

Harpur Hill, Buxton  
Derbyshire, SK17 9JN  
T: +44 (0)1298 218000  
F: +44 (0)1298 218590  
W: [www.hsl.gov.uk](http://www.hsl.gov.uk)



**Evaluation of the Reallocation of Corporate  
Topic Group resources to Strategic Programmes  
and Front-line Delivery: Pilot investigation of  
Process Safety Unit**

**HSL/2006/84**

Project Leader: **Christine Daniels**

Author: **Christine Daniels**

Science Group: **Human Factors Group**

## **ACKNOWLEDGEMENTS**

The author would like to thank all the HSE staff who participated in interviews for this project.

The author would also like to thank David Birkbeck, Risk Management Section, HSL for arranging and carrying out some of the interviews for this project.

# CONTENTS

<b>1</b>	<b>INTRODUCTION.....</b>	<b>1</b>
1.1	Background .....	1
1.2	Pilot Investigation .....	1
1.3	Aims and Objectives.....	2
<b>2</b>	<b>METHOD.....</b>	<b>3</b>
<b>3</b>	<b>INTERVIEWS WITH CURRENT MANAGERS .....</b>	<b>4</b>
3.1	Results of the interviews with the current managers of the CTG Process Safety staff .....	4
3.2	Work recording table.....	9
<b>4</b>	<b>PROCESS SAFETY CTG: INTERVIEWEES RESPONSES.....</b>	<b>10</b>
4.1	Interviewees Background .....	10
4.2	Benefits of the Reallocation to HSE.....	11
4.3	The Reallocation.....	13
4.4	Ideas for Change Management .....	19
<b>5</b>	<b>SUMMARY &amp; CONCLUSION .....</b>	<b>22</b>
5.1	Summary .....	22
5.2	Conclusions and Recommendation .....	25
	<b>APPENDIX A: QUESTION SET FOR CTG INTERVIEWEES.....</b>	<b>27</b>
	<b>APPENDIX B: QUESTION SET FOR MANAGERS .....</b>	<b>28</b>
<b>6</b>	<b>REFERENCES.....</b>	<b>29</b>

# EXECUTIVE SUMMARY

## Objectives

The Health & Safety Laboratory (HSL) was commissioned by the Health & Safety Executive's (HSE) Corporate Science and Analytical Services Directorate (CoSAS) to gather information in order to evaluate the impact of the reallocation of Corporate Topic Group (CTG) resources from proactive core (business enabling) work to Strategic Programme (SP) and front-line activities. More specifically, the objectives of the evaluation were:

- (i) To identify benefits realised by the reduction in business enabling work (level 3); and to gather any evidence of benefits realised, including quantifiable benefits and to appraise whether the benefits will be sustained in the future
- (ii) To assess the management of the move from the CTG, including both the positive and negative aspects.
- (iii) To consider how the move could have been managed differently, reporting any lessons learned.

## Main Findings: Current managers

Interviews were also conducted with all the ex-CTG members' current managers. Five managers were interviewed. Data between 04/04/2005 – 02/04/2006 was also collected from the HID work recording system (CIS database).

- From the interviews with the current managers of the ex-CTG staff it could be concluded that they are now spending a third of all their time on front-line work. It was estimated that the financial implications of the front-line works comes to a total of £288,984.
- Most of the ex-CTG members had received significant amounts of training in their new role – a total of 300 days was estimated. However, now the training is complete it was estimated that the majority will be functioning at full efficiency and full capability by the end of 2006.

## Main Findings: ex-CTG staff

Information with which to evaluate the impact on business of the reallocation of Corporate Topic Group resources was gathered by interview. The Process Safety CTG was chosen for initial investigation and interviews were conducted with all 10 technical staff who had been reallocated.

The interviews canvassed the staff's opinions regarding the benefits of the reallocation to HSE, and the quality of the change management process. The main findings were as follows.

- HSE staff identified several organisational benefits as a result of the reallocation. Amongst the responses expressed, staff felt that they now:
  - have broader knowledge of their subject field;

- have broader knowledge of HSE;
  - have broader knowledge of industry (related to their field);
  - deliver more front-line work;
  - assist in the creation and delivery of Knowledge Hubs;
  - input their specialist topic area knowledge into the relevant Pooling team.
- However, the reallocation was not welcomed by the staff from the Process Safety CTG - they were disappointed that their previous work was now seen as lower priority.
  - The interviewees all considered that their work in the CTG was vital and of continued importance to HSE as an organisation.
  - It was noted by the interviewees that they were still being contacted for specialist advice relating to their previous role. They perceived that guidance and research are continuing in the Process Safety area within HSE even though they were told it was no longer necessary.
  - It was perceived by the majority of the interviewees that the new methods for knowledge exchange have not been properly set up and that the Process Safety Pool and Knowledge Hubs do not appear to work in practice.
  - By examining a model of planned organisational change it was shown that the management of the reallocation was inadequately organised and administered.
  - The reallocation was missing key process aspects that organisations must go through to achieve a successful change.

## **Recommendation**

In order to achieve a fully integrated reallocation as anticipated by the current managers it will be necessary to attend to the concerns put forward by the ex-CTG staff since the move. At present their concerns may appear to be unsupported opinions but this is exactly why these potentially valuable insights need to be further explored.

# 1 INTRODUCTION

## 1.1 BACKGROUND

One of the Health and Safety Executive (HSE) Board decisions in May 2004, following the review of HSE's future Science and Technology (S&T) resource needs, was that the Corporate Topic Groups (CTGs) should reduce the amount of proactive core (level 3) work by at least 20% in total across the CTGs. The resources released should be reallocated to the Strategic Programmes (SPs) and front-line delivery (level 1 and level 2 work).

To provide input to HSE's business efficiency plan, the Corporate Science and Analytical Services Directorate (CoSAS) need to determine the business benefits of this reallocation. In order to do this the research agency of the HSE, the Health and Safety Laboratory (HSL), were commissioned to carry out telephone interviews with the staff who had been reallocated and their managers. This report summarises the progress on taking HSE's Board decision forward.

## 1.2 PILOT INVESTIGATION

Overall, the changes that took place following the HSE Board's decision represent around a 39% reduction in proactive core work across all the CTGs (OTM paper 47/5, 2004). The current report details the findings from an initial pilot in which the customer, CoSAS, chose to investigate the effects of the reallocation on one Corporate Topic Group only. This group was Process Safety; this CTG had the greatest number of reallocated staff, accounting for a 69% reduction in proactive core work.

### 1.2.1 Process Safety CTG

The Process Safety CTG was reduced in size from 14.5 to five technical staff (plus a Band 1). The remainder of the staff from the CTG were transferred to other parts of Hazard Installations Directorate (HID) to contribute to delivery of level 1 and 2 work. It was proposed that some staff would carry with them existing responsibilities that could not be dropped in the short term (e.g. petrol licensing appeals).

Overall, therefore it was proposed that 10 staff should leave the CTG to move into level 1 and 2 work.

As well as the Process Safety CTG resources in other Units were also reallocated. The other Units involved:

- Health Effect of Chemicals
- Noise and Vibration
- Electrical and Control
- Biological Agents
- Chemical Risk Assessment and Control (Occupational Hygiene)
- Radiation

It was documented in the OMT paper that all of the reductions in proactive core work and reallocations had been determined through discussions between the CTGs and their host Directorates with the Chief Scientist.

