

Reclaiming health and safety for all: a review of progress one year on

Professor Ragnar E Löfstedt

January 2013

Foreword

Dear Minister,

Your predecessor, the Right Honourable Chris Grayling MP, wrote to me on 30 May 2012 requesting my independent assessment of how well the recommendations in my report, 'Reclaiming health and safety for all: an independent review of health and safety legislation', have been implemented so far and how those still to be delivered are progressing, one year on from its publication. He also asked me to consider the delivery of the recommendations in Lord Young's report 'Common Sense, Common Safety', published in October 2010.

Overall, as described in my attached assessment, I have found that good progress is being made in delivering my recommendations and I believe there is already some evidence that the perception of health and safety is changing. I am confident that the ongoing work, together with the wider programme of reforms, will help ensure that health and safety is not seen as an unnecessary bureaucratic burden but as a proportionate and risk-based system that helps businesses comply with their duties and ensures that employees are protected from the real risks to their health and safety.

I would like to take this opportunity to thank the many stakeholder organisations and individuals who I have discussed my report with over the past twelve months, including my advisory panel. I have really appreciated their interest and willingness to engage in a discussion about the recommendations. My one regret is that, because I am on sabbatical for the calendar year 2013, I will be unable to participate in further debates on this topic during this time beyond the two that I have already committed to. However, both I and my advisory panel believe there would be benefit in another, independent, review of progress in a year or so time, to ensure that implementation remains on track, and assess the impact on the ground of the changes already made.



Professor Ragnar E Löfstedt
24 January 2013

Contents

Introduction..... 4

The scope and application of health and safety legislation..... 5

Simplifying the regulatory framework..... 7

The enforcement of health and safety regulations..... 9

Engaging with the European Union 10

The wider perspective – the role of health and safety law in the civil justice system
and improving the understanding of risk..... 11

Implementation of Common Sense, Common Safety recommendations 12

Conclusion..... 13

Introduction

1. The terms of reference for this independent assessment were set out in a letter from the Right Honourable Chris Grayling MP¹. It asked me to consider how well the recommendations in my report, 'Reclaiming health and safety for all: an independent review of health and safety legislation'², have been implemented so far and how those still to be delivered are progressing, one year on from its publication in November 2011. It also asked me to consider the delivery of the recommendations in Lord Young's report 'Common Sense, Common Safety'³, published in October 2010.
2. This assessment is supported by a report, published on the DWP website⁴ that outlines the progress made by the Health and Safety Executive (HSE) and Government departments towards delivering each of the recommendations in my review as well as those in Lord Young's report.
3. Since my report was published in November 2012. I have spoken at well over a hundred events up and down the country during the course of which I have heard the views of a wide range of stakeholders. These have informed my assessment, as have the comments offered by members of my Advisory Panel (Sir John Armit, Andrew Bridgen MP, Dr Adam Marshall, Andrew Miller MP and Liz Snape⁵), which reconvened in January. The Panel had a wide ranging discussion and expressed differing views about how some of the recommendations are being implemented, particularly in relation to strict liability and local authority inspections. I am grateful to them for their continued interest and commitment to this work.
4. The majority of those I spoke to, including business representatives, trade unions, professional organisations and trade associations, welcomed the overall direction and conclusions of the report. A few felt I should have been more deregulatory while others were concerned that the changes will result in reduced health and safety protection for employees and members of the public (such as the proposal to revoke the Notification of Conventional Tower Cranes Regulations)^{6,7}. It was never my intention that any of my recommendations should put workers or the public at risk. My aim was to identify a suite of reforms that would deliver a simplified health and safety legislative framework that is evidence-based and risk-based and to ensure that it is applied in a fairer and more consistent way. This in turn should help businesses and employees to understand more easily what they need to do to keep workplaces safe. This is complemented by other work, some put in train by Lord Young's recommendations, to ensure that the justice system is fair and balanced.

