

PAPER AND BOARD INDUSTRY ADVISORY COMMITTEE (PABIAC)
Minutes of the 87th Meeting of PABIAC
Held on Thursday 21st July 2009, DS Smith Packaging, Maidenhead.

PRESENT	FROM
Terry Aston	HSE Chairman
Andrew Barnetson	CPI
Andy Braund	CPI
Anne Rayner	HSE Minutes Secretary
Bob McLellan	DS Smith (CPI)
Bud Hudspith	Unite
Derek Simpson	Unite
Graham King	HSE Secretary
Kevin Johnston	GMB
Peter Seggie	CPI
Roger de Toney	CPI
Shuna Rank	HSE
Simon Weston	Smurfit Kappa Recycling (CPI)
Stewart Begg	SCA Hygiene Products (CPI)
Martin Oldman	CPI
OBSERVERS IN ATTENDANCE	APOLOGIES
Andrew Wooler	David Watts
Andy Johnson	Martin Millar
NON-COMMITTEE CONTRIBUTORS	Peter Ellis
Geoff Cox HSE, Head of Manufacturing Sector	David Symmers
Nancy Hamilton, Occupational Health Inspector	George Dews

Summary of Agreed Actions

Item	Agreed Action	By Whom	By when
6.1	Trade association sector committees to discuss and prepare proposals for occupational health objectives.	Sector committees	ASAP
6.2	Secretary/Minutes Secretary to forward Ms Hackitt's letter to members	Secretary/Minutes Secretary	With the minutes
6.3	Mr Aston and Mr Cox to consider further Chairing and membership.	Mr Aston and Mr Cox	ASAP

ITEM	DISCUSSED	ACTION TAKEN/AGREED	BY WHOM?	BY WHEN?
1	WELCOME & INTRODUCTIONS			
1.1	The Chair welcomed all and thanked Mr McLellan for hosting the meeting.	-	-	-
2	APOLOGIES FOR ABSENCE			
2.1	Apologies received from David Watts, Martin Millar, Peter Ellis, George Dews and David Symmers	-	-	-
3	MINUTES OF MEETING OF APRIL 23RD 2009			
3.1	The minutes of the previous meeting were agreed and approved with minor amendments.	-	-	-
4	MATTERS ARISING			
4.1	(min 5.1) Trade Associations to contact CEOs of member companies to urge them to sign the 'pledge'.	This had been done –pledges from 28 employers had been received to date.	-	Discharged
4.2	(min 5.5) <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Place development of an occupational health objective on the agenda of the July 2009 meeting Ms Hamilton to be contacted to establish if she is also looking at stress, alcohol and drug dependency issues 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> This had been done and taken at item 5 on the Agenda. Ms Hamilton reported that the project remit hadn't included stress, alcohol and drug dependency issues. 		Discharged Discharged
4.3	(min 5.6) Secretary to feed into RDAG: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> If EU haulage companies are also being made aware of the risks posed by inadequate securing of goods onto vehicles. If, following the joint HSE/ VOSA pilot spot check enforcement exercise, a national campaign will run 	Carol Grainger had fed in the committees views. HSE and VOSA spot checks had not been confined specifically to UK hauliers. PABIAC members had been sent HSE press release following the joint HSE/VOSA spot checks A campaign on 'Moving Goods Safely' had been		Discharged

ITEM	DISCUSSED	ACTION TAKEN/AGREED	BY WHOM?	BY WHEN?
		planned commencing with a publicity exercise in 4 th quarter of current work year. The campaign to focus on safe loading, unloading and securing of loads on lorries. Likely to involve HSE working with VOSA and LAs. At the early planning stage so no more details available at present.		
4.4	(min 5.7) Trade Associations to use the progress monitoring record template table to record individual sector progress on PABIAC objectives prior to each PABIAC meeting	CPI's progress report was received.	-	Discharged
4.5	(min 6.1) Secretary to forward name of HSE International contact to Mr Wooler	Actioned	-	Discharged
4.6	(min 7.1) Mr McLellan to check availability of meeting room for next PABIAC meeting and confirm with the Secretary	Actioned	-	Discharged
5	SETTING AND OCCUPATIONAL HEALTH OBJECTIVE			
5.1	<p><u>REPORT ON FINDINGS FROM SAMPLE VISITS</u></p> <p>Ms Hamilton, HSE Principal Occupational Health Inspector had visited six companies and tabled her report (distributed at meeting) outlining findings and recommendations. Companies had been helpful and co-operative. Main points were</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Often there were areas of good practice in managing sickness absence etc. but she found no corporate policies. • Some didn't have clear policies on managing occupational health or clear roles and policy set out. • There were no lines of accountability to occupational health providers who were not used in a targeted way, reports back weren't always clear and data not organised. • Line managers weren't clear about the competencies required of occupational health providers. 	-	-	-