Staff in the CTGs affected were said to be aware of the changes but that there was less knowledge about the changes more widely in HSE. The Trade Union (TU) was said to be aware of the changes through members in the affected CTG but they had not been formally informed (OMT paper 47/5, 2004).

### **1.3 AIMS AND OBJECTIVES**

The Health & Safety Laboratory (HSL) was commissioned by COSAS, HSE to gather information in order to evaluate the impact of the reallocation of the CTGs resources so far. More specifically, the objectives of the evaluation were:

- (i) To identify benefits realized by the reduction in business enabling work (level 3); gather any evidence of benefits realized, including quantifiable benefits and to appraise whether the benefits will be sustained in the future
- (ii) To assess the management of the move from the CTG, including both the positive and negative aspects.
- (iii) To consider how the move could have been managed differently, reporting any lessons learned.

The output from this research will be used to help CoSAS inform the HSE business efficiency plan.

## 2 METHOD

Information with which to evaluate the effectiveness of the reallocation of Corporate Topic Group resources to Strategic Programmes and front-line delivery was gathered by interview. As this was the first stage of the research one group was chosen for initial investigation; this was the Process Safety CTG. This group contained the largest number of staff to have been reallocated (69%). Process Safety CTG alone accounts for 9% of total reallocation.

In order to provide a comprehensive appraisal of the Process Safety CTG reallocation, all the key stakeholders were consulted. These were:

- 10 Process Safety ex-CTG members.
- 5 Current managers of the Process Safety ex-CTG members.

Two question sets were devised to obtain the information required (see Appendix A and B). The question sets were devised in consultation with the HSE Project Officer to ensure that the criteria for evaluation were met.

To gain insight from the HSE staff involved in the reallocation, interviews were conducted with all technical staff who had moved from the Process Safety CTG (this did not include any administration staff). In total, 10 staff were interviewed. All of these interviews were conducted by telephone and lasted between 15 and 25 minutes. The interviews took place between April and May 2006.

In order to report a balanced view of the reallocation it was deemed important that the current managers of the ex-CTG staff were also consulted. In total, 5 managers were interviewed. All of these interviews were conducted by telephone and lasted between 15 and 25 minutes. The interviews took place between July and August 2006.

The questions canvassed the staff's and manager's opinions regarding the benefits of the reallocation to HSE, and the quality of the change management process.

After data collection was completed, a thematic analysis of each interview was produced. The results from each interviewee were then amalgamated and anonymised. The results of the analysis of the ex-CTG staff are given in Section 4. The results of the analysis from the current managers is given in Section 3.

## **3 INTERVIEWS WITH CURRENT MANAGERS**

### **3.1 RESULTS OF THE INTERVIEWS WITH THE CURRENT MANAGERS OF THE CTG PROCESS SAFETY STAFF**

In order to report a balanced view of the reallocation it was deemed important that the current managers of the ex-CTG staff were interviewed. The following section reports the interview findings from the five managers.

#### **3.1.1 What work are the CTG staff doing and what type of role they were taking on?**

The current managers of the ex-CTG members were asked about the work the staff were doing and what type of role they were taking on in their current positions. The following questions were asked:

- What work have the ex-CTG member/s been doing?
- How are they being used in their new role?

All ten of the ex-CTG members were now doing front-line work. The amount of front-line work varied between individuals – from a third of their time to all of their time. They either have a partial or a full operational role within their team providing operational support, and/or technical process safety information input in terms of supporting the regulatory teams. Their work includes: fieldwork, inspection, assessment and investigation and incident work including COMAH charging work. They were also said to be doing some topic based work which is relevant to OSD, NSD and HID.

Most of the staff are now doing a much broader range of things than they were before. That process has developed over the last 18 months and it still going on. However, in one instance one ex-CTG member had continued doing the work they had been doing previously. So there was not a lot of change to that person's work except that it can now be classed as front-line.

In some cases the ex-CTG staff receive their investigation work through the Pool task manager. In other cases work demand comes from FOD, however, currently there is less demand from FOD for technical support in Process Safety than anticipated. This was thought to be due to few COMAH Dangerous Occurrences (DOs) and incidents that have required process safety input.

Lack of work demand for some of the Process Safety ex-CTG members has also come about because the proactive Process Safety report assessments are planned annually in advance with the COMAH sites' cooperation. Therefore, the plans were put together before the CTG staff had joined their new departments.

CTG members are also involved in the planning and decision making process of the COMAH safety assessments. They have been asked to look at the existing plans and exercise professional, managerial judgement in terms of whether the issues that their teams have been looking at are appropriate for the type of sites that the intervention plans cover. This was something that was not being done before and so their professional knowledge, competence, and

skills are being used to check that their teams are taking the right decisions and applying the right resources.

### **3.1.2 How broad or narrow is their focus?**

When asked ‘how broad or narrow was their staff’s focus’ all the current managers explained that the ex-CTG members focus was as broad as the Process Safety discipline. The managers all felt that the staff now have a broader focus than they would have done in the CTG. However, not all of the staff were currently being asked to deal with every Process Safety job - this was because some individuals were considered to be stronger in particular areas of Process Safety and so the work they were asked to do reflected their strengths.

### **3.1.3 Are they still covering for their old role?**

The current managers were asked if the staff were still covering for their old role or if they were still doing work that they used to do within the CTG. All managers responded by saying that all of the 10 individuals were now doing far less CTG work. They had been managing their portfolio down and were now gradually moving away from CTG work. Only three of the 10 staff were said to have completely stopped doing work classed as outside their new team’s remit.

For example, in one case the overlap of work was estimated to have been for about 18 months. It was said to have been, *“quite a lot at the beginning and then it gradually eased off and then it completely finished in September last year.”*

According to their current managers, seven of the ex-CTG members are still covering for their old role, or doing work that they have brought with them from the CTG.

In one case, it was described as being ‘*outside*’ the work they should be doing in their new role. According to their manager that individual seemed to be allowing their old work to affect their new position. The manager commented that they were continuing to do the work because they liked doing it and so they were carrying on doing it.

It was reported that five of the ex-CTG staff still had a few things to finish off and that this has taken slightly longer than anticipated – the original plan had been to close the CTG work down earlier. However, in these cases the CTG work that had been kept on was seen to be relevant to the team they had moved into.

*“... most of what [they are] currently doing is relevant to HID anyway, so it’s not an uncomfortable fit. It’s not front-line, but about a third of [their] work is probably now front-line.”*

The continuation of the CTG work needed to be considered to see if elements of what staff were doing previously was still essential business for HSE. One of the managers interviewed described their staff as having specific and considerable knowledge and skills in particular areas and because of that the manager had *“decided to capitalise on their depth of knowledge and experience and where the case has been made that HSE needs to support a particular area of business then I have agreed that they could provide that resource.”*

As an example it was explained that, one of the ex-CTG members unique skill set was being able to provide operational support and guidance in relation to specific process safety issues at

COMAH sites. The manager has made sure that the individual is keeping up the level of competence they had before. The manager stated that they are now actually applying that knowledge to the front-line as the following quote explains:

*“... the fact that they have those skills has been very helpful and useful to us and they have also used those skills and knowledge in my unit in relation to an incident investigation we’ve had.... which ultimately led to a prosecution and [Name] was involved in supporting that investigation. .... [Name’s] background has been very useful there in terms of [them] providing ... technical support to the investigation. So there have been transferable skills really...”*

In contrast, another manager interviewed argued the opposite case:

*“[They] used to get involved with [type of work A ... they have] moved away from all that. That was a function of the CTG so [they are] actually directly relating to operational and front-line work now, but there is a move now to recreate almost the CTG, [through] knowledge Hubs which is just another word, and they have been trying to get [Name] involved, [doing type of work A again] ... I’ve resisted, I’ve said ‘no, I don’t mind [their] name being there, giving advice on [area] but the reason [they] came out of CTG was to free up time to work for us on the front-line [work]’.”*

#### **3.1.4 Has the transfer of skills been effective?**

To estimate how effective the reallocation has been the managers were asked the following question:

- How effective has their transfer of skills been, i.e. they came in as CTG experts, so have they needed any training; if so, how much?

