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1 Regulatory approach

Implementing effective strategies for work health and safety (WHS) regulation in a rapidly changing world of work is an ongoing challenge for regulators in Australia and internationally. Ensuring that regulatory practice is evidence-based, and aligned to legislative requirements, is essential to ensure that workers and others have the highest levels of protection for their health and safety.

In the past, focus on managing obvious hazards and risks in relatively simple work environments was successful in achieving substantial reductions in traumatic injuries and fatalities. As work and work environments became more complex this focus has proven to be less effective for managing all of the risks and the types of harm that workers and others are now exposed to.

Changes in legislation have also impacted on the regulatory approach and outcomes required. The Workplace Health and Safety Act 1995, especially with the reverse onus of proof, had more emphasis on enforcement, particularly with the highly specific regulations. In contrast, the Work Health and Safety 2011, reflecting best practice WHS management, places more emphasis on the obligations of business operators and officers of corporations, and, particularly, ensuring participation of workers in decisions regarding WHS. The types of injuries and illnesses occurring, as reflected in workers’ compensation claims, now highlight the need to address significantly more complex mechanisms of harm, such as musculoskeletal disorders and, increasingly, those stemming from psychosocial risks.

In this modern world of work, Workplace Health and Safety Queensland (WHSQ) carries out a broad range of regulatory activities which result in substantial improvements to WHS management in Queensland workplaces and substantially reduce the risk of work-related fatalities, injuries and illnesses occurring.

WHSQ takes a regulatory approach which is designed to ensure two main aims:

- that obvious risks to the health and safety of workers and others are being managed and that any breaches with legislative requirements are quickly addressed; and,
- that the businesses and other organisations are fulfilling their duties to ensure WHS by implementing systematic WHS management.

Generally, the first aim is best achieved by requiring immediate action by the Person Conducting a Business or Undertaking (PCBU), while the inspector or advisor is still on site, or by issuing of notices where immediate compliance cannot be achieved or there is a likelihood the non-compliance will continue or recur. WHSQ has long experience in strong and effective programs to achieve this aim. This is the approach generally taken when WHSQ is responding to complaints or notification of incidents.

Achieving the second aim is more complex, both in terms of assessment and in taking action to ensure and sustain compliance; simply issuing notices is generally not an effective strategy. WHSQ and other WHS regulators are continually evolving and improving the approaches used to achieve this aim. In this respect, in combination with regular inspection and audit programs, WHSQ uses strategies such as: the Injury Protection and Management Program (IPaM); Safety Improvement Plans for Major Hazard Facilities; Participative Ergonomics for Manual Tasks (PErforM); the Medium-Sized Business Initiative; and, Industry specific focus using a combination of strategically placed notices and agreed approaches to rectification (agreed actions). Increasingly, these approaches actively involve workers, either to explain the hazards and risks at the workplace or to independently verify that risk controls are implemented and systematic management is being practiced at the workplace.

WHSQ focuses resources on the businesses and industry sub-sectors which have the highest risk of adverse health and safety consequences for workers and others. Risk is determined by the potential for serious adverse consequences including, multiple-fatality,
fatalities, high percentage permanent impairments and injuries and illnesses which have a high workers’ compensation cost.

The highest risk industries have been determined as: construction, agriculture, transport and manufacturing. The specific improvement strategies adopted by WHSQ for these industries are outlined in sections below.

As well as targeting high risk industries and industry sub-sectors (see below), specific hazards which constitute particularly high risk are also focused on. For example: WHSQ is currently planning a campaign that will focus on improving compliance by businesses in the construction and manufacturing industries where workers are at risk of exposure to respirable crystalline silica, and therefore the potential to develop silicosis. This project is likely to commence in the second half of 2017 and will include workplace visits by WHSQ inspectors targeting dust control. Particular activities where there is a heightened risk include the use of dry diamond saw blades in construction and the manufacture of stone benchtops.

WHSQ also takes a risk-based approach in determining the regulatory tools used in achieving compliance. WHSQ identifies that there are two main aspects of non-compliance with the requirements of the Work Health and Safety Act 2011:

1. Breaches which mean that there is a direct risk to the health and safety of workers and others. For example, failure to ensure:
   - provision and maintenance of a work environment without risks to health and safety
   - provision and maintenance of safe plant and structures
   - the safe use, handling and storage of plant, structures

2. Breaches which mean that WHS is not effectively managed, which means that the overall risk to the health and safety of workers and others may be elevated. For example:
   - failure of an officer of a PCBU to acquire and keep up-to-date knowledge of work health and safety matters
   - failure to consult with other duty holders
   - failure to consult with workers

Regulatory tools which provide immediate protection to workers or others (e.g. prohibition notices), are used where a serious imminent risk exists. Where there is evidence of a breach, but there is less risk, and that risk has some level of management, improvement notices are warranted. For issues which may become a risk to workers or others, or where comprehensive WHS management improvements need to be made, but clear evidence of a breach is not apparent, a documented agreed actions approach is warranted. In many cases, a PCBU will immediately address an issue identified by an inspector, compliance is then achieved without a formal notice being required.

For all programs to be effective, both notice and non-notice approaches are needed to secure compliance. It is not a matter of one or the other being used exclusively or in isolation. When used together, in a congruous and complementary manner, compliance and improved WHS management are achieved in the most effective and efficient way. WHSQ uses three regulatory approaches, in combination, to ensure compliance:

- focused attention on the most significant risks, ensuring that unmanaged risks are quickly addressed, either immediately by the PCBU or under direction of a notice.
- using agreed actions to identify and document all unmanaged hazards and risks, and ensuring that the PCBU either addresses them immediately or in a set timeframe, which is discussed and followed-up by the inspector until all are addressed.
- intensive work with selected employers with poor workers’ compensation claims experience, under the Injury Prevention and Management (IPaM) program, to ensure that they are addressing all hazards and risks and improving their overall management of WHS.
This paper will provide information demonstrating how WHSQ inspectors and advisors utilize, and rely on, a broad range regulatory strategies to ensure that businesses address non-compliances, maintain compliance, and implement effective improvements to WHS practices.

1.1 Relationship to legislative and policy requirements

To achieve sustained improvement, modern WHS management practice shifts the focus from simple hazard identification and risk management to a systematic approach. This includes addressing: senior management commitment and leadership; consultation and participation by workers; proactive management of risks; building of WHS knowledge and skills; planning and resourcing of WHS management; and, maintaining and communicating documentation. The *Work Health and Safety Act 2011* is based on this systematic management approach, with specific obligations (duties) placed on business operators (PCBUs). Individual hazards and risks remain a key focus as part of a systematic approach to WHS management, however, it is recognised that their management involves all of the other aspects, particularly commitment and leadership by business owners and managers, and meaningful participation by workers in the system used for WHS management.