ITEM	DISCUSSED	ACTION TAKEN/AGREED	BY WHOM?	BY WHEN?
	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Occupational health providers were included in risk assessments in only a very few cases. Medicals for FLT drivers appeared to have dropped off the horizon for Occupational Health in parts of the industry. 			
5.2	<p><u>DISCUSSION AND AGREEMENT ON AN OH OBJECTIVE.</u></p> <p>There was general discussion about Ms Hamilton's report which highlighted the problem of finding an occupational package that was relevant to the needs of individual companies.</p> <p>It was agreed that the associations would consider how the problems discussed could be addressed and prepare proposals for their sector. Ms Hamilton said that the construction industry model detailed on the HSE Construction industry website might provide a useful model/template</p> <p>Mr Hudspith highlighted the potential problems with commercial Occupational Health "packages" and employers relying on providers standard packages regardless of individual employer needs. The chair highlighted the need for customers to be more specific in what they need and the fitness for purpose of the package. The service level agreement needs to be tight.</p>	<p>The Associations should develop systems to translate the understood best Occupational Health practices.</p> <p>The next step would be to decide a model of what an Occupational Health framework would look like in various categories of sector companies so that this could be cascaded for adoption. It should deal with the nuts and bolts issues (competence, procurement etc). This will not be a "one size fits all" solution.</p> <p>Individual PABIAC sectors to produce roll out plans for delivery, with implementation dates.</p>	-	=
6	THE FUTURE OF PABIAC			
6.1	<p><u>DECISION BY HSE BOARD AND REQUEST FOR FORWARD PLAN OF WORK</u></p> <p>Mr Cox the head of the Manufacturing Sector explained that he was attending the meeting as the 'mouthpiece' of the Board. The 'Health and Safety of Great Britain\ Be part of the solution' document set out the way Judith Hackett (HSE Chair) saw the future of HSE. The current PABIAC strategy appears to fit well with the new HSE strategy and was very much in line with this thinking. With focus on delivery, ambition, implementation and everyone working together to achieve the common goal. "Ambition" is a key word. Our response to Judith Hackett's request recently received by the Chair for PABIAC delivery plan will basically be to continue with the existing plan for the remainder of the current PABIAC strategy, perhaps with some trimming to align with the new HSE Strategy fully. The Chair added that he felt the HSE Strategy allowed industry a degree of freedom</p>			