The interviews with the managers revealed that overall they thought four members of the Process Safety CTG had the right knowledge and experience for immediate effective transfer from the CTG to their current roles.

*“Yes it has [been an effective transfer of skills], simply because of the nature of the person [themselves] and the skills that [they] had already - they were directly transferable skills.”*

Of the four that were suitably experienced for their current front-line role only one was said not to have received any further training. This was because they were not doing any enforcement/regulatory work - they were however, fully booked up with alternative front-line work.

In the other three cases, although the experience and knowledge was there, they still needed to get back up to speed in terms of the process of investigation, current legal requirements with regards to evidence handling and management. They were said to be up to speed within relatively short periods of time. They received specific training on COMAH, legislation, and evidence handling and management.

*“The courses were just to make sure we plugged any little bits of gaps, and also to satisfy the requirements that everybody in a sense should do them at one time or another.”*

Nine of the former CTG members were said to have received significant amounts of training including those that were considered to be already suitably experienced for front-line work. This

was because the majority of the training was the compulsory and basic introductory courses to HID aimed at those new to inspection and enforcement.

According to their managers, six of the CTG members needed quite significant amounts of training and further development. They either had limited experience or no experience of front-line inspection. They were not considered to be up to speed on issues such as evidence collecting, contributing to audits, and COMAH safety reports. They therefore needed quite an extensive amount of basic training in front-line operational activities.

*“[Name] needed quite a significant amount of training but it’s the same amount of training that you would go through if you were starting from scratch with any risk assessor to familiarise themselves with HSE systems and arrangements. You’re probably talking about 30 days in total.”*

The table below details the approximate number of days the CTG staff members spent on formal training courses since the reallocation. Their current managers estimated the figures shown.

<b>Table 1. Days spent on formal training courses (including HID specific core training courses) (rough estimate)</b>	
	0
	5-10
	10-30
	30
	30
	30
	30-35
	30-35
	40
	60
<b>Total</b>	<b>265-300 days</b>

Is it worth noting that the estimates given by the current managers do not seem to tally with what has been recorded under CIS for training (see Table 3, page 9). A total of approximately 150 days were recorded to training by nine of the 10 ex-CTG individuals. Data was unavailable for one person. In addition, by using the data collected from the ex-CTG members interviews (see section 4.2.2.2) it may be speculated that the numbers of days spent on training may be nearer to approximately 200 days.

### **3.1.5 How quickly have they become a front-line inspector?**

In order to evaluate the business efficiency of the reallocation of the CTG resource to front-line activity the following two questions were asked:

- How quickly have they become a front-line inspector and/or got up to speed/ efficiency?
- Are there any further developments of their skills/ knowledge needed to get them up to speed; if so, how much?

Interviews with the current managers revealed that the CTG staff reached full efficiency at different times.

One individual was considered to be up to speed immediately upon moving across.

Two were acknowledged to have got up to speed “*very quickly, within about a year*”.

Five of the ex-CTG members were described as being up to speed after between three and six months. It was explained that they are now capable of handling simple assignments but they were said to still be on a learning curve. The formal courses are over and they now need further coaching and development from experts in the area. This was described as an, ‘*ongoing process of consolidation and putting the theory into practice*’. It was estimated that this would take between three to six months before the individuals were fully up to speed and fully capable.

*“... it’s more a question of continuing consolidation of their knowledge and skills, so they are fully embedded really. The ideal is that when you are doing investigation work, that everything is second nature and you don’t have to really think about the process of investigation. I don’t think they are quite there yet, since they were last in the field, the rules of evidence and everything else have changed, and how we manage things and the procedures that we have to follow so I would expect that they were still need to stop and consider as they are investigating...”*

It was considered to be a difficult transition for two individuals - one needed a lot of retraining and the other currently did not appear to be settling into their new role.

The following figures in Table 2 attempt to capture the length of time, as estimated by the managers, it has taken for the former CTG staff to reach efficiency in their new role.

<b>Table 2. Estimated number of months taken to achieve efficiency</b>	
Months taken to get up to speed/ efficiency (rough estimate)	Remaining number of months it will take to reach full efficiency (rough estimate)
Immediately	N/A
2-3	N/A
2-3	2-3
2-3	2-3
6	6
6	6-12
6	6-12
6	6-12
6	6-12
On going	On going

### 3.2 WORK RECORDING TABLE

In order to evaluate the reallocation of the CTG resources to front-line work quantitative data was also needed for examination. The following figures in Table 3 draws the data from the CIS database. CIS is the work recording system used in HID. The table only shows work related to front-line activities included in CIS; nevertheless this gives a more quantitative estimate of the number of hours of front-line work now being charged by the previous CTG Process Safety staff. The data is between 04/04/2005 – 02/04/2006.

<b>Table 3. Work recording drawn from CIS: 04/04/2005 – 02/04/2006</b>							
CTG Member	Total days recorded excluding leave	Total Days Front-line	Percent days front-line work	Days chargeable	Days non-chargeable	Days training	Percent days training
1	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
2	109	14.09	13	2.6	11.49	31.19	29
3	233.28	39.24	17	6.54	32.7	26.76	11
4	219.26	43.43	20	4.91	38.52	9.22	4.2
5	242.85	66.88	28	7.3	59.58	20.04	8
6	224.73	66.57	30	3.88	62.69	6.84	3
7	213.18	73.82	35	3.65	70.17	18.43	8.6
8	232.74	99.65	43	45.82	53.83	11.92	5
9	139.32	70.16	50	2.77	67.39	1.24	1
10	227	161.17	71	-	161.17	21.95	10
Totals	1841.36	635.01	-	77.47	557.54	147.59	-
Averages	204.6	70.6	34	8.6	61.9	16.4	8.9

Work recording is dependent upon how people interpret the categories and how they see their work fitting into them.

Please note that there is no data available for one individual.

An estimate of the financial implications of the front-line work is provided by calculating the time spent on front-line delivery in days using average salary costs:-

393.16 of Bd 2 front-line activity @ £481/day = £189,109  
 241.83 of Bd 3 front-line activity @ £413/day = £99,875  
 Total = £288,984

## 4 PROCESS SAFETY CTG: INTERVIEWEES RESPONSES

### 4.1 INTERVIEWEES BACKGROUND

#### 4.1.1 Role in the CTG before allocation to front-line and/or strategic programmes

The 10 individuals from the Process Safety CTG were topic specialists on various Process Safety areas, such as: carriage of dangerous goods; chemical reaction hazards; flammable liquids; gas safety and LPG; steam and air plants; industrial gases and oxygen; fire precautions; and process integrity.