The Australian Work Health and Safety Strategy 2012-2022 (Australian Strategy) provides the national framework for the broad range of activities which are needed to improve the health and safety of workers in Australia. The Australian Strategy emphasises the importance of taking a systematic approach and the role that the legislative duties play in providing workers with the highest practical level of protection against harm to their health and safety from hazards and risks arising from work.

WHSQ’s regulatory strategy aims to support the principles of the Australian Strategy by focussing on the Strategy action areas in order to achieve the strategic outcome targets by 2022. To achieve this, WHSQ uses a broad range of strategies to change behaviour and achieve compliance.

1.2 Reporting of regulatory activities: CPM report

Regulatory activity is currently recorded against long standing agreed criteria which are reported to Safe Work Australia and published as the Comparative Performance Monitoring (CPM) annual report. Generally, “what gets measured gets done” or, at least, it receives more focus. To effectively regulate WHS, it is crucial that the measurements reflect the activities which achieve outcomes for the protection of the health and safety of workers and others. That is, those activities aimed at achieving the two aims outlined above. Currently this is not occurring.

The current Comparative Performance Monitoring (CPM) report uses metrics which are most effective at explaining activity which is focused on achieving the point-in-time compliance of the first aim outlined above. Although, even with this, much activity which achieves this aim is not obvious from the CPM metrics. For the second aim, although the CPM does report “proactive” activities, the level of detail is not sufficient to explain the effectiveness of these activities or provide an indication of the compliance levels with the Act obligations (duties).

The number of workplace visits and number of notices issued are key performance measures. However, these are somewhat limited since these metrics do not capture the level of risk managed or the degree to which workers’ health and safety were safeguarded. Whilst a notice generally only addresses one unmanaged hazard or risk, the workplace visit may have addressed a multitude of issues which, individually and collectively, may have posed significant risk. Broad proactive activities effectively address multiple hazards and achieve a sustained and long-term improvement in the protection of workers and others
health and safety, but again, the extent to which they do this is not reflected in the “proactive” metric reported.

As a result of these limitations, the CPM performance measures do not reflect the full range of regulatory activity undertaken to achieve legislative objectives and the outcomes sought under the Australian Strategy. In particular, the CPM measures are not well suited to recording of inspector or advisor activity which result in correction of non-compliances without the need for notices (e.g. where corrective action is performed while the inspector/advisor is still onsite; or actions which the PCBUs agree to carry-out in an agreed timeframe following an inspectors or advisors visit) or activities which result in an improved systematic approach by the PCBU (e.g. as a result of discussion and information provided by the inspector/advisor, the PCBU implements increased consultation with workers or implementation of an improved hazard identification and risk management process).

Although good data is not available to demonstrate the extent of use of non-notice regulatory actions, it is estimated that that each visit by an inspector or advisor to a workplace will result in better management of more than 10 individual hazards or risks.

Examples of regulatory compliance activity which are not adequately reflected in reporting, include:

- Hazards and risks are identified by an inspector/advisor and are immediately addressed by the PCBU whilst the inspector is still on site. For example, a missing machine guard is replaced; faulty electrical equipment is rendered inoperable by severing the power cord; poorly coupled scaffolding components are corrected; incompatible chemicals are separated and stored correctly.
- An inspector/advisor provides information, guidance and tools to the PCBU which result in the PCBU substantially improving their systematic management of WHS and effectively managing a multitude of poorly managed hazards and risks, and workers being more aware of, and involved in, management of these risks.
- An inspector/advisor identifies multiple hazards at the workplace, which are currently not presenting a risk to workers or the risk is low, but where the risk may increase in the future or under certain conditions, and the PCBU agrees to systematically address all of these risks within a reasonable time period. In these cases, the inspector/advisor notes the issues in their notebook and the PCBU also independently takes note of them. The inspector/advisor then follows up to ensure that the issues have been addressed.
- An inspector/advisor identifies a serious issue at one business or workplace (and it is addressed with or without the issuing of a notice) and WHSQ works with the industry to ensure that the issue is also addressed at all other workplaces through safety alerts and follow-up campaigns. For example, ladder platform brackets; vehicle stabilisers and outriggers; unsafe electrical equipment; unsecured stabilisers on trucks; multi-cutters on power tools; and, securing of concrete wall panels.

Since adoption of the harmonised legislation, Queensland has been seeking review and updating of the CPM measures so they reflect regulatory activity to achieve legislative and Australian Strategy aims. Although some changes were implemented for the most recent CPM, these changes fall well short of the changes needed. Queensland has been liaising with other jurisdictions, notably Worksafe Victoria, to identify a better set of metrics and how they could be implemented.

Achieving national agreement on a fully modernised set of measures is made more difficult by the individual and somewhat disparate IT systems and databases used by each jurisdiction to collect and collate this information. In Queensland, the development of work programs to address the growing complexity of regulating WHS has also resulted in the development of individual IT support tools and databases. For example, the IPaM program requires a management database which is significantly different to the database used for compliance and investigation activities. Existing systems, using older platforms, do not
provide the functionality or flexibility to be adapted easily to new business or reporting
needs, or to be easily consolidated into a single modern regulatory database or support
system. Updating these systems and databases, or creating new ones, is a complex and
potentially expensive endeavour, however, updating is needed to support effective
regulatory practice and reporting. Queensland is looking to move to a new ICT platform in
the near future and it is hoped that the compliance activity will be transitioned to the new
platform in 2018. If that is the case some of the local ICT issues around this reporting may
be addressed.

1.3 Strategies to secure compliance

WHSQ has had a long history of ensuring that obvious risks to the health and safety of
workers and others are being managed and that any breaches with legislative requirements
are quickly addressed. In the early to mid-2000’s there was strong focus on this approach
and it was demonstrated to be effective in addressing common causes of work injury. In the
late 2000s, it was recognised that this approach was only partially effective, and was not
leading to businesses developing their own sustained management of WHS. Although
systematic WHS principles had been a part of the Queensland legislation since 1989, it was
only in the 2000s that there was consolidation of thinking around these approaches, and
guidance for practical implementation became readily available. In the late 2000s with the
drafting of harmonised laws which would become the Work Health and Safety Act 2011,
WHSQ began to diversify the regulatory approach and introducing programs which were
aimed at increasing focus on the obligations of business owners and officers of corporations,
and facilitating participation of workers in decisions affecting their health and safety. The
sections below outline some of the approaches used which aim to ensure: that obvious risks
to the health and safety of workers and others are being managed and that any breaches
with legislative requirements are quickly addressed; and, that the businesses and other
organisations are fulfilling their duties to ensure WHS by implementing systematic WHS
management.