ITEM	DISCUSSED	ACTION TAKEN/AGREED	BY WHOM?	BY WHEN?
	<p>to formulate its own specific plans to meet its own needs and enable changes to be made according to the emerging perceived need.</p> <p>Mr McLellan pointed out that the 'Strategy' document didn't mention IAC's as such and what did Ms Hackitt think about them? Mr Cox said that if they produced results they would be well thought of but couldn't continue if they didn't. The way forward for the future was thought to be in secretariat or steering groups. Mr Aston quoted the following paragraph from Ms Hackett's letter:-</p> <p><i>'We need people, working together with others, to bring about the improvements in performance we all want to see, The HSE Board recognises that its industry advisory committees have made significant contributions to health and safety in the past and the Board now sees these committees as a key to future improvements in the sectors they cover.'</i></p> <p>Mr Cox said there was a future for IAC's but they needed to deliver; committees that delivered were part of the solution.</p> <p>Mr McLellan said it was a shame the letter hadn't been sent out with the Strategy Document and that the statement in Judith Hackitt's letter hadn't been included in the HSE Strategy booklet. It was agreed the sentiment would be fed back up to Judith Hackitt, but the Chair pointed out that IACs were but one player in the health and safety system and it was difficult in a publication such as this to address all players individually.</p>	<p>Secretary/Minutes Secretary to forward Ms Hackitt's letter to members.</p> <p>Chair to feed Mr McLellan's sentiment to Judith Hackitt</p>	<p>Secretary /Minutes Secretary Chair</p>	<p>With the minutes</p>
6.2	<p><u>Proposal for restructuring PABIAC from CPI</u></p> <p>Mr Braund outlined CPI proposals for changes to the structure and terms of reference of PABIAC as circulated prior to the meeting. Drivers were the numbers of forthcoming retirement from PABIAC and its groups, HSC/E changes and the move towards more strategic working by PABIAC. Prior discussions with Unite and HSE indicated agreement that there was an issue.</p> <p>In summary</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • PABIAC's key success is in its ability to change • the size of PABIAC did not facilitate strategic thinking/agreement • 2008 saw the formation of a strategy group of six that drew up the current strategy that went through without debate, which didn't seem right • Mr Braund outlined his proposal that the strategy group would become the top-level committee setting the strategic objectives 			

ITEM	DISCUSSED	ACTION TAKEN/AGREED	BY WHOM?	BY WHEN?
	<p>with a "leadership/steering committee" sitting below for "doing the work/ deciding how to make objectives happen"</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> without change the impetus of PABIAC might be lost. <p>Mr Hudspith agreed with the analysis of the problem but not the solution</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> was against another body above PABIAC -- more action was needed at the bottom end rather than another committee PABIAC should remain the top committee, but may need to change and see itself as a leadership committee the strategy group did work well in his view and there was adequate discussion at PABIAC preferred retention of the strategy group at the side of the main board, making recommendations to it action should be down to sectors (corrugated etc) "doing", with activities concentrated "down the line" to companies (example might be the "Felt Changing Group" although it had ultimately faded) any top-level body created would have to be absolutely tripartite with full representation. This raised problem of who could be found to sit on it. <p>PABIAC should be clear about what it does and should not do the detail. It should be able to commission working groups to work on a problem but we seem to have stopped doing this. PABIAC should have the authority to discipline such groups that failed to deliver</p> <p>Mr Oldman said that</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> retaining the existing structure would require more discipline, discussing only strategic issues, and having the facility to "subcontract" to working groups. Need a PABIAC that people want to come to that does things that will draw more than 2 chief executives, as at present. We needed to smarten up and sharpen up the agenda. We are not constrained by the rigid rules from HSE and can build it the way we want. Example -- occupational health issue discussed earlier could have been handled by a subgroup with a proposal brought to the meeting. 			

ITEM	DISCUSSED	ACTION TAKEN/AGREED	BY WHOM?	BY WHEN?
	<p>Mr Begg thought that Mr Hudspith had managed to ‘say it all’ and he was in agreement with him – this should be a decision committee.</p> <p>Mr de Toney highlighted difficulties in resourcing which were now more marked. If other bodies already have produced competent guidance it would be optimistic to suggest project teams could be found to translate it into something industry specific.</p> <p>Mr Johnson agreed that there were not enough CEOs -- they were the movers and shakers. If necessary to enable CEOs to attend he would sacrifice his place to facilitate this.</p> <p>Mr Cox saw a lot of commonality in what had been said. Central idea was an agreement that to make PABIAC viable and an attractive body to attend it had to have some authority and standing and have a vitality of its own. If there is a need for a project group it should be constituted at the appropriate level and with relevant objectives, terms of reference and timescales.</p> <p>Simon Weston thought the challenge was not to be drawn down into issues of delivery in order to remain attractive to CEOs. Issues of delivery were not attractive to CEOs because they're not practitioners. Commitment to delivery and endorsement of the detail are 2 different things.</p> <p>The Chair reminded the meeting that "delivery" was what Judith Hackitt's message was about. It might be that we need to "smarten" language up so that we had a common understanding of terminology. In summary debate had illustrated</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • agreement of need to change way of working, but not structure • to stay "strategic" • issues regarding subgroups/working parties. <p>There was much commonality and we needed to draw threads together into consensus position. The Chair proposed that the members consult in their own constituencies and respond formally on how to meet their needs, with forward proposal being a main item for next meeting.</p>			