The work in the CTG involved several different areas, such as:

- **Guidance.** Developing guidance, which involved going out to companies to see what they were doing, talking to other specialists in the field, and looking at the literature.
- **Standards.** Deciding what standards were reasonable and putting them together with the guidance produced, which was then published either on the Internet or in HSE booklets.
- **Representation.** CTG members often liaised with various groups outside HSE on their specific topic areas. They were asked to represent HSE at various meetings with other government departments, trade associations, professional bodies, and in Europe.
- **Research.** They commissioned research where there was felt to be gaps in the knowledge, and managed the research projects in their areas.
- **Reactive Support.** The role involved visits to assist field inspectors when they needed specialist help. For example, if there were incidents related to their topic specialism, they were called on to provide specialist support to the rest of HSE, particularly, policy division (now called the utilities intervention group), FOD utilities group, and HID.

#### 4.1.2 Current role and activities

Four of the 10 CTG members had moved into new posts within HSE that they had applied for, so they were not actually reallocated. The other six individuals were formally reallocated as part of the move.

All 10 of the interviewees said that their new work was being done before they were reallocated into their current jobs. Six interviewees thought that their new departments were under resourced and so they were a needed addition. However, four of the interviewees stated that they did not yet feel fully competent in their role and therefore were not yet able to do much front-line work. In contrast, two individuals thought that their new unit was over-resourced. Two interviewees did not comment either way in regard to resource issues.

## 4.2 BENEFITS OF THE REALLOCATION TO HSE

This report specifically intended to identify the benefits realized by the reduction in business enabling work for HSE as an organisation. In order to examine this several questions were asked. They were:

- What impact has the move had on HSE work? What are the benefits?
- Any evidence of benefits realized, including quantifiable benefits? (e.g. chargeable COMAH<sup>1</sup> work).
- Will the benefits be sustained in the future?

The following section summaries the comments made.

### 4.2.1 Benefits as discussed by Process Safety ex-CTG members

As detailed in section 3.2.4.1 a number of the individuals interviewed felt that the reallocation of CTG resources allowed them to take up a new role. They considered this to be a positive aspect of the move for their own career development. However, alongside this, four of the interviewees recognised that their new role may also be seen as an organisational benefit to HSE. They stated that they had broadened their knowledge base and gained insights into different parts of the organisation. The other members had either moved back to a previous role, or they were doing the same work outside the CTG. Therefore these six individuals did not feel that the new role had necessarily increased their knowledge base.

When questioned, nine interviewees acknowledged that they were now doing more chargeable work for HSE than they had been doing previously in the CTG. Of the 10 interviewees, nine stated that they were adding to HSE chargeable targets, either through front-line inspection or COMAH safety cases. However, the interviewees were quick to point out that this ‘benefit’ was not clear-cut and a number of caveats were put forward. They all still considered the work they had done in the CTG was a greater and more useful benefit to HSE as an organisation.

From the conversations it could be estimated that: four of the interviewees felt that they were doing a minimal amount of chargeable time (around 9 days); three were doing a moderate amount of chargeable time and two were doing a considerable amount of chargeable work. Unfortunately the interviews were unable to determine exactly how many hours of chargeable work the CTG members had completed in their current role.

*“The obvious benefit from my point of view, I’m now earning much, much more than I’m being paid by HSE in chargeable work, I’m earning them an absolute fortune in chargeable work and I actually really like the job I moved into, and I really liked the job I was in before so that’s not an issue for me.”*

---

<sup>1</sup> Control of Major Accident Hazards Regulations 1999 (COMAH).

Several organisational benefits could be derived from the conversations. Amongst the responses expressed, staff felt that they now:

- have broader knowledge of their subject field;
- have broader knowledge of HSE;
- have broader knowledge of industry (related to their field);
- deliver more front-line work;
- assist in the creation and delivery of Knowledge Hubs;
- input their specialist topic area knowledge into the relevant Pooling team.

#### **4.2.2 Caveats as discussed by Process Safety CTG members**

A number of perceived caveats and concerns were put forward in the conversations and they require examination alongside the organisational benefits. They were:

- Marginal opportunity to do more chargeable work, due to:
  - Lack of pre-planning for increased resource;
  - Training requirements.

*“I don’t perceive that HSE will have any positive benefits from forcing me to give up my topic specialist role and placing me in a new role for at least another three years; because of the training implications and the degree of creditability and expertise that you need to deal with outside industry, public trade associations in a completely new topic area.”*

- Deteriorating specialist knowledge, due to:
  - Poor quality of new guidance being produced;
  - Lack of new up-to-date guidance;
  - No procedure for new writing guidance;
  - Hubs and Pooling Groups seen as less effective, due to members competing commitments, i.e. not a permanent and mandatory role.

*“The gains of the organisation are that they now have more people who can do the chargeable work but the down side is that the work that used to be done, and wasn’t properly recognised, is now not being done. The fact is that we don’t have up-to-date guidance or the procedure for writing new guidance but it’s still going on half-heartedly. I feel that guidance is important for industry and also for our own inspectors. I’ve have always felt very passionately that we should have proper up-to-date guidance and if we don’t have a means to do that then we are slowly deteriorating in our own knowledge.”*

- Loss of specialist knowledge exchange said to have a knock on effect for:
  - Field inspectors;
  - Industry;
  - Trade associations;
  - HSE as a credible organisation;
  - UK position as world leader in Process Safety.
- Some loss of good will towards HSE as an employer.
- Lack of structured and relevant re-training opportunities.

#### **4.2.2.1 Views on Pools & Hubs**

Pilot Pools and Knowledge Hubs both came up in the conversations. The view transpired that although both the Process Safety Pool and the Knowledge Hubs were, in theory, good ideas but they unfortunately do not currently work in practice.

There are Hubs being set up but this was perceived to be happening very slowly. The DESEAR Hub<sup>2</sup> had been set-up and it will act as a pilot. However, the current shortage of Hubs, as one individual pointed out, means that everyone in the field is still relying on the good will of the specialists who were in the CTG. The majority of the ex-CTG members said that did not want to turn people away and they had continued to give advice, in effect, carrying on their previous roles. However, they considered it to be unfair for HSE to expect them to carry on with this role because they now had other work to do. This was also the problem with the actual functioning of the Hubs; the interviewees did not see how they could find adequate time to input into the Hub. It would be a subsidiary role and because of this, they would not always be able to attend the meetings due to other more pressing work commitments.

*“I am still being contacted and because I’m so busy with my new work I just have to say I can’t answer the question, which is ridiculous. I even get people in head office asking me about certain [area] issues ... and I know the answer off the top of my head, but my job isn’t to sit round answering those queries anymore, but there is no one still who can answer them, so they have lost it all ... I do get people from industry saying ‘why aren’t you doing [area] anymore?’ It’s industry who seem to be most upset about this, they have been shouting and screaming, saying ‘it’s awful’.”*

#### **4.2.2.2 Views on Training**

When the CTG members were asked whether they had completed any training since the move, six of the 10 interviewees said that they had received varying amounts in the form of in-house courses. Some of the staff interviewed were unable to recall how many days they had actually spent training; therefore a figure detailing the number of days spent training could not be estimated for the Process Safety CTG. However, of those that gave a figure estimating the number of days spent on training courses, the figures appeared to correspond to the data recorded in CIS, see section 3.2.