1.3.1 Use of notices

It is OIR policy that inspectors will issue an improvement notice in all cases where they
reasonably believe there is a breach or likely breach unless:

- a prohibition notice or electrical safety protection notice is appropriate in the
circumstances;
- the situation is remedied when they are present at the workplace.

Improvement notices are used to remedy contraventions of the WHS Act which do not or will
not involve a serious risk to the health and safety of a person emanating from an immediate
or imminent exposure to a hazard. Conversely, a prohibition notice is the most appropriate
notice to issue when contraventions of the WHS Act do or will involve a serious risk to the
health and safety of a person emanating from an immediate or imminent exposure to a
hazard.

In order to issue a notice, an inspector must have sufficient evidence to support their
reasonable belief. Generally, information from one source should be validated from another
source to confirm the reasonable belief. This should be drawn from consideration of the
following:

- the inspector’s observations;
- information obtained from speaking with persons who work at the workplace
  (including HSRs) or are associated with the workplace;
- information obtained from reviewing relevant documents;
- information from relevant codes of practice, Australian Standards and other published
  guidance material;
- advice provided by suitable technical specialists (if relevant); and
• known prior history of the person.

Each contravention must be the subject of a separate improvement notice; there are limited exceptions to this. One notice with a common compliance date may only be issued in circumstances where multiple instances of the same contravention are observed.

• for example, five identical machines require the same risk control measure. In these circumstances the inspector should consider the implication of issuing one notice for the five machines with a common compliance date because it means that all of the five machines detailed in the notice must be complied with by the stated date;

• a number of fire extinguishers are located at different locations in the workplace and there is no evidence that any of them have been tested regularly; or

• in strategically-identified circumstances where the inspector observes identical risk factors for the same type of work at multiple workplaces of the one PCBU, for example, installing a patient lifting device at 3 different aged care facilities managed by the same PCBU.

The power to issue a prohibition notice is predicated on the presence of a “serious risk” at a workplace. This “serious risk” must also emanate from an immediate or imminent exposure to a hazard. This establishes a two-step test. It is not enough for a serious risk to be simply present for a prohibition notice to be issued. If at a particular workplace or site there are a number of activities taking place, each of which the inspector reasonably believes constitutes an immediate imminent exposure to a serious risk to a person’s health and safety, separate prohibition notices are required to be issued in order to prohibit each activity.

Establishment of sufficient evidentiary support for a notice is relatively quick and easy for simple and obvious unmanaged risks (e.g. unguarded machinery; no edge protection; poorly stored hazardous substances). Often, multiple instances of non-compliance are identified by an inspector. An extreme example of this is what occurred at timber mill in the Brisbane North region. Following a worksite assessment, a workplace health and safety inspector issued 172 notices to the workplace, predominately for a range of plant related issues. While the duty holder at the workplace was initially displeased with the number of notices received, they came to view the inspector as a valuable source of assistance and knowledge and were reassured by WHSQ’s stated commitment to work with them to improve health and safety at the workplace. The plant at the workplace was progressively guarded and all notices complied with. It is noted that taking such an approach, especially when ensuring that evidentiary requirements are met for each notice, is extremely resource intensive and will mean that the inspector is not available to address risks at other workplaces which may also have a similar level of risk.

More complex risks (e.g. psychosocial and musculoskeletal) or poor overall management of WHS (e.g. non-compliance with duties to consult with workers or provision and maintenance of safe work environment) will require more comprehensive evidence to be collected, with significant implications for the inspectors’ time. Overly focussing on notices as the preferred compliance strategy may unintentionally lead to inspectors focussing on simple risks rather than more complex risks.

Many of the injuries and illnesses which are now resulting in the majority of workers’ compensation claims (e.g. musculoskeletal disorders) have complex aetiology, this is they stem from a complex set of causes and a combination of risks created by the work environment, work processes and situational issues. Focus on individual obvious hazards will generally not address these risks and may divert business resources away from proven effective strategies to achieve sustained WHS improvements. Inspectors and advisors frequently encounter situations where it is not practical to identify these complex causal factors and thereby establish the evidentiary requirements to support the issuing of a notice. In these situations, inspectors and advisors utilize a range of other strategies to obtain compliance and ensure protection for the health and safety of workers and others.
Notices can be issued for section 19 and 27, for failing to comply with obligations under the Act to take a systematic approach to OHSM and due diligence, respectively. Notices issued under these sections could be a powerful way to secure higher level compliance with obligations and resultant sustained improvement to WHS practices. However, a perception exists that there are legislative difficulties in ensuring that the evidentiary requirements are met. Further consideration of this is occurring with WHSQ, however, national consideration and possibly legislative change may be required.

1.3.2 Injury Prevention and Management (IPaM) program

In 2010, the Work Health and Safety Board (WHS Board) recognised that employers with comparatively poorer WHS performance and claims experience would benefit from a sustained improvement approach. It was evident that point in time correction of unmanaged risks by issuing hazard focussed improvement notices was not going to address the entrenched failures to systematically address WHS management. The WHS Board recommended to the government that it establish the Injury Prevention and Management (IPaM) program, which was then established in 2011.

Previously, in 2009, a major initiative involving medium sized business had been planned and this was conducted in 2010-11. The Medium Sized Business Initiative (MSBI) targeted businesses in Queensland with declared wages between $1 million and $10 million. This roughly equates to businesses which have between 17 and 200 employees. Approximately 6700 medium sized businesses were included in the initiative.

The MSBI combined an educative approach, utilising information sessions and one-on-one consultations, with inspections where the inspector examined the WHS systems implemented by the business and conducted a walk through inspection, identifying hazards and unmanaged risks, which were linked back to failures in the systematic approach to managing WHS at that business (recorded against: management commitment; consultation; safe work procedures; training and supervision; and, reporting safety). 2881 businesses participated in either a one-on-one consultations or an information session, and 5869 businesses were inspected. The inspections took between one and six hours to complete. Time taken varied depending on the size and complexity of the business, the level of WHS knowledge/awareness in the business and the number of inspectors conducting the inspection.

Evaluation of the MSBI revealed that although this comprehensive approach was worthwhile, the inspector resources required to follow-up, and check progress made against the systematic WHS management elements, was prohibitive. Another limitation was the point-in-time nature of the systems assessment and the difficulties this presented for the inspector making an assessment of system adequacy and performance, and for the business to fully understand what the expectation entailed and how to achieve it.