¹ <http://www.dwp.gov.uk/docs/letter-c-grayling-prof-lofstedt-300512.pdf>

² <http://www.dwp.gov.uk/docs/lofstedt-report.pdf>

³ http://www.number10.gov.uk/wp-content/uploads/402906_CommonSense_acc.pdf

⁴ <http://www.dwp.gov.uk/policy/health%2Dand%2Dsafety/>

⁵ Liz Snape replaced Sarah Veale CBE as the employee representative on the panel when the latter became a member of the HSE Board in October 2012.

⁶ http://www.iosh.co.uk/ConsultDoc/IOSH_submission_Lofstedt_implementation_review%20Dec12.pdf

⁷ <http://www.parliament.uk/edm/2012-13/259>

The scope and application of health and safety legislation

5. HSE has to date made considerable progress in taking forward my recommendations in this area. It has either met the milestones in the Government response or is on course to do so. There have been consultations on exempting some self employed from health and safety law⁸ and on changes to the Reporting of Injuries, Diseases & Dangerous Occurrences Regulations 1995 (RIDDOR)⁹.
6. While there have been criticisms of the Government's reforms to RIDDOR, to date they have mainly been directed at Lord Young's proposals for the extension, from three to seven days, of the period before an injury or accident in the workplace needs to be reported, which was introduced in April 2012, and for a wider examination of the effectiveness of RIDDOR. Critics believe the proposals will reduce the level of protection offered to workers^{10,11} and weaken the regulation, monitoring and management of health and safety. My recommendation for RIDDOR focused on making the regulations, and associated guidance, clearer and simpler for employers to understand and comply with.
7. My recommendation on the self-employed was clear. Only those self-employed whose work activities pose no potential risk of harm to others should be exempt from health and safety law. This approach has been taken in a number of other EU member states¹². A number of stakeholders have raised concerns that this recommendation might lead to the self-employed in risky occupations, such as construction, being taken outside health and safety law^{13,14}. This was never my intention and I am pleased to note that the consultation document focused on clarifying which categories of self-employed workers would and would not be affected by the exemption¹⁵.
8. I understand decisions on both these areas will be taken soon by the HSE Board but so far I am content with the way this work is being taken forward.
9. Stakeholders have also been consulted on the recommendation to remove the requirement in the Health and Safety (First Aid) Regulations 1981 for all first aid training and qualifications to be approved by HSE¹⁶. A number of training providers have told me that they have concerns about the consequences of this proposal. I am looking to HSE to ensure that the implementation of this recommendation does not have any impact on the quality of first aid training.

⁸ <http://www.hse.gov.uk/consult/condocs/cd242.htm>

⁹ <http://www.hse.gov.uk/consult/condocs/cd243.htm>

¹⁰ <http://www.tuc.org.uk/workplace/tuc-21600-f0.pdf>

¹¹ http://www.iosh.co.uk/ConsultDoc/IOSH_submission_Lofstedt_implementation_review%20Dec12.pdf

¹² <http://eur-lex.europa.eu/LexUriServ/LexUriServ.do?uri=CELEX:52002PC0166:EN:HTML>

¹³ https://www.ucatt.org.uk/article.php?group_id=400

¹⁴ <http://www.guardian.co.uk/commentisfree/2012/jul/29/nick-cohen-construction-workers-blacklist>