Several themes emerged from the conversations. The basic (mandatory) training they had received was not considered to be ‘in tune with their needs’ as it was directed to staff new to HSE. The interviewees felt that they already knew the contents of the course - it ‘was mainly procedural rather than technical’. One interviewee estimated that only 10% was of relevance. The specialist COMAH courses were said to be unavailable and so instead some individuals attended the course for the regulatory inspectors. Again, this was considered to be ‘not strictly relevant’, as it was thought to be aimed at new starters to HID.

### **4.3 THE REALLOCATION**

When asked to discuss how they felt about the management of the CTG reallocation, all the interviewees stated that they thought the move had been managed badly. Some interviewees discussed the disorganisation during the move, while others chose to focus on the lack of

---

<sup>2</sup> Dangerous Substances and Explosive Atmospheres Regulations 2002 (DESEAR).

planning or consultation before the move. From the interviews emerged the widely held view that the move had produced negative consequences for HSE as an organisation. The conversations are presented in the themed sections below.

#### **4.3.1 Pre-planning & Consultation Process**

When interviewees were asked to discuss how they felt the move from the CTG was managed, a number of individuals were disappointed with the apparent lack of planning and forethought given to the implications of the reallocation of CTG resources. Some considered the flawed consultation process the reason for this ‘mistake’.

Two interviewees noted that HSE had spent time and effort in briefing the CTG in advance by holding workshops and discussions to explain why the change was necessary and what was going to be done. However, when the actual plan materialised it had been modified at the last minute and was completely different from the one they had been briefed on. So, what the CTG had been consulted about and briefed on did not happen.

It was said that they were consulted at length, they had given their views, and a plan had been put together for how they were going to be dispersed and then it was *‘just torn up with no briefing at all about the actual move that materialised’*. The majority of the interviewees also stated that they still do not know why it was changed at the last minute and that no reasons had ever been given.

*“We knew it was coming and my personal view is, if this is what the Board wanted to do, they should have just got on and done it. There were various scoping projects, that seemed to come up with various conclusions but those of us in the CTG saw this as a done deal, this was what the Board wanted and therefore it was going to go ahead. I just wish that instead of putting us through a long period of uncertainty the Board had just gone ahead and done it, I think it would have been a lot more honest and overall it would have been a lot easier on people.”*

Other members of the CTG interviewed commented that they had not been consulted or briefed about the reallocation.

*“Basically, one day I was in the CTG, then next it was, ‘we no longer want you; where do you want to go?’ ... It wasn’t something I chose to do, the powers that ‘be’ decided they no longer wanted the CTG, and it was, ‘where are we going to put all these people’. There didn’t seem any reason for those that went, to go, or reason for those that stayed, to stay.”*

One interviewee thought that HSE could not explain the change adequately because as they saw it, it is *“change for changes sake in HSE, and not because there is a true operational need”*. Poor management, reflected by the need to keep changing, was blamed.

The lack of adequate consultation perceived by the majority of the Process Safety CTG team created disruption and most of the staff interviewed relayed ill feeling towards both the decision to reallocate them and also towards the actual management of the change process.

#### **4.3.2 The Change Management Process**

When interviewees were asked to discuss how they felt the move from the CTG was managed, all 10 responded that they ‘didn’t think it was managed’ or that ‘it was managed very badly’.

*“You could use this as the ideal example of how not to manage change.”*

*“I don’t think there was any external management of it at all.”*

A number of interviewees described the time during the move as confused and disorganised. As has been seen in the previous section, the move was confusing because it appeared as though the plans they had been consulted about were not carried through. Following the change in the original plans, staff then felt that they were “parachuted” into places they would not have chosen if they had been given a choice.

*“I think when the CTG was disbanded ... there were some discussions with my manager at the time ... but the end point was really determined for me with little consultation, there was some consultations but I got the impression that the decisions had already been taken as to where I would be going within the organisation. I think one of the difficulties at the time was the feeling of loss of control of my own destiny.”*

### **4.3.3 Views of the Reallocation**

The majority of the staff interviewed were not in agreement with the decision taken by the HSE Board to reduce their proactive core (level 3) work and to reallocate them to Strategic Programmes (SP) and front-line delivery. Several themes emerged from the conversations and they are presented in the themed sections below.

#### **4.3.3.1 Feeling of demoralisation**

As one interviewee expressed, staff were ‘*taken aback that work they had been doing for some time now seemed unwanted, or not quite so relevant*’. The majority of CTG members interviewed considered the HSE Board’s decision as demoralising.

The HSE Board’s decision in itself was upsetting for the CTG members however as has been seen from the previous sections the CTG members all felt that they were subsequently subjected to a disorganised change management process. As one interviewee stated, the CTG felt ‘*press ganged*’ because they were initially told they would be going to another unit then they were told that the move ‘*would mean they could throw their previous CTG work in the bin*’. The interviewee felt that this ‘*antagonised*’ individuals who had spent many years doing something that they thought was worthwhile. This difference of opinion between the CTG members and the HSE Board was stated to have caused friction.

*“I don’t remember being consulted at all on where I wanted to go to, I just remember being told, ‘this is where you are going’. It was a case of like it or lump it really. It just wasn’t how I expected to be treated at all. I felt that I had no say whatsoever in anything that went on, and when we moved there was a lot of uncertainty for quite a long time about what our role was and what our priorities were. I mean, the 12 months from January 2005 to January 2006 were honestly the worst 12 months of my professional career ... I think a lot of it could have been made a lot easier by good management and good planning and that didn’t happen.”*

As one CTG member explained, although they are now content with an inspection role the bottom line is the feeling that there was a huge lack of importance placed on what they were all doing before.

*“Someone somewhere turned around and said what those [people] are doing in the CTG isn’t important so we won’t do it anymore – I think that’s what really hurt everyone ... and I think that is probably the issue they need to take on board.”*

#### **4.3.3.2 Loss of work and specialised knowledge**

From the interviews it became evident that all the individuals from the CTG feel that one of the main problems for HSE as an organisation has been the loss of work carried out by them as specialists. They were all concerned about how the changes may have affected HSE through the loss of skill and knowledge in the area. One interviewee stated that HSE used to provide impartial advice to industry but that this has now been lost. Similarly, another interviewee said:

*“I was the UK expert ... representing the UK and now there is nobody doing it ... it was being done for a very good reason, i.e. to keep us in the forefront of that particular class of work ... no one has ever sat down and explained to any of us exactly why they [HSE] don’t want to do this work anymore and what the benefits are, other than monetary. What the actual benefits are to the company from a knowledge perspective are impossible to see.”*

Similarly another interviewer explained:

*“... getting rid of the CTG was made all the more harder because I felt it was a very useful resource, well an essential resource for people in the field. If we’d have felt it was a good change that would produce worthwhile results that would have made the whole business a lot easier to cope with, but because we all thought it was a really bad move and would leave a huge hole because we wouldn’t have topic specialists anymore that made it very difficult.”*

#### **4.3.3.3 Lack of current work**

Several individuals discussed the impact of the move from the perspective of their current work situation. In particular three interviewees spoke of how they felt they were being under-utilised as a resource. They considered that the move was completed without any consideration of the resources needed to do the work they are currently doing.