This led to a refocussing of both the systematic approach and longer-term interaction between WHSQ and certain regulated businesses. This resource intensive activity was now focussed on those businesses who, by their workers’ compensation history, were shown to be most in need of this level of intervention. The tools to assess and provide feedback on the business’ systematic WHS management evolved, using best practice approaches from WHS research and other WHS regulatory agencies. It was recognised that this approach could be effectively applied to businesses with comparatively poorer WHS performance and claims experience and would meet the need identified by the WHS Board and WHSQ. This became the Injury Prevention and Management (IPaM) program.

The primary purpose and goal of the IPaM program is to engage with and assist participating businesses to have a sustainable impact on improving their WHS and injury management systems with the objective of building capacity and facilitate change in businesses, empowering them with the skills to develop and sustainably implement their safety
management systems, which in turn helps their productivity and growth. The IPaM program has worked with 902 businesses since its inception in 2011.

When working with employers the IPaM Senior Advisors work intensively with each employer for an initial period of 12 months. In this initial part of the program the Advisor works closely with the employer through multiple visits firstly to promote the program to all employees and then commence the review of current safety management systems, verify workplace hazards, review existing injury management arrangements. Through this comprehensive assessment and engagement process employee participation is improved, as is the employer’s capability to comply with legal obligations. Legislative requirements and codes of practice are considered and outlined to the employer as part of the process. Worker involvement in this process and feedback through participation in the safety climate assessments ensures that real improvements are made and are delivered on the ground as safer working conditions and processes.

Following completion of the assessments, a tailored business improvement plan (BIP) is developed outlining the key opportunities for improvement (OFI) and sets out activities and milestones for improving the employer’s management of work safety, health and injury management. After the initial active phase (12-month intensive engagement), the employer then commences supported self-management phase where the IPaM advisor continues with regular on-site reviews to coach the employer in implementing the plan and monitoring progress. Once the employer has completed the 24-month program a review is undertaken to identify areas that need ongoing attention to ensure ongoing sustainability and lessons learned through the process. Some key improvement actions undertaken by employers as a result of the recommendations in the Business Improvement Plan include:

- improving worker consultation in development and review of Job Safety Analysis
- review contractor induction
- introduction of Health and Safety Representatives (HSR)
- improve senior management reporting measures
- update position descriptions to reflect job requirements
- update WHS policies and procedures and establish regular communication to staff through team talks and monthly WHS consultation
- improve reporting measures to include near misses and undertake regular analysis to identify emerging patterns
- undertake risk assessments and increase awareness of priority hazards including, hazardous manual tasks, mobile plant, falls from height, and remote and isolated works
- implement a range of health and wellbeing initiatives including stop smoking campaign, flu vaccinations, superannuation presentations and healthy food options introduced to vending machines.

Inspectors responding to incidents or complaints, or at the request of the IPaM advisor, may attend an IPaM employer workplace and, if the situation requires it, may issue a notice to ensure compliance. Generally, it is expected that businesses in IPaM will be actively addressing hazards and risks and therefore the likelihood of a non-compliance requiring a notice will be reduced.

Since commencement, IPaM has resulted in $26 million reduction in workers’ compensation premiums, 7 per cent reduction in statutory costs, 8 per cent reduction in claims and $8 million in business savings. Particular outcomes for employers who have successfully completed the program include improvements in:

- injury prevention processes
- safety management systems
- rehabilitation and return to work systems
- injury management outcomes
- worker participation and involvement
- accountability for WHS
• insurance premium rates
• workplace injuries rates.

Two examples of the improvement that can occur through the IPaM program are:

• Company A, a leading food and support services company, utilised the outcomes from the safety climate survey to prioritise leadership and further investment in resources and people leading to a significant reduction in new workers’ compensation claims and an estimated saving in saving in workers’ compensation costs approaching $1 million per annum.
• Company B is a labour hire organisation. They were able to critically examine their WHS management systems, culture and performance and implement plans to drive improvement. This included launching CEO endorsed safety goals and targets, implementing better consultation mechanisms with key clients to achieve a more coordinated approach to injury management and making safety reporting more transparent.

Currently the IPAM program relies on workers’ compensation data to identify employers for participation in the program. Over the next three years, IPaM is aiming to broaden the scope of employers considered for inclusion in including:

• introduction of IPAM Evolve program that facilitates systems improvement with small to medium size business. This program offers a 3 to 6 month intervention for businesses at varying stages of maturity, not currently suited to the 2 year IPAM intervention.
• development of eligibility criteria to prioritise engagement with employers who choose to self-refer into the program.
• collaboration with OIR Industry Strategy, Technical and Operational Units to identify alternate mechanisms for identification with particular focus on safety performance i.e inspector referrals, enforceable undertakings, targeted campaigns.
• engage with Tier 1 employers to identify strategies to better engage with contactors across the supply chain.
• partner with industry associations and other government departments to provide assistance using IPAM interventions and projects that deliver simplified tools and resources for small business.

1.3.3 Agreed actions

Agreed actions (sometimes referred to as agreed outcomes) is a term loosely used to describe the giving of advice and seeking voluntary compliance. It is a flexible and discretionary way in which inspectors can achieve compliance. Actions range from an inspector identifying a hazard at a workplace and it being rectified immediately, to a long term strategy of continuous improvement that is recorded in an action plan and closely monitored. If the duty holder fails to achieve the identified outcomes within the prescribed timeframes the inspector can quickly move to using directive measures, such as notices, to achieve compliance. The decision to utilize an agreed outcome approach rather than write a notice is based on the evidentiary requirements for the notice and a risk management approach. That is, agreed actions are only appropriate for lower level risks, e.g. unregistered pressure vessel, no chemical register, an unguarded piece of plant which has limited access/hard to reach and can be rectified in a day or two, no asbestos register, test and tag out of date on power tools. Higher-level risk justifies an improvement or prohibition notice and the time and resources required to satisfy the evidentiary requirements.

Agreed actions are a useful persuasion tool for inspectors, particularly when duty holders are willing to make substantial improvements beyond compliance. They are an effective way to ensure that the PCBU addresses multiple unmanaged risks in a large or complex workplace. They can also be used in conjunction with strategically placed prohibition and improvement notices. For example, a high risk, such as an unguarded auger, will warrant a prohibition
notice by an inspector; through and agreed actions approach, the PCBU is prompted to address all machinery guarding issues. This can also be communicated to workplaces in that industry which have not yet been visited, prompting the PCBUs to fix the issue before being directed to by an inspector. Another example is falls from height risks, which may require significant changes to workplace design, and the PCBU may be reluctant to commit funds to make the changes. Issuing an improvement notice for a specific activity or structure at the workplace will demonstrate that the regulator is taking the issue seriously; then, through an agreed actions approach, the PCBU will be prompted to address all the other falls from height issues at the workplace. Again, by communicating this to other PCBUs likely to have the same risk, action is prompted without the need for notices being issued to all PCBUs.