ITEM	DISCUSSED	ACTION TAKEN/AGREED	BY WHOM?	BY WHEN?
	<p>Mr McLellan said he didn't agree. Meetings had got into too much detail and were not operating at the strategic level. He agreed with Mr Hudspith that a strategic board wasn't necessary. His needs were to be told what he should have by experts like HSE, full-time professionals and people who work in the business, who could work as subcommittees but should be for the main committee to take a strategic view on. The overwhelming strategic issue was to make sure that people go home undamaged. There was a view that the Chairmanship had been "handed down" following the retirement of James Barrett, and that we could all hand it down. CEOs should be attending and viewing PABIAC as the key decision-making body. He considered that there was agreement that PABIAC should remain a strategic body and we didn't need a position paper and prolonging the debate.</p> <p>Mr Weston summarised that</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • we didn't need structural change, but • we did need to have regard more to the modus operandi • we could use working groups and operate in a commissioning way • the fundamental change proposed by Andrew Braund's paper was not required • resources would come from PABIAC board members and involving others. If CEOs are engaged they can commit the resources, but these are scarce and we need to work in a "smart" manner (e.g. more use of electronic communication) <p>Mr Braund agreed with the general thrust, but reiterated the committee was too big at 20 people and how the work was to be done still needed to be decided</p> <p>Mr Hudspith said that</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • HSE was obsessed with delivery • he didn't consider PABIAC a delivery board • PABIAC should manage and oversee delivery which should happen further down the chain • HSE's board is wrong to expect CEOs etc to be delivery boards -- they are instead the top of the structure that delivers 			

ITEM	DISCUSSED	ACTION TAKEN/AGREED	BY WHOM?	BY WHEN?
	<p>Mr deToney reminded the meeting that PABIAC had expanded to cover more sectors and had to recognize that.</p> <p>Mr Begg said that this was the area where strategy was discussed. A strategy team could be sent away to come up with delivery ideas which could be agreed or not. Then the committee had to decide how it helped industry to deliver, sought professional advice and produced the delivery tools.</p> <p>The Chair reminded the meeting that one of the criticisms of IACs had been in the past that they talk strategy but don't deliver anything. Again summarised that we appear to be agreed that</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • PABIAC should broadly continue structurally as it stands, but • it should act more strategically • it could delegate to project groups at sector level (e.g. technical issues) or the strategy group where appropriate • it should retain the existing strategic model • it should seek to ensure that people who can influence change are around the table. <p>The Chair asked if the current chairing arrangements were accepted by the committee, in view of Mr McClellan's comment. Mr McClellan said that it was a matter for HSE and whether it viewed the body as strategic or delivery, and this needed to be considered separately by Mr Cox and Mr Aston.</p> <p>Mr Cox pointed out that within the industries where HSE had advisory committees there were various models in place for chairing the meetings. One of the benefits of Mr Aston chairing the meetings was that he had familiarity with the issues. There was a trade off regarding seniority, perspective etc. The decision on the new arrangement had been a finely balanced one and we could review it.</p> <p>Mr Braund said the committee didn't have 18 months to decide on a strategy and the way forward would have to be agreed at the next meeting.</p> <p>The Chair, in closing the debate, said that particular care would be paid in drawing up the minutes in view of the importance of this debate and asked</p>	<p>Mr Aston and Mr Cox to consider further Chairing, membership and ways of working.</p>	<p>Mr Aston/ Mr Cox</p>	<p>As soon as possible.</p>

ITEM	DISCUSSED	ACTION TAKEN/AGREED	BY WHOM?	BY WHEN?
	all to check them carefully and respond.			
6	AOB			
6.1	Mr Hudspith – CPI and Unite had entered into a discussion regarding running a version of the 'Just say No' campaign, possibly in November	-	-	-
7	DATE, TIME AND VENUE OF NEXT MEETING			
7.1	November 11 th 10.30am at HSE's Nottingham office.	-	-	-