*“We came to join [new team] and they didn’t need us, and they didn’t even know we were coming, there was no demand from this group we joined, there was no demand for extra work, so they didn’t know what to do with us.”*

The three interviewees explained why they thought they were now being under-utilised in their new role. It was because either the new unit had already done their work planning so there is now little scope for using them as a resource or because the unit was sizably over-resourced. This means that for a number of individuals there is very little opportunity to work on chargeable projects.

#### **4.3.4 Consideration of the positive (and negative) aspects of the move**

When asked directly about whether they could think of any positive aspects of the move, either for HSE as an organisation or for them as individuals, seven of the interviewees felt able to comment. The other three stated that they could not see any positive aspects for HSE as an organisation.

*“From the CTG side there were no positive benefits – I think it was appalling.”*

#### **4.3.4.1 Positive aspects**

Of the seven interviewees that commented on the positive aspects of the reallocation several themes emerged. One interviewee saw that the move had put a small group of specialists into one unit, which gave a “*nucleus of knowledge*”. This benefit however was not sustained as individuals have since left the unit.

Another interviewee recognised that they have been accommodated well and people have been pleasant and they felt that this was a positive feature.

The other five individuals all commented on the positive aspects of the move to them as individuals, which they in turn recognised was of benefit to HSE. They discussed how they quite liked their new role, either because they had been given the chance to do work they had wanted, such as more operational work, or because they had been able to move to an area of work they had wanted.

*“Yes, I think there are probably some positive aspects ... the change has meant that I’ve had to adapt to other technologies, other ways of working and other pressures and problems in a different working environment; so in a sense there has been a broadening of my horizons.”*

*“I did want to get into the [description] type work at some point in my career anyway because I’m very committed to Process Safety as a discipline and everyone working in Process Safety says that it is as very useful skill to have done some of this work. So from a personal point of view and from a career development point of view it was something I wanted to do but I would have definitely not chosen to do it at this point in my career.”*

Positive aspects were also noted because the reallocation had not really changed the nature of the work too much.

*“I was fortunate, my job hasn’t changed much ... I was able to do the job I was doing previously, it’s altered slightly but nothing much has changed for me.”*

Four interviewees negotiated their own arrangements and applied for jobs they wanted rather than wait to be reallocated to where they might have been asked to go. So in a sense the reallocation created the opportunity for change, which some individuals took; they felt positive about their new roles because they had chosen them. This however cannot really be seen as a positive benefit created by good change management since the individuals created their own success. It was commented by one member that they ‘jumped before they were pushed’ and in a sense this could be seen as a highly negative and possibly unwanted result of a poorly managed change process.

In a sense HSE may be lucky that these individuals moved within the organisation since they were not reallocated as planned. On the other hand, three of the four individuals did note that they had been able to get jobs they had previously wanted but had not been allowed. The reallocation however, opened up the transfers.

*“You could call it a positive aspect – sat in the CTG, if this job had been advertised the chance of getting it would be nil... If I’d wanted to get out of the CTG, that would have been very difficult, you couldn’t even make a sideways move.”*

#### **4.3.4.2 Negative aspects**

Four interviewees chose to take a new job rather than be reallocated, and as seen in the previous section, some found positive benefits. However, even when the individuals had found satisfactory alternative employment they still did not feel that the move had any positive aspects from an organisational perspective.

*“It was a very good move. I enjoy what I’m doing but I still think it was a huge mistake to get rid of the work we were doing but that’s up to other people not me.”*

As one individual explained, they considered the main problem was that the information given was so poor. They did not get any information of where they were going or what their long-term future was going to be. The interviewee commented that they could not work like that so they took matters into their own hands:

*“I managed the move myself, I jumped before I was pushed. I saw this job advertised, saw the writing on the wall and went for it. No way I would want to carry on working in Bootle under the conditions they wanted us to. The management of the move was so poor that none of us knew what we would be doing in our new roles.”*

Another interviewee wanted to emphasise that had they not been moving from the CTG they would not have submitted their Move Action Plan (MAP). And in this case the interviewee could not think of any positive aspects.

## 4.4 IDEAS FOR CHANGE MANAGEMENT

When the Process Safety CTG team were asked to discuss how they felt the move from the CTG could have been managed differently, nine interviewees responded with several clear ideas. One individual did not want to discuss the topic.

The ideas that were put forward could easily be overlain onto a well-known framework of organisational change. The intuitive suggestions made by the individuals interviewed fit the four-phase model of planned change by Bullock and Batten (1985). By examining the conversations in this manner, the author believes that it can be shown that the suggestions made by the CTG members are, in essence, vital ingredients needed in any change management process.

In Bullock and Batten's model the four change phases, and their attendant change processes, are as follows:

1. Exploration phase;
2. Planning phase;
3. Action phase;
4. Integration phase.

Occupational psychologists argue that as an organisation undertakes planned change there are distinct stages that it must pass through in order to move from an unsatisfactory present state to a more desired future state (Arnold, Cooper & Robertson, 1998). Bullock and Batten's model has said to have broad application in that it incorporates the key aspects that organisations must go through to achieve a successful change (Cummings & Huse, 1989).

### 4.4.1 Exploration phase

According to the model, in this first phase HSE should have explored and decided what changes it needed to make to its operation, and if so, commit resources to planning the changes. It appeared to the CTG members that this did not happen.

*"I think it should have started from a very critical analysis on what was going wrong with the existing structure in the organisation and I don't believe that that was done on a sound footing, because I don't think that some of the issues that were inevitable from moving the topic specialists to doing more general types of work were recognised at the time, they weren't seen as being particularly important."*

The model maintains that the change processes involved in this phase should be: becoming aware of the need for change; searching for outside assistance (a consultant/ facilitator) to implement the changes; and establishing a contract with the consultant.

The majority of interviewees queried whether there was a real need for change; and from the interviews it appears that no outside assistance was used.

*"If there had been the need for us within the CTG to do chargeable work then we could have done it, we didn't have to change to do it ... if a request had been put in then there was no reason why we couldn't have done it. People had volunteered and gone on training courses but*

*the work never came through – that was a management thing, we didn't need change to sort that out."*

#### **4.4.2 Planning phase**

According to the model, once the consultant and organisation have established a contract, the next stage, which involves understanding the organisation's problem, begins. The change processes involved in this are: collecting information into order to establish a correct diagnosis; establishing change goals and appropriate actions for their achievement; and getting key decisions makers to approve and support the proposed changes.

For the Process Safety CTG members the correct diagnosis was not reached and they, as the key decisions makers, did not give their full support for the changes suggested. They could not give their support or approval because the plan was altered at the last minute and they did not actually know what was taking place.

*"... it was obvious [to CTG members] that the system needed to continue; [however] there seemed to be a fundamental problem, in that, the people managing these changes seemed to think that Process Safety had all been done, that there was nothing new coming out of the area anymore, therefore [HSE] didn't need these people, [but] all of us with field experience knew that we did."*

#### **4.4.3 Action phase**

In this state, an organisation implements the changes derived from the planning. According to the model, the processes needed are: appropriate arrangements to manage the change process and gaining support for the actions to be taken; and evaluating the implementation activities and feeding back the results so refinements can be made as necessary.

As has been seen from the conversations held, the Process Safety members did not feel that HSE implemented the planned proposal (see sections 3.2.1 and 3.2.2).

The following quotes show that the interviewees are certainly not supportive of the actions undertaken and it also appears to the staff that their concerns are not being listened to. So it would appear that the evaluation and feedback process from the model is not currently taking place. (However, it should be noted that this current investigation will act as part of the evaluation and feedback process).