Agreed actions are widely used across all high priority industries. Agreed actions have achieved good results, especially when working with businesses such as transport, agriculture and manufacturing, a sustained investment into a fixed workplace can occur. Agreed actions provide an effective method for recording issues, dedicating agreed timeframes for rectification and monitoring the ongoing safety improvements at a workplace. They achieve the objective to improve management of risks, ensure non-compliances are corrected, build relationships with the business and often achieve greatly improved attitudes towards WHS compliance. Experience of using agreed actions in the meat processing industry has shown that effective results are obtained because:

- PCBUs feel that they have a higher level of control which allows them to schedule corrective action and set priorities which are aligned with their business processes. The action plan and time frames are agreed through a process of discussion and negotiation, which gives the PCBU ownership of the issues rather than begrudging acceptance that occurs when a notice is imposed.
- The progressive checking of progress towards compliance, rather than the point-in-time requirement for compliance with an improvement notice, appear to be more effective in securing improved safety outcomes. The success of the changed approach and the difference in the issuing of notices are demonstrated in the following sections.

The shared ownership of the issues and the ability for progressive checking of progress towards compliance, rather than the point-in-time requirement for compliance with an improvement notice, appear to gain a higher rate of compliance. The agreed outcome sets up the expectation with the PCBU that checks will be made and lack of progress will result in tougher measure being taken. This generally occurred by requiring the PCBU to provide regular reports on actions completed, due and outstanding, with the inspector prompting for more information or undertaking further follow-up as required.

The basic approach is a comprehensive walk through inspection of the workplace/worksite, documentation of identified unmanaged risks (by both inspector and PCBU representative) and discussion about corrective actions which can be applied immediately and those which need time to address. If the inspector is satisfied that the duty holder is willing to take the corrective action, and immediate actions are taken to minimise risk to workers and others in the short-term, the agreed actions are discussed with the duty holder, who is encouraged to make independent notes of what is required, and a record made by the inspector in their official notebook. In some cases an email confirming the discussion and the actions required is sent by the inspector to the duty holder. Attachment 1 contains examples of emails used as part of agreed actions processes.

As the current IT system is unable to effectively record agreed actions, robust data on the extent of use and outcomes achieved is not readily available. However, interviews conducted with inspectors and advisors in 2016, which took place as part of a regulatory research study being conducted as a collaboration between WHSQ and Queensland University of Technology, revealed that inspectors find that agreed actions are an effective way of getting results and that they are used extensively.
Formalisation of the agreed actions process has not occurred because of difficulties encountered in modifying the IT system to allow inspectors to easily record the information, and allow the recorded information to be easily extracted, analysed and reported on. Moving to a new ICT platform may allow the development of a suitable system and supporting database to address these issues. Mobile technology could then be used to effectively support the regulatory work of inspectors and allow them to quickly and efficiently document the WHS issues addressed and outcomes achieved. This would then provide better data on the use and effectiveness of the agreed actions approach.

1.3.4 Examples

1.3.4.1 Musculoskeletal disorders

Musculoskeletal disorders (MSDs) account for 50-60 per cent of all workers’ compensation claims. MSDs are often seen by industry as a complex issue which is difficult to address. However, MSDs are caused by a variety of mechanisms of injury including, slips, trips and falls, hazardous manual tasks and hitting or being hit by objects.

Poor work design, while often only associated with increased risk of MSDs, is a direct cause of fatigue and distraction which are often a major contributing factor in other kinds of traumatic injuries and fatalities. There are numerous examples of high risk work activities, for example, work at heights, scaffolding, traffic management on roads, swing stages, work around mobile plant, where workers have high physical and or psychological work demands. These are often compounded by modifiable chronic disease risks for the worker such as obesity, smoking and poor mental health. Focus on the direct causes of injuries, particularly in the construction industry, is often given priority over effectively managing high risk manual tasks and the prevention of MSDs, which may be very significant underlying causes and, if addressed, may have meant that the incident causing injury did not occur.

The causes of work related MSDs are multifactorial and include physical, psychosocial and modifiable chronic disease risk factors. These risk factors are very much a part of high risk and hazardous work. These hazards may be independent, but they are often overlapping. These risks need to be managed together with other workplace hazards. If these MSD risk factors are not identified and controlled there will be significant negative impacts on the overall safety of the activity, that is, there is a greater risk of fatality or serious injury.

Section 19 of the Work Health and Safety Act 2011 (general duties), and sections 40 (general workplace facilities) and section 60 (hazardous manual tasks) of the Work Health and Safety Regulation 2011, have particular relevance for the management of risks associated with MSDs. Failure to comply (breaching) these requirements mean that a notice is warranted.

In addressing MSDs, the normal approach is for the inspector to undertake a walk-through assessment of the workplace and identify the tasks and activities which are being undertaken and the interactions that workers have with the workplace plant, equipment and general infrastructure (e.g. steps, platforms). Inspectors identify activities or tasks for which there is a clear breach of requirements and issue notices for these. They explain to the PCBU why a notice has been issued (prohibition notice: imminent serious risk; improvement notice: breach with likelihood of causing harm) and also identify other tasks or activities at the workplace where improvements could be made. Whilst the risk associated with an activity may be clear to an inspector, often the time required to collect evidence of the risk, to the standard required to support issuing a notice, is prohibitive. Therefore, a strategic approach is to focus on the few most important risks and ensure that they are dealt with by notices. These strategic notices are issued because a significant risk to workers or others exist but also as a demonstration to the PCBU that action needs to be taken. It is noted that receiving a notice and working through the process of complying with the notice can be a
positive experience for the PCBU and one which gives confidence in their ability to effectively manage a WHS issue.

Other issues identified are worked through taking an agreed actions approach. An agreed actions approach allows fuller explanation of more complex issues and stepwise ways to address them. It is noted that making improvements to meet WHS legislative requirements can involve not only significant capital expenditure, but also significant periods of time in planning, ordering, taking delivery and commissioning new structures and equipment. Generally, compliance with a notice leads to minimalistic compliance using low level controls which do not provide the best protection to the health and safety of workers and others. Use of agreed actions provides the instruction, guidance and feedback to ensure that better controls are put into place. The case study below provides an example of how an improvement notice was combined with an agreed actions approach in a metals manufacturing workplace to address a high risk manual task.