¹⁵ <http://www.hse.gov.uk/consult/condocs/cd242.htm>

¹⁶ <http://www.hse.gov.uk/consult/condocs/cd248.htm>

10. A major step in helping businesses to understand what is meant by 'reasonably practicable' was made in September 2012 when HSE published the Health and Safety Toolbox¹⁷. This interactive site, developed with input from small businesses and their representatives, gives businesses practical advice, tools and case studies for controlling common risks on specific topics¹⁸. In the first four months there were over 75,000 separate visitors to the Toolbox and feedback from a wide range of stakeholders has been positive¹⁹. The Federation of Small Businesses said "The Toolbox should give small, low-risk businesses the information that they need in a simple and easy to use way without asking them to read through reams of guidance"²⁰. HSE has actively engaged with stakeholders and has used social media as a means of directing people to the Toolbox²¹. I would encourage HSE to continue working with employer organisations and other representative bodies to further raise awareness.
11. Portable appliance testing was an example of a regulatory requirement that was being applied too widely and disproportionately and was raised by stakeholders both in response to my call for evidence, and to the Government's Red Tape Challenge website. HSE estimated that UK offices are potentially wasting up to £30million a year on this²². Its new guidance, published in April 2012²³, dispelled the myth that all portable electrical appliances in a low-risk environment, such as an office, need to be tested every year. The launch generated considerable media coverage^{24,25} and, based on feedback from business organisations I have spoken to, this guidance is already making a difference. I welcome HSE's continued engagement with stakeholders to ensure that the messages reach a wide audience and look forward to seeing the results of the planned evaluation.
12. HSE has also undertaken a detailed review of the Work at Height Regulations and the associated guidance in discussion with stakeholders. This concluded that where problems remain, these are associated with the misinterpretation of the requirements of the Regulations rather than the Regulations themselves²⁶. New guidance is scheduled to be published in April 2013 and stakeholders have commented on drafts to ensure these issues are addressed.

¹⁷ <http://www.hse.gov.uk/toolbox/index.htm>

¹⁸ <http://www.hse.gov.uk/aboutus/meetings/hseboard/2012/311012/poctb1284.pdf>

¹⁹ <http://webcommunities.hse.gov.uk/connect.ti/sbtafcommunity/view?objectId=460165>

²⁰ <http://www.hse.gov.uk/press/2012/hse-toolbox.htm>

²¹ <http://content.govdelivery.com/bulletins/gd/UKHSE-67a2e3>

²² <http://www.hse.gov.uk/press/2012/hse-pattesting.htm>

²³ <http://www.hse.gov.uk/pubns/indg236.pdf>

²⁴ <http://www.bbc.co.uk/news/uk-politics-17929112>

²⁵ <http://www.shponline.co.uk/commentcommunity-content/full/hse-don-t-waste-money-on-unnecessary-pat-tests/>

²⁶ <http://www.hse.gov.uk/aboutus/meetings/hseboard/2012/260912/psepb1272.pdf>

13. Following a consultation on Approved Codes of Practice (ACoPs)²⁷, the HSE Board agreed that twelve ACoPs should be revised or removed by consolidation by the end of 2013²⁸. The Board will also consider separate proposals to withdraw a further three including the ACoP for the Management of Health and Safety at Work Regulations²⁹. I know these proposals concern some interest groups, and I recognise that care will be needed to ensure that the removal of an ACoP is not incorrectly perceived as the dilution or removal of the underpinning legal requirement. I therefore await the outcome of the HSE Board's careful deliberations with interest.
14. HSE published the evaluation of the Construction (Design and Management) Regulations 2007³⁰ on time and I note that they have gone further than my recommendation, with work already underway to consider how these Regulations could be simplified and rationalised without reducing standards³¹.

Simplifying the regulatory framework

15. The recommendations primarily concerned with simplifying the regulatory framework are also well underway. By April 2013 there should already be about 10% fewer sets of health and safety regulations on the statute book than when I started my review. As part of the Government response, HSE was asked to keep health and safety regulation under continuous review and the Government commitment was to reduce the total number of health and safety regulations that businesses have to comply with by 50% by 2014³². My recommended consolidation of sector regulations (mines, explosives, petroleum etc) will contribute to this figure as will the planned revocation of some further out-of-date regulations. In my report I said that I could see a "case for removing some older regulations that are no longer needed to control health and safety risks or that duplicate more recent regulations" so I am pleased to see that HSE has identified some other legislation that could be removed without reducing standards in the workplace. Seven such statutory instruments were revoked in October 2012 and a further tranche of measures are scheduled to be removed in April 2013 at the same time as the five I recommended for revocation (the Notification of Conventional Tower Cranes Regulations 2010 and the Amendment Regulations, two sets of regulations relating to the Celluloid and Cinematograph Film Act 1922 and the Construction (Head Protection) Regulations 1989).