*"I think we all feel like Guinea pigs – management really has not listened to the concerns of staff, and by that I mean very senior management."*

*"We weren't listened to at all, I don't know if it would have influenced how things had gone, but if we could have felt that we were listened to throughout it all that would have helped; and if we could have felt we could have had a bit of a stake in where we were going."*

#### **4.4.4 Integration phase**

This state commences, as identified by the model, once the changes have been successfully executed. The changes are consolidated and become part of everyday operation. The change processes involved are: reinforcing new behaviours through feedback and rewards systems;

diffusing the successful aspects of the change process throughout the organisation; and training managers and employees to monitor and seek improvement on the changes.

It is debatable from the interviews as to whether this phase in the model has been reached. However, if HSE wants the reallocation to become consolidated, they need to continue to listen to the concerns of the Process Safety CTG members as they adapt to their new roles. The following quote leaves no doubt that there are still concerns to be addressed before the reallocation can be claimed to be completed.

*“I felt that maybe moving the CTG into HID as a central resource, which could be used on particular topics, would have worked better. I think that was fair enough. Less time for proactive work, more time for reactive work, and I think that have would worked very well. You would’ve still had topic leads, which I think the Pool is sadly lacking. Instead you’ve got guidance coming out from all sorts of places, with insufficient quality control. I think things are getting worse as far as Process Safety is concerned.”*

The next section examines the organisational benefits to HSE from the reallocation. As can be seen, the benefits need to interpreted alongside the numerous concerns which remain from the move. These issues will need to be attended to in order to complete phase 4 of the planned change model and to realise a successful consolidation of the Board’s vision. Otherwise, as the model suggests, any changes will remain unstable and unsuccessful.

## 5 SUMMARY & CONCLUSION

### 5.1 SUMMARY

To summarise, this project aimed to gather information in order to evaluate the impact of the reallocation of resources to Strategic Programme and front-line activities. 10 individuals from the Process Safety CTG were interviewed in this pilot investigation for the COSAS, HSE. The individuals' current managers (N=5) were also interviewed in order to gain a balanced view of their current work activities and their views on the benefits of the reallocation.

#### 5.1.1 Summary of interviews with the current managers

In order to report a balanced view of the reallocation the current managers of the ex-CTG staff were interviewed. The five managers reported that all ten of the ex-CTG members were now doing front-line work. The amount of front-line work varied between individuals – from a third of their time to all of their time.

They stated that most of the staff were now doing a much broader range of things than they were before and had a broader focus than they would have done. All 10 individuals were now doing far less CTG work. They have been managing their portfolio down and have been gradually moving away from CTG work. Three of the 10 staff were said to have completely stopped doing their previous CTG work. Seven individuals are still covering for their old role, or doing work that they have brought with them from the CTG. However, in most cases the CTG work that had been kept on was seen to be relevant to the team they had moved into.

Managers stated that nine of the former CTG members had received significant amounts of training including those that were considered to be already suitably experienced for front-line work. This was because the majority of the training was the compulsory and basic introductory courses to HID aimed at those new to inspection and enforcement. Four members were said to have had the right knowledge and experience for immediate effective transfer from the CTG to their current roles. Six people needed quite significant amounts of training and further development. This was because they either had limited experience or no experience of front-line inspection. They were not considered to be up to speed on issues such as evidence collecting, contributing to audits, and COMAH safety reports. They therefore needed quite an extensive amount of basic training in front-line operational activities. The current managers estimated that the staff had spent a total of 300 days on formal training courses.

Interviews with the current managers revealed that the staff reached full efficiency at different times. One individual was considered to be up to speed immediately upon moving across. Two members were acknowledged to have got up to speed very quickly, within a year. Five of the ex-CTG members were described as being up to speed after between three and six months. However, they were still considered to be on a learning curve and it was estimated that this would take between another three and six months before the individuals had fully consolidated their formal training. It was considered to be a difficult transition for two individuals - one needed lots of retraining and the other currently did not appear to be settling into their new role.

Finally, quantitative data was also examined in order to assist in the evaluation of the reallocation of the CTG resources to front-line work. An estimate from CIS data collected

between 04/04/2005 – 02/04/2006 was made based on average salary costs. It was estimated that the financial implications of the front-line work comes to a total of £288,984.

### **5.1.2 Process Safety CTG team**

The 10 individuals from the Process Safety CTG were topic specialists on various Process Safety areas. The work in the CTG involved several different areas, such as: developing guidance; deciding on standards; and representing HSE. They also commissioned research, managed projects, and assisted field inspectors.

Four of the 10 CTG members moved into new posts within HSE that they had applied for, so they were not actually reallocated. The other six individuals were formally reallocated as part of the move. All ten of the interviewees said that their new work was being done before they were reallocated into their current jobs. Six interviewees thought that their new departments were under resourced, although, four of the interviewees stated that they did not yet feel fully competent in their role to do much front-line work. In contrast, two individuals thought that their new units were over-resourced.

### **5.1.3 Organisational Benefits as discussed by Process Safety CTG members**

The organisational benefits realised by the reduction in business enabling work (level 3) were examined. It was stressed that the benefits need to be interpreted alongside the numerous concerns which remain from the move.

Several organisational benefits could be derived from the conversations. Amongst the responses expressed, staff felt that they now:

- have broader knowledge of their subject field;
- have broader knowledge of HSE;
- have broader knowledge of industry (related to their field);
- deliver more front-line work;
- aim assist in the creation and delivery of Knowledge Hubs;
- input their specialist topic area knowledge into the relevant Pooling team.

The interviews also attempted to appraise whether the benefits will be sustained in the future; unfortunately there seem to be several perceived obstacles threatening the success of the reallocation.

### **5.1.4 Caveats as discussed by Process Safety CTG members**

A number of perceived caveats, or concerns, were put forward in the conversations and they require examination alongside the organisational benefits. They were:

- Marginal opportunity to do more chargeable work, due to:
  - Lack of pre-planning for increased resource;
  - Training requirements.

- Deteriorating specialist knowledge, due to:
  - Poor quality of new guidance being produced;
  - Lack of new up-to-date guidance;
  - No procedure for new writing guidance;
  - Hubs and Pooling Groups seen as less effective, due to members competing commitments, i.e. not a permanent and mandatory role.
- Loss of specialist knowledge exchange said to have a knock on effect for:
  - field inspectors;
  - industry;
  - Trade associations;
  - HSE as a creditable organisation;
  - UK position as world leader in Process Safety.
- Some loss of good will towards HSE as an employer.
- Lack of structured and relevant re-training opportunities.

### **5.1.5 Views of the Reallocation**

The management of the move from the CTG was assessed, and the interviewees all stated that they thought the CTG reallocation was managed badly and that overall it had produced negative consequences for HSE. The individuals were disappointed with the apparent lack of planning and forethought given to the implications of the reallocation of CTG resources. Although the CTG members contributed to a consultation process the actual plan that they had been briefed on was later modified. So the move that actually took place was completely different.

The lack of adequate consultation created upset and all of the staff interviewed relayed ill feeling towards both the decision to reallocation them and towards the change process. Following the change in the original plans, staff then felt that they were put into places they would not have chosen if they had been given a choice. Individuals who had spent the last 12 years doing something that they thought was worthwhile felt demoralised when they were effectively told their work was no longer needed. They all felt that there had been a lack of importance placed on what they were all doing before and that in fact their work was vital. They were all concerned about how the changes may have affected HSE through the loss of skill and knowledge in the area of Process Safety.

