 Designer Site Awareness Initiative**

The Designer Site Awareness Initiative was held preceding CONIAC - 34 HSE Inspectors focused on 140 Designers' visits. Designers were invited to join inspectors on sites using their designs and to bring along examples of innovative designs. It was too early to report back on the responses from the initiative. Designers were given challenges at the end of the visits to take away and work on.

**7.3 CDM Designer Audits**

In summary, results from interviewing 49 designers indicated that, for example, only:

- 35% could identify which Regulations applied to designers;
- 40% could name the all CDM duty holders;
- 24% identified all the hierarchy of risk (eliminate, reduce, inform, control);
- 35% were able to identify more than 3 possible hazards.

**7.4 Analysis of designer contributions to accidents**

The major findings from analysis of major accidents carried out by the HSE were:

- Two-thirds of accidents have a significant design omission. In these cases:
  - The design problem was easily discernable in 80%;
  - Cost was not an issue in 76%;
  - In fact in 18% controlling the hazard would have made cost savings.

## **Item 8        Agreeing the way forward on Design.**

8.1 The Chair invited members to structure the discussion under three issues:

- Improving Designers' Competence;
- Integrated Teams/Rethinking Design;
- The Law.

### ***Improving Designers' Competence***

8.2 The Chair asked what 'levers' might be applied. Members responded that there was a need:

- To 'sell' health and safety to stakeholders;
- For students to work on sites during the early stages of their learning;
- To integrate fully health and safety into courses and not treat it as a 'bolt-on' extra;
- For professional bodies to recognise only those degrees which incorporated health and safety;
- To learn lessons from other industries – e.g. the automotive industry has found that spending more on design results in a better product.

8.2 Members said it was important that designers improve health and safety awareness and suggested that benchmarks for health and safety standards, approved by the HSE, should be required for trainers.

8.3 Members also said that it was important to:

- Determine who trains the trainer;
- Ensure that site work was a part of chartered status;
- Make designers more aware of the need to eliminate health and safety hazards by design;
- Make sure there are more opportunities for undergraduates to obtain site experience.

8.4 Steve Wright noted that a significant number of responses mentioned accreditation and licensing and were seeking independent vetting of health and safety competence (for contractors generally as well as designers).

8.5 Members noted that overseas recruitment made it necessary not only to target UK undergraduates, but also employers.

8.6 Members thought that part of the problem was that educationalists did not think health and safety was an academic topic. It was up to industry to change the slant.

### ***Integrated Teams/Rethinking Design***

8.7 Members said that integrated teams could be financially beneficial on large projects eg Terminal 5 and that there were clear benefits in being able to move expertise and lessons learnt from one job to the next. They went on to say that there was a need to:

- Invest in gateways to sign off designs in order to improve process safety;
- Promote integrated working in a way that smaller clients would also benefit.

8.8 Members said that health and safety should be at the forefront of any design and encompass all stages of the process from concept to end-use.

8.9 A member reported that in one instance where a union was recognised by a client, that client had adopted the following practices:

- Safety representatives were included early in Integrated Teams;
- Planning Supervisor was included early in Integrated Teams.
- Planning Supervisor carried out reactive monitoring;
- Workforce was motivated to be actively involved in health & safety;
- Integrated Team monitored residual design risks;
- Integrated Team managed high-risk activities, for example, demolition.

8.10 Members also said that:

- It should not be underestimated how defensive SME designers often were;
- Local authorities are poor at acknowledging 'people' issues and tend not to use integrated teams;
- Housing Association clients' value 'people' issues.

8.11 Members commented positively on the work HSE had carried out through Designer Audits, DADs and Designer Awareness Days.

8.12 Members felt that a freely accessible website drawing on good practice from Constructing Excellence and other demonstration projects, might be set up to pull together messages of good practice.

8.13 Members said that it was important to integrate the whole workforce, not only the professionals. They commented that SMEs can be wary of health and safety as there are a great many regulations on the subject. They suggested that SMEs could be aided by the provision of examples in ACOPS or guidance.

8.14 Members noted that large national contractors were more often following an integrated team approach and that, in conjunction with gateways, this may assist designers in achieving good practice.

### ***The Law***

8.15 Members were concerned that designers lacked practical knowledge of site processes. Members also commented that there should be more explicit obligations on designers in the revised CDM regulations.

8.16 Members commented that there had been two fundamental changes to the Building Regulations in the last 2 years making it difficult for SME designers to keep up to date on changes. However, members commented that there may be scope for using those regulations for health and safety purposes. There was the possibility that Building Control Inspectors might be able to assist HSE. Members said that 'standard questions' about health and safety could form part of a planning application with a requirement to appoint key duty holders linked to the application.

8.17 Geoff Cox informed members that the CIC had been working in collaboration with the HSE on Information Sheets for designers.

8.18 Members suggested that an *ad hoc* working group might be set up to help develop a strategy for design issues for the next CONIAC.

8.19 The Chair reminded members that the Strategic Forum is developing an Integrated Teams Toolkit which complements this discussion.

8.20 Members asked that copies of the presentations would be distributed.

**Action: Secretariat**

8.21 The Chair closed this part of the meeting by thanking everyone for their contributions. It was agreed that a paper would be prepared for the next CONIAC containing proposals on what needs to be done and how matters might be carried forward.

**Action: Secretariat**

## **Item 9 SLIC Campaign.**

9.1 Mike Cosman gave an update to members about the 2003 '*Falls from Height*' Campaign which is an EU-wide initiative.

Themes for the June and September initiatives will be:

- Risk assessment;
- Selection of contractors;
- Selection of appropriate equipment.

- Publicity Campaigns promoting inspection activities and a new video on work at height.

9.2 Site Safe News has included an article on the campaign to raise awareness. Mike Cosman added that he hoped that members would also raise awareness in the bodies they represent.

**Action: Members**

**Item 10 Occupational Health Support Pilot Scheme. Paper M1/2003/9.**

10.1 Richard Boland presented the paper. Members welcomed the paper and were supportive of the ideas and recommended that all CONIAC members should support the scheme.

10.2 Members sought clarification on the definition of construction worker for the purposes of the pilot and if it included professionals. Richard Boland replied that it extended to anyone working on a site or project.

10.3 Members were concerned that industry's RHS targets for 2010 would not be met unless it addressed ill-health issues more positively.

10.4 The main issue in taking forward the pilot was a recommendation to establish an Action Forum charged with deciding how the Pilot should be run and securing funding to do so. CONIAC members were invited to agree the establishment of the Action Forum and were asked to put forward nominations of key industry players' who might usefully sit on the Forum and facilitate its work.

**Action: Members**

**Item 11 Minutes of meeting M3/2002 – Matters arising not dealt with elsewhere.**

11.1 **Toxic Moulds** – Report from Health Directorate will be resent to Members of CONIAC.

**Action: Secretary**

11.2 **WSA Pilot** – A report on the Pilot is to be presented to the Commission in April. An update will be given to CONIAC at its next meeting.

11.3 **Driver Visibility** – Secretariat will ensure that a paper updating members will be prepared when issues have more clearly crystallized.

**Action: Secretariat**

11.4 **Reconstitution of CONIAC and the proposed timescale** - Members were informed that more information would hopefully be available for the next CONIAC meeting. The chair observed that reconstitution would need to reflect the Commission's desires for new ways of working through IACs. He believed

that it would be necessary to ensure that the reconstituted CONIAC would need to be more task driven, contributing towards meeting the RHS targets through work streams and working groups.

**Item 12      Any other business.**

12.1 None

**Item 13      Date of Next Meeting.**

13.1 24<sup>th</sup> July 2003 at Rose Court.