²⁷ <http://www.hse.gov.uk/consult/condocs/cd241.htm>

²⁸ <http://www.hse.gov.uk/aboutus/meetings/hseboard/2012/051212/pdecb1294.pdf>

²⁹ <http://www.hse.gov.uk/aboutus/meetings/hseboard/2012/051212/pdecb1295.pdf>

³⁰ <http://www.hse.gov.uk/research/rrhtm/rr920.htm>

³¹ <http://www.hse.gov.uk/aboutus/meetings/iacs/coniac/200612/m2-2012-2.pdf>

³² <http://www.dwp.gov.uk/docs/lofstedt-report-response.pdf>

16. I know some are concerned that the revocation of the Construction (Head Protection) Regulations, whose requirements have been replaced by equivalent duties in more recent regulations, could be misinterpreted and increase the risk that vital head protection is not worn^{33,34}. HSE is planning to mitigate any such risk by targeting publicity at smaller construction companies with the message that head protection must still be provided and worn³⁵. I support this approach and would encourage others in the wider health and safety community to play their part in promulgating this important message.
17. I recognise that the major consolidation exercises will take time to deliver. In my view this work should not be rushed. It is important that the proposals are developed and scrutinised carefully to ensure that there are no unintended consequences which could result in a lowering of health and safety protections and that regulation remains evidence-based and risk-based. More generally, business representatives and professional organisations have told me that they would be happy for more time to be taken on the implementation of my recommendations so that their views can be fully taken into account.
18. Turning to the issue of whether to consolidate the core set of health and safety regulations, the research I recommended was published in December 2012³⁶. It concluded that none of the options set out in my report would be beneficial and any such consolidation would be potentially costly and confusing for business. A stakeholder workshop to discuss the findings was held on 7 January 2013 and I understand that HSE will report to the HSE Board and Ministers in the near future.
19. The Budget statement in March 2012 included a commitment to scrap or improve 84% of health and safety regulation³⁷. I was initially concerned by this, as I know were a number of stakeholders, but I am reassured that the figure includes improvements to regulations, revisions to associated ACoPs, improvements to guidance and new web-based tools in addition to the revocations and consolidations already discussed. I welcome this if it helps businesses and employees better understand health and safety requirements and I know HSE's review of guidance is already well underway. This aims to provide businesses with a suite of practical, proportionate guidance that is easier to understand and helps them to comply with their legal obligations³⁸.
20. Businesses, particularly new starters, should feel the benefits of this range of simplified guidance immediately even if the positive effects of a simplified, more streamlined legislative framework take longer to have an impact.
21. For those who choose to read the legislation, HSE's website was updated at the end of December 2012 to help distinguish between regulations that impose specific duties on businesses and those that define administrative requirements or revoke/amend earlier regulations³⁹.

³³ <http://www.parliament.uk/edm/2012-13/223>

³⁴ http://www.iosh.co.uk/ConsultDoc/IOSH_submission_Lofstedt_implementation_review%20Dec12.pdf