Seven interviewees noted some positive aspects. One interviewee saw that the move put a small group of specialists into one unit, which gave a “*nucleus of knowledge*”. Another interviewee recognised that they have been accommodated well. The other five individuals all commented on the positive aspects of the move to them as individuals, which they in turn recognised was of benefit to HSE. They discussed how they quite liked their new role, either because they had been given the chance to do work they had wanted, such as more operational work, or because they had been able to move to an area of work they had wanted.

### **5.1.6 Lessons learned from the Change Management Process**

The research was asked to report any lessons learned from the administration of the change management process. The Process Safety CTG team were asked to consider how the move could have been managed differently. Their ideas were overlain onto Bullock and Batten’s four-phase model of planned change (1985).

By examining the conversations alongside the model it was shown that the suggestions made by the CTG members were vital ingredients missing from the change management process. It was shown from the interviews that key processes that should take place during effective change management were missing in all four phases. The model's four change phases are: Exploration phase; Planning phase; Action phase; and Integration phase.

It was recommended that the remaining issues of the Process Safety CG team be attended to in order for reallocation to have the opportunity to be successfully completed. Otherwise, as the model suggests, any changes will remain unstable and unsuccessful.

1. **Exploration phase:** It appeared to the CTG members that HSE did not adequately explore what changes it needed to make. The majority of interviewees queried whether there was a real need for change.
2. **Planning phase:** For the Process Safety CTG members the correct diagnosis of the organisation's problems was not reached by HSE and they, as the key decisions makers, did not give their full support for the changes suggested. They could not give their support or approval because the plan was altered at the last minute and they did not actually know what was taking place.
3. **Action phase:** In this phase, an organisation implements the changes derived from the planning. As has been seen from the conversations held, the Process Safety members did not feel that HSE implemented the planned proposal and they were certainly not supportive of the actions undertaken.
4. **Integration phase:** This state commences once the changes have been successfully executed. It is debatable from the interviews as to whether this phase in the model has been reached. The changes still need to be consolidated and become part of everyday operation. To complete this stage HSE needs to continue to listen to the Process Safety CTG members as they adapt to their new roles and address their continued concerns.

## 5.2 CONCLUSIONS AND RECOMMENDATION

To conclude, the reallocation of CTG resources was not welcomed by the Process Safety staff, and they were disappointed that their previous work was seen as unnecessary. They all considered that their work in the CTG was vital and of continued importance to HSE as an organisation.

The interviewees stated that they were still being contacted for specialist advice but that they no longer had the time available to attend to all the queries. It was also noted that guidance and research are continuing within HSE even though they were told it was no longer necessary. Some interviewees stated that they thought the new guidance being produced was flawed. It was also perceived that the new methods for knowledge exchanges have not been probably set up and that the Pool and Knowledge Hubs do not work in practice.

By examining a model of planned organisational change it was shown that the management of the reallocation was badly organised and administered. The reallocation was missing key process aspects that organisations must go through to achieve a successful change. For HSE to move from the unsatisfactory state, as judged by the Board, to the desired future state of

increased front-line work, HSE would do well to attempt to complete the suggestions made by the model. Particularly, the report recommends that the numerous concerns which remain from the move should be addressed.

Finally, according to the current managers the CTG staff are now spending a third of all their work time on front-line work. It was estimated that the financial implications of the front-line work comes to a total of £288,984. The staff also appear to be gradually moving away from CTG work; the work which has continued was seen as relevant to their new teams.

Most of the ex-CTG members had received significant amounts of training in their new role - a total of 300 days was estimated. However, now they have completed their compulsory and basic introductory courses to HID the majority of staff are said to be up to speed. It was estimated that the majority will be functioning as full efficient and full capability by end of 2006.

### **5.2.1 Recommendation**

In order to achieve a fully integrated reallocation as anticipated by the current managers it will be necessary to attend to the concerns put forward by the CTG staff since the move. At present their concerns may appear to be unsupported opinions but this is exactly why these potentially valuable insights need to be further explored.

## APPENDIX A: QUESTION SET FOR CTG INTERVIEWEES

### Evaluation of the reallocation of Corporate Topic Group resources to strategic programmes and front-line delivery Open Interview Questions

Work is for Julian Delic/ Brian Fullam – CSAS (Corporate Science & Knowledge Unit).

#### AIM - To evaluate the reallocation of Corporate Topic Group resources to strategic programmes and front-line delivery

- *Organisational benefits of the move to HSE*

#### Background:

1. What were you doing in the CTG before you were allocated to front-line and/or strategic programmes?
2. What are you doing now?
3. Were your current activities being done before? (e.g. was this a new/additional activity or was it work that had been done by someone else who had moved on).

#### Move:

4. How was your move from CTG managed?
5. What were the positive or negative aspects?
6. How could the move have been managed differently/better?
  - *Lessons learnt?*
  - *e.g. loss of staff and/or knowledge,*
  - *loss of people's good will,*
  - *time taken to re-train.*

#### Benefits:

7. What impact has the move had on HSE work? Benefits? (identify benefits realized by the reduction in business enabling work (level 3).
  - *Broader knowledge*
  - *More front-line and/or strategic programme work?*
  - *Knowledge Hubs*
8. Any evidence of benefits realized, including quantifiable benefits (e.g. chargeable COMAH work)?
9. Will the benefits be sustained in the future?
  - *i.e. once any training completed etc.*

## **APPENDIX B: QUESTION SET FOR MANAGERS**

1. What work have the ex-CTG member/s been doing?
2. How are they being used in their new role?
3. How broad or narrow is their focus?
4. Are they still covering for their old role (i.e. ex-CTG work)?
5. How effective has their transfer of skills been, i.e. they came in as CTG experts, so have they needed any training; if so, how much?
6. How quickly have they become a front-line inspector and/or got up to speed/efficiency?
7. Are there any further developments of their skills/ knowledge needed to get them up to speed; if so, how much?
8. Do you have any comments to make, from your perspective, on the change management process that took place (of the CTG staff)?

## 6 REFERENCES

Arnold, J., Cooper, C.L. and Robertson, I.T. (1998) *Work Psychology: Understanding Human Behaviour in the Workplace*. Third Edition. Pearson Education Limited.

Bullock, R.J. and Batten, D. (1985) 'It's just a phase we're going through: a review and synthesis of OD phase analysis', *Group and Organizational Studies*, vol. 10, pp.383-412. In, Arnold, J., Cooper, C.L. and Robertson, I.T. (1998) *Work Psychology: Understanding Human Behaviour in the Workplace*. Third Edition. Pearson Education Limited.

Cummings, T.G. and Huse, E.F. (1989) *Organizational Development and Change*. St Paul, MN: West Publishing. In, Arnold, J., Cooper, C.L. and Robertson, I.T. (1998) *Work Psychology: Understanding Human Behaviour in the Workplace*. Third Edition. Pearson Education Limited.

OMT Paper 47/5. The HSE Operations Management Team. Reallocation of Corporate Topic Group resources to Strategic Programmes and Front-line Delivery: A Paper by Paul Davies. Advisor(s): Brian Fullam and Julian Delic. Cleared by Paul Davies on 03/11/2004..