1.3.4.1.1 Manual tasks case study – manufacturing workplace

The workplace is an engineering company. It was established in 1965 and has 120 workers over two sites located in a regional city. The company services the mining, infrastructure, energy, civil, construction, government and rural industries in the design, manufacture, supply and installation of:

- light vehicle and medium truck bodies, towing equipment and trailers, buses and vans
- equipment (including ROPS), accessories and associated services
- sheet metal fabrication (steel, alloy, stainless)
- steel fabrication including light structural and miscellaneous metalwork
- innovative engineering services (e.g. equipment repair, rebuild, time critical onsite services)
- vehicle modification and compliancing

Hazardous task identified: Pipe bending

The task was identified during walk around. A manual task had not been selected for analysis prior to the walk through. Inspector and safety officer watched the task being performed.

Pipe is bent with an existing machine, however this machine frequently bends the pipe beyond the true 90 degrees that it needs to be, requiring someone to bend it (or pull it) back so that it is at true 90 degrees. Workers were observed to be manually pulling hollow steel pipe into a true 90 degree reverse bend (see at “before” photo in Figure 1 below). There was no standard operating procedure or risk assessment completed for this task. Risk factors observed by inspector:

- forceful exertions – worker was observed to “put a lot of effort into” straightening, as well as using ‘jerky movements’ (a ‘yanking ’ type of pull)
- awkward postures – worker observed to be “reaching above shoulder height

Evidence gathered by inspector

- Photographs taken and provided to inspector at time of visit and sketches drawn
- Details regarding observations made by inspector were entered into his inspector notebook

Action taken

- Discussed task and issue with workplace
- Discussed possible controls
- Improvement notice was issued, with workplace given approximately 1 month to comply.

Workplace action/Solution

An in–house designed foot-controlled hydraulic ram was made to perform this bending task (see “after” photos). To stabilise the ram during operation, the ram was bolted to the floor
Workers are not required to use forceful exertions, work above shoulder height, or use jerky movements to perform the task. This solution was installed in the workplace within the agreed timeframe (for compliance with Improvement Notice).

![Before and after photos of pipe-bending activity](image)

**Figure 1.** Before and after photos of pipe-bending activity

### 1.3.4.2 Safety Improvement Plans for Major Hazard Facilities

Six of the 36 major hazard facility (MHF) licences have an improvement plan as a condition on the licence. The safety assessment conducted to support the safety case usually generates or informs a safety improvement plan for the business. If a MHF fails to nominate safety improvement plan, this prompts questions as to adequacy of the safety assessment and further scrutiny by WHSQ’s Hazardous Industries and Chemicals Branch (HICB). HICB expects that all safety improvement plans to have actions and dates assigned and be supported by a tracking system. It is also an expectation that recommendations from HICB audits are considered and appropriate actions are recorded by the MHFs tracking system.

A condition will be attached to an MHF licence if the licence audit reveals significant deficiencies in the safety management system and/or specific risk controls. In such cases, the improvement plan will be generated by the operator and agreed to by the regulator. This can take several iterations and workshops with inspectors to ensure that the improvement plan addresses the identified issue. MHF safety advisors will also monitor the implementation of the improvement plan. Failure to comply with the improvement plan can be a trigger to suspend or cancel the licence, and review the suitability of the operator and/or officers of the operator. Our process is to give a warning on slippage, then a reminder to the operator and associated directors, and then initiate the show-cause process. To date the notice to the directors has been very effective in getting appropriate resources and governance. The improvement plan, whether or not used as a condition, is often a relevant matter in determining the licence duration.

HICB have some examples where the improvement plan condition has been successful and subsequently removed. In one case, after 10 years of ineffective directives, HICB assigned a MHF safety advisor in a consultative role to work intensively with the manufacturer. The effort coincided with expansion plans (another MHF in Victoria) and employment of an informed senior officer – which resulted in a step change in system maturity. In another case the improvement plan condition was used to support stability of purpose during commissioning, and subsequently removed.

There have been occasions where a condition on the improvement plan was proposed, and the operator convinced the regulator that voluntary compliance would be sufficient. This also was successful, in that compliance was achieved with minimal expenditure of government resources, and the operator was able to protect what it saw as its interest.

Changes resulting from implementation of a corporate safety improvement plan potentially has significant industry penetration, for example, in the Liquefied Petroleum Gas sector.
where there is a concentration of major players. Such improvements can originate in the MHFs and then be adopted more broadly.

Figure 2 is an extract of the tracking system of a MHF which has implemented a safety improvement plan.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>HICB Recommendation</th>
<th>&quot;company&quot; Response</th>
<th>Agreed Action</th>
<th>Due Date</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>&quot;company&quot; should perform further analysis to determine if the response procedures adequately cover the unique features of the MIs identified in the SC and modify procedures accordingly.</td>
<td>&quot;company&quot; is reviewing the ERP template against WHS regulations, regulator feedback and emergency services feedback. The adequacy of the response procedures for the MIs will be included in this review.</td>
<td>&quot;company&quot; is reviewing the ERP template against WHS regulations, regulator feedback and emergency services feedback. The adequacy of the response procedures for the MIs will be included in this review.</td>
<td>Jul-17</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The EP should include representative contours for flash and jet fires. UPDATE Jan 2016: The resolution of the consequence contours should be improved and they should be annotated to show the meaning of the various contours.</td>
<td>This has been addressed in the recently submitted safety cases for Townsville and Cairns. It will be incorporated into the next ERP update.</td>
<td>The ERP will be updated to include representative contours for flash fires and jet fires. The contours will include a legend. (This has been done for Gladstone, Townsville and Cairns.)</td>
<td>Jul-17</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
| The EP should include arrangements for assisting emergency services and nearby facilities – these would typically be determined by consultation. | "company" will review the recommendations and update the ERP accordingly. To be included in action item #32

This will require consultation with QFES and GMAG | ERP to be reviewed and updated to ensure arrangements for assisting emergency services and nearby facilities are included. This should be done in consultation with stakeholders. | Jul-17 |
| The EP should include any relevant details of the role of GMAG in the EP, particularly the provision of external resources or assistance. | "company" will review the recommendations and update the ERP accordingly. To be included in action item #32 | Review HICB audit recommendation below and update ERP accordingly: The EP should include any relevant details of the role of GMAG in the EP, particularly the provision of external resources or assistance. | Jul-17 |
| "company" should address the issues regarding evacuation and accounting procedures identified above. | "company" will review the recommendations and update the ERP accordingly. To be included in action item #32 | Review HICB audit recommendation below and update ERP accordingly: "company" should address the issues regarding evacuation and accounting procedures identified above. | Jul-17 |
| The EP should include instructions for the isolation of the electrical supply and any other utilities that may need to be isolated in the event of an emergency. | "company" will review the recommendations and update the ERP accordingly. To be included in action item #32 | Review HICB audit recommendation below and update ERP accordingly: The EP should include instructions for the isolation of the electrical supply and any other utilities that may need to be isolated in the event of an emergency. | Jul-17 |

Figure 2. MHF safety improvement plan tracking system
1.4 Summary

The broad range of regulatory activities undertaken by Workplace Health and Safety Queensland (WHSQ) result in substantial improvements to WHS management in Queensland workplaces and substantially reduce the risk of work-related fatalities, injuries and illnesses occurring.