³⁵ <http://www.hse.gov.uk/aboutus/meetings/hseboard/2012/220812/paugb1257.pdf>

³⁶ <http://www.hse.gov.uk/legislation/consolidation-of-regulations.htm>

³⁷ http://cdn.hm-treasury.gov.uk/budget2012_complete.pdf

³⁸ <http://www.hse.gov.uk/aboutus/meetings/hseboard/2012/280312/pmarb1226.pdf>

³⁹ <http://www.hse.gov.uk/legislation/statinstruments.htm>

The enforcement of health and safety regulations

22. HSE is currently consulting on a National Local Authority Enforcement Code designed to ensure that Local Authority (LA) health and safety regulators take a more consistent and proportionate approach to enforcement⁴⁰. The draft Code, which is based on existing HSE powers under section 18(4)(b) of the Health and Safety at Work etc Act 1974, will require LAs to target interventions on those activities that give rise to the most serious risks, and to only otherwise use proactive inspections where intelligence suggests that risks are not being properly managed. While it is unfortunate that the Code does not go as far as my recommendation (for HSE to be given the authority “to direct local authority health and safety inspection and enforcement activity”), it is certainly a step in the right direction and, if adhered to, should ensure a more proportionate, risk-based approach to LA enforcement. To assess current performance, HSE has undertaken a voluntary mid-year data collection exercise of LA regulatory activities. The returns have been modelled to produce an annual projection. The estimated figures for the 2012/13 work year indicate that LAs will have reduced their unannounced proactive inspections to 16,400, a reduction of 86% since the baseline year of 2009/10⁴¹. The new Enforcement Code is due to be launched in April 2013.
23. Meanwhile, legislation to strengthen the Primary Authority scheme is being progressed by the Department for Business, Innovation and Skills and is currently being scrutinised in the House of Lords as part of the Enterprise and Regulatory Reform Bill 2012-13. HSE is working with Better Regulation Delivery Office to ensure the scheme increases consistency.
24. I will be interested to see if the subsequent evidence shows that these initiatives have a sustained impact on LA regulatory activity over time and improve the consistency of enforcement. The latter was a key theme, particularly for multisite retailers, in the evidence submitted to my original review⁴².
25. I also learnt about HSE’s ‘Find-It’ tool, developed by the Health and Safety Laboratory, which is helping inspectors to target premises in higher risk sectors that are still trading and that have not been recently visited. This ensures that regulation is targeted where it is most needed and that regulatory decisions are based on evidence. Meanwhile HSE is working with a number of other agencies to take forward the prosecutions recommendation through the National Liaison Committee for the Work-related Deaths Protocol. Further details of this work are in the DWP progress report.

⁴⁰ <http://www.hse.gov.uk/consult/condocs/cd247.htm>

⁴¹ <http://www.hse.gov.uk/aboutus/meetings/hseboard/2012/051212/pdec1290.pdf>

⁴² For example, one major supermarket chain said that “Despite general agreement that retail is a low-risk sector and our participation in Primary Authority agreements we still experience inconsistent enforcement at a local level. In particular we do see that local enforcement bodies will push for local solutions despite the fact that we have national strategies and policies. Whilst Primary Authority is starting to help in this regard we do see that there is still significant room for improvement and hope that this review will continue to help this improve further”.

Engaging with the European Union

26. In September I was delighted to speak at the launch of the informal working group on risk-based policy-making in the European Parliament established by Julie Girling, MEP, alongside other experts on risk policy and health and safety regulation. This initiative is gaining momentum with around half a dozen MEPs joining the group in the last couple of months. Three meetings are planned for 2013 which will consider risk versus hazard, substitution, and the precautionary principle. I very much welcome the formation of this group which will discuss how risk can be better incorporated into European policy-making. I would also urge business representatives and employees groups to continue to make the case for evidence-based and risk-based policy making both in the EU and with UK MEPs. This will complement the UK Government's work in Europe particularly in relation to some proposals that are of concern to businesses in this country. The UK Government needs to do more its dealings with European policy makers in promoting risk informed policy making. The UK should not be on the sidelines but actively attempting to set evidence based regulation into the heart of Europe. I hope that the UK will play an active role in the forthcoming European Commission review on health and safety regulation.
27. The summary provides details of the work officials have been taking forward but one aspect I would like to highlight is a new social partner agreement (the European Framework Agreement on the Protection of Occupational Health and Safety in the Hairdressing sector) that was announced in April 2012⁴³. Nine Member States (including the UK) have written to the Commission suggesting that the agreement should be implemented as a non-binding Autonomous Agreement rather than a directive, though employee representatives are concerned about this approach and instead favour a legally binding directive⁴⁴. I am in favour of social dialogue but this is a good example of where preparing an impact assessment would have helped inform the discussions and ensure that an agreement was based on the evidence and an assessment of the risks as well as the costs to business.

⁴³ http://ec.europa.eu/commission_2010-2014/andor/headlines/news/2012/04/20120426_en.htm

⁴⁴ [http://www.uniglobalunion.org/Apps/UNINews.nsf/vwLkpById/DF11C6126BB8A33DC1257AA0005145CC/\\$FILE/2012%2010%2022-L%20Andor-Hairdressers'%20sector-12206.pdf](http://www.uniglobalunion.org/Apps/UNINews.nsf/vwLkpById/DF11C6126BB8A33DC1257AA0005145CC/$FILE/2012%2010%2022-L%20Andor-Hairdressers'%20sector-12206.pdf)

The wider perspective – the role of health and safety law in the civil justice system and improving the understanding of risk

28. Finally I have considered the work underway to deliver the proposals that were aimed at tackling some of the wider issues associated with the regulation and perception of health and safety.
29. In relation to the civil law, I was pleased to learn that the Civil Justice Council is considering my recommendation relating to Pre-Action Protocols and has invited the Civil Procedure Rule Committee to comment on a revised draft Protocol, which does not contain the Standard Disclosure list. A revised Protocol will be presented to the Master of the Rolls for his approval with a view to it coming into force in April 2013. I hope this will curtail the activities of those claim management handlers whom, it was reported to me, were using the Standard Disclosure List inappropriately.
30. An amendment to the Enterprise and Regulatory Reform Bill 2012-13 is being used by the Government to deliver the recommendation on strict liability⁴⁵. The amendment has proved to be highly controversial and has provoked much debate, including amongst the members of my Advisory Panel. I have also been lobbied by many interested stakeholders including personal injury law firms and trades unions. My understanding is that the proposed amendment to the Health and Safety at Work Act reverses the current position on civil liability. This means that, unless exceptions apply, claims for compensation in relation to breaches of health and safety legislation will need to prove that the employer has been negligent. The approach being taken is more far-reaching than I anticipated in my recommendation⁴⁶ and, if this amendment becomes law I hope that the Government will carefully monitor the impact to ensure that there are no unforeseen consequences.
31. I hope these changes will reduce the amount of unnecessary paperwork that businesses feel they need to complete and encourage them instead to proactively manage risks in the workplace.
32. I wholeheartedly welcome the initiative of the Government's Chief Scientific Adviser, Sir John Beddington, to address the challenge of how to engage society in a discussion about risk. Go Science's workshop in November 2012 entitled 'Policy Makers, the Public and Perceptions of Risk' was jointly chaired by Sir John and Michael Gibbons OBE, Chair of the Regulatory Policy Committee and was attended by academics, civil servants and regulators. I am looking forward to seeing the report of the workshop and doing what I can to help the new Government Chief Scientific Advisor Sir Mark Walport and his team take forward the actions.

⁴⁵ http://www.publications.parliament.uk/pa/bills/lbill/2012-2013/0045/lbill_2012-20130045_en_7.htm

⁴⁶ "I recommend that regulatory provisions that impose strict liability should be reviewed by June 2013 and either qualified with 'reasonably practicable' where strict liability is not absolutely necessary or amended to prevent civil liability from attaching to a breach of those provisions".