Notices, which obtain proven, and easily trackable, evidence of regulatory effectiveness, are not able to be used in every situation nor are they suitable to ensure sustained compliance by PCBUs to systematically and effectively manage WHS.

While notices are an effective way of ensuring that PCBUs address obvious unmanaged risks to the health and safety of workers and others, and that any breaches with legislative requirements are quickly addressed, they become less useful when complex WHS issues are identified and there is significant complexity in providing the evidentiary requirements to demonstrate non-compliance.

For effective regulation, notices and non-notice regulatory approaches have to be used in a complementary and congruous manner. Both approaches are means to an end rather than an end in themselves. The actual end point is ensuring that hazards and risks are effective managed and the health and safety of workers and others is safeguarded.

Effective tracking of regulatory performance and outcomes achieved requires the development and use of more meaningful metrics for the national CPM report and an associated investment to modernise IT systems and databases.
2 Priority industries

2.1 Meat processing industry

The meat and meat processing industry is a high priority for WHSQ as it encompasses national priority areas of livestock, transport and manufacturing industries. In an environment with largely ageing infrastructure, the workforce demographic is diverse, ranging from low skill-set to highly technical professionals in relatively small groups who work under strict production timeframes. As with many other manufacturing industries, to remain competitive, the industry needs to embrace innovation to increase productivity. An example of this is the increased use of robotics and the introduction of high-tech safety devices to replace inadequate machinery guarding.

WHSQ recognises that a broad range of strategies are required to ensure that long-term and sustained improvements are made, as well as ensuring that immediate obvious risks are addressed. The meat industry experience has shown that taking a three pronged approach to regulating the industry provides more sustained outcomes than a single approach. The three aspects are:

- focused attention on the most significant risks, ensuring that unmanaged risks are quickly addressed, either immediately by the PCBU or under direction of a notice
- using agreed actions to identify all unmanaged hazards and risks, and more broadly documenting these and ensuring that the PCBU either addresses them immediately or in a set timeframe, which is discussed and followed-up by the inspector until all are addressed
- intensive work with selected employers with poor workers' compensation claims experience to ensure that they are addressing all hazards and risks and improving their overall management of WHS. Six employers from the meat processing industry have participated or are currently participating in IPaM.

2.1.1 Rationale for focus on meat processing

In 2010, WHSQ commissioned Marsden Jacob Associates (MJA) to conduct an evaluation of the differences between Australian jurisdictions in workers’ compensation claim rates for manufacturing. Claims in Queensland were around 30 per cent higher than the Australian average rate for manufacturing.

MJA found that Queensland had a higher proportion of high risk industry sub-sectors making up the manufacturing industry. One sub-sector, meat and meat product manufacturing, accounted for 38 per cent of the higher claim rate in Queensland. Other significant industries contributing to the higher claim rate include the fabricated metal product (21 per cent) and structural metal product (14 per cent) manufacturing industries.

A high proportion of labourers in the meat processing industry in Queensland (65 per cent of workers in Queensland compared to 55 per cent nationally) also contributed to the high Queensland rate. These workers are more likely to carry-out manual tasks and therefore be at higher risk of musculoskeletal disorders, which form a significant proportion of workers’ compensation claims.

Meat processing is a specific focus for WHSQ. A broad range of intervention activities to address the most prevalent workers’ compensation claims in this industry, e.g. MSDs, slips and falls, cuts and lacerations, were developed under a Priority Industry Action Plan.

2.1.2 Regulatory approach

Meat processing has long been the focus of WHSQ regulatory activity. Strategic examination of the regulatory approach, which included consideration of the MJA report, indicated that the approach being taken was not leading to sustained improvement in the industry.
Furthermore, large numbers of serious incidents (notifiable events) at these workplaces were being reported. Following this strategic examination, the approach was reformulated. Two distinct periods are therefore identified, which also roughly align with the change in legislation: 2008/09 – 2011/12 and 2012/13 – 2015/16.

2.1.2.1 Approach from 2008/09 – 2011/12

The approach prior to 2012 mainly consisted of strong, but uncoordinated, focus on meat processing workplaces. Inspectors from the WHSQ offices closest to each meat processing workplace would undertake inspections and issue notices for non-compliances identified. In total, 478 statutory notices were issued: 222 Improvement notices; 49 Prohibition notices; 4 Infringement notices; 1 Electrical Safety Protection Notice; and, 202 Directives under Dangerous Goods legislation. These notices were for highly specific issues associated with individual tasks, equipment or practices. For example, commonly five notices were issued for the individual aspects of poor handling and storage of chemicals (handling, use storage, register, and risk assessment). Other common individual hazards and risks addressed by notices included:

- plant guarding (individual equipment e.g. augers, chain drives, conveyors)
- hazardous manual task risks (individual for lifting, high force, postures, blunt knives, duration)
- falls from height (e.g. ladder, platforms, mezzanine floors)
- forklift licensing
- asbestos registers
- test/tag of electrical equipment

The meat processing workplaces would address each issue raised and comply with the requirements of the notice. This often resulted in a short-term and low level control being implemented, one which only addressed the specific task or equipment identified in the notice. For example, a notice to guard the power take-off (PTO) of a tractor would result in action for the individual tractor specified rather than all the tractors at the workplace. Another common approach to complying with the notice involved declaring the equipment specified in the notice to be “out-of-service”. The approach meant the notice was complied with and was closed, or if done while the inspector was on-site, meant that the notice could not be issued. Often there was little that the inspector could do to ensure that the equipment did not “accidently” go back into service without the issue being fixed. Whilst issuing notices undoubtedly did raise awareness and start to act as a catalyst for change, it was apparent that improvements were not occurring rapidly enough or being sustained.

2.1.2.2 Approach from 2012/13 – 2015/16

From 2012 to 2016, following receipt of the MJA report, WHSQ developed a program of work around meat processing workplaces. This program of work included strong industry engagement, pre-visit meetings at workplaces where WHSQ expectations were clearly defined, walk through assessments, close out meetings once the assessment was completed and ongoing communication between Inspectors and the management of the workplace until identified risks were being addressed. One of the elements of this program of work that made the most impact and gained industry buy-in was the use of agreed actions that clearly discussed the risk, the expectations from the regulator and the timelines in which the rectifications need to be completed.