33. I hope this will complement the work of an ad hoc House of Lords committee that could examine this issue. I understand that a proposal, supported by Lord Lindsay, Lord Curry of Kirkhale and Lord McKenzie of Luton, has been submitted for consideration and look forward to hearing whether the application has been successful.
34. In the meantime, to tackle the misperception of health and safety, in April 2012 HSE launched the Myth Busters Challenge Panel in response to my proposal that “Government looks at introducing a challenge mechanism that allows for cases of incorrect, over-application of health and safety legislation to be addressed”. By Christmas, the Panel had considered 100 cases with summary outcomes published on the HSE website⁴⁷. An update, presented to the HSE Board in October 2012⁴⁸ reported a media evaluation which showed there was a 12.5% fall in the total volume of ‘health and safety gone mad’ stories in the national press between 2010/11 and 2011/12, reflecting a more robust approach to tackling misreporting and the subsequent introduction of the Panel. The paper also said that there had been “a sharp improvement in favourability, with fewer solely negative stories and more coverage that reflected HSE’s position”. I note that the Myth Busters Panel plays a key part in HSE’s more robust approach to tackling misreporting. Furthermore, the Independent Regulatory Challenge Panel⁴⁹, that provides a means for businesses to challenge specific health and safety regulatory advice they believe to be unreasonable or disproportionate, published its first judgement in January 2013⁵⁰.
35. These initiatives, together with the work to deliver my recommendations on the civil justice system, should lead to an improved perception of health and safety by the public and business.

Implementation of Common Sense, Common Safety recommendations

36. I have also considered the report of progress with the implementation of the recommendations contained in Lord Young’s report. I note that 23 of the 35 recommendations have been implemented in full and understand that the majority of the remaining recommendations are moving towards delivery or are awaiting space in the legislative timetable or a suitable legislative vehicle for implementation. Of particular note is the work by the Ministry of Justice to implement the reforms contained in Lord Justice Jackson’s Review of Civil Litigation costs including the reform of ‘no-win, no-fee’ conditional fee arrangements and a ban on the payment and receipt of referral fees in personal injury cases^{51,52}.

⁴⁷ <http://www.hse.gov.uk/myth/myth-busting/index.htm>

⁴⁸ <http://www.hse.gov.uk/aboutus/meetings/hseboard/2012/311012/poctb1284.pdf>

⁴⁹ <http://www.hse.gov.uk/contact/challenge-panel.htm>

⁵⁰ <http://www.hse.gov.uk/contact/challenge-panel-findings.htm>

⁵¹ <http://www.judiciary.gov.uk/publications-and-reports/review-of-civil-litigation-costs/reports/civil-litigation-costs-review-final-report>

⁵² <http://www.judiciary.gov.uk/publications-and-reports/review-of-civil-litigation-costs/reports/wms-civil-litigation-funding-costs>

Conclusion

37. In summary, all the recommendations in my report have either been delivered already or are on track to be completed by the agreed date, although in some cases the Government has gone further than I proposed. In any case, the HSE should be commended for meeting the targets on time, especially at a time of austerity and severe budget cuts. Significant work remains to be done to ensure that the regulations and directives coming out of Europe are both risk and evidence based. In the 100 plus talks that I have given up and down the country on health and safety it is clear that many stakeholders are not aware of the influence of the European Commission and Parliament, as well as other bodies, in setting health and safety regulation in this country. This is an issue that needs to be tackled head on and one where the UK has much to offer. Health and safety stakeholders in this country need to actively engage with their European counterparts. I will spend a considerable part of my sabbatical pushing for this in the corridors of the Commission and Parliament and I hope to see a few of the people I have spoken to or corresponded with joining me.
38. I also welcome HSE's commitment to reduce occupational ill health and hope that the planned stakeholder workshop⁵³ will result in a range of evidence-based, practical interventions that will contribute to a reduction in occupational diseases including occupational cancers.
39. Finally, I would like to thank both Ministers Grayling and Hoban again for giving me the opportunity for doing both my original review and this follow up One Year On Review. It was a joy working with them both and I am glad that they too welcomed the importance of an evidence-based approach.

⁵³ <http://www.hse.gov.uk/aboutus/meetings/hseboard/2012/220812/paugb1264.pdf>