Rather than issuing notices for every non-compliance identified, a more strategic approach to notices was taken. Issues which were particularly high risk, those where workers were in close proximity to hazards which could cause serious injury, were highlighted and the appropriate notice issued. For example:

- Issuing a prohibition notice for an identified high risk (such as an unguarded auger, conveyor or chain) then following this up by communication to other businesses in the
red meat industry, which have not yet been visited, prompting the PCBUs to fix the issue before being directed to by an inspector.

- Issuing an improvement notice for a poorly managed risk (such as falls from height risks from use of ladders or platforms) which often were using low level administrative controls rather than a design or engineering control. For example, the fall risk from the work platform on the kill floor was generally managed by instructing the worker to step back from the edge until the carcass was in front of the worker thus providing a physical barrier. Engineered edge protection which met food safety standards was available but the PCBU was often reluctant to commit funds to put the more effective control in place. Issuing an improvement notice demonstrated that the regulator was taking the issue seriously and requiring the higher level control, as specified in the legislation. Again, by communicating this to other PCBUs likely to have the same risk, action is prompted without the need for notices being issued to all PCBUs and becomes an industry wide expectation and is perceived as a level playing field.

It was recognised that there were difficulties in writing notices which had high levels of detail about broad categories of hazards and risks which needed addressing across a range of different work areas, activities and practices. Further to this, it was apparent that writing notices failed to have a broad effect on WHS practices or have a long-term term impact or sustained improvement.

To address this, lower level risks did not receive a notice, instead an agreed actions approach was taken. This involved the business, in consultation with the inspector, detailing every issue, prioritising them and carrying-out work to plan and implement rectification work. The inspector continued to communicate with and have focus on the business until all identified risks were managed. In total, 1100 agreed actions were recorded for the 18 red meat processing workplaces across Queensland (average of 61 unmanaged or poorly managed risks per workplace which were addressed and are now being effectively managed). Common risks which were effectively managed in this way included:

- upgrading machinery guarding, even where worker exposure was low
- addressing all falls risks with engineered solutions
- improving work procedures and documentation
- addressing maintenance issues
- addressing chemical storage and use issues

Attachment 2 contains an extract of an agreed actions spreadsheet compiled by one PCBU as part of the red meat processing campaign.

Agreed actions have achieved good results, especially when working with businesses such as meat processing. Agreed actions provide an effective method for recording issues, dedicating agreed timeframes for rectification and monitoring the ongoing safety improvements at a workplace. They achieve the objective to improve management of risks, ensure non-compliances are corrected, build relationships with the business and often achieve greatly improved attitudes towards WHS compliance. The use of agreed actions in the meat processing industry has shown they are effective because:

- PCBUs feel that they have a higher level of control which allows them to schedule corrective action and set priorities which are aligned with their business processes. The action plan and time frames are agreed through negotiation, which gives the PCBU ownership of the issues rather than begrudging acceptance that occurs when a notice is imposed.
- The progressive checking of progress towards compliance, rather than the point-in-time requirement for compliance with an improvement notice, appear to be more effective in securing improved safety outcomes.
2.1.3 IPAM businesses within the meat processing industry

It was recognized that some employers in the meat industry continued to experience poorer than average workers' compensation claim rates. These employers were identified as needing additional intervention and were included in the Injury Prevention and Management Program (IPaM).

Six employers from the Meat Processing Industry have participated in the IPAM program. One is in the pre-agreement phase and yet to commence engagement and two have completed the program. Three employers are currently in their second year of participation as part of the supported self-management (SSM) phase. As a priority industry sector, employing in the Manufacturing industry make up approx. 29 per cent of employers engaged in IPAM. However, engagement with a number of meat manufacturing employers, identified for IPaM through WorkCover data, was deferred given a high level of Inspectorate activity and various focussed campaigns with this sector.

Training and supervision, communication and consultation, systems review, and reporting and recording documented the highest number of action items for this sector. Table 1 provides an overview of the number of actions for each employer across eight focus areas.

Table 1. Overview of IPaM actions for each employer

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Employer</th>
<th>Status</th>
<th>Systems development</th>
<th>Hazard identification</th>
<th>Risk assessment</th>
<th>Reporting and recording</th>
<th>Training and supervision</th>
<th>Communication and consultation</th>
<th>System review and maintenance</th>
<th>Injury management</th>
<th>Improved controls implemented and/or resourced</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>Exit</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>-</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>Exit</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>-</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>Active (SSM)</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>5</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>Active (SSM)</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5</td>
<td>Active (SSM)</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6</td>
<td>Pre Agreement</td>
<td>N/A</td>
<td>N/A</td>
<td>N/A</td>
<td>N/A</td>
<td>N/A</td>
<td>N/A</td>
<td>N/A</td>
<td>N/A</td>
<td>N/A</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td></td>
<td>6</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>17</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>9</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Following completion of the assessments the outcomes are then incorporated into a tailored Business Improvement Plan. Attachment 3 contains an extract of a Business Improvement Plan for a meat industry IPaM employer. Some key improvement actions undertaken by employers as a result of the recommendations in the Business Improvement Plan include:

- improve worker consultation in development and review of Job Safety Analysis
- review contractor induction
- introduction of Health and Safety Representatives (HSR)
- improve senior management reporting measures
- update position descriptions to reflect job requirements
- update WHS policies and procedures and establish regular communication to staff through team talks and monthly WHS consultation
- improve reporting measures to include near misses and undertake regular analysis to identify emerging patterns
- undertake risk assessments and increase awareness of priority hazards including knife sharpness, hazardous manual tasks, forklifts and remote and isolated works
- implement a range of health and wellbeing initiatives including stop smoking campaign, flu vaccinations, superannuation presentations and healthy food options introduced to vending machines.
Inspectors responding to incidents or complaints, or at the request of the IPaM Advisor, may attend an IPaM employer workplace and, if the situation requires it, may issue a notice to ensure compliance. Generally, it is expected that businesses in IPaM will be actively addressing hazards and risks and therefore the likelihood of a non-compliance requiring a notice will be reduced.

2.1.4 Effectiveness of approach

The effectiveness of the approach is demonstrated by the marked decrease in occurrence of notifiable events in the meat industry. As can be seen in the data table presented as Attachment 4, for the period 1 July 2008 to 31 July 2016, there has been a decline in the number of events (incidents, complaints and dangerous events) notified to WHSQ, by a factor of 46 per cent.

That is, for the four year period of the completion of WHSQ’s dedicated audit campaigns, there was a total of 803 notified events. For the four year period after the completion of WHSQ’s dedicated audit campaigns, the number of notified events fell to 433 (46 per cent reduction).

A more truly reflective indicator of risk reported in a business is events notified about an industry that does not include complaints (about health and safety conditions at the workplace). While some complaints relate to genuine health and safety issues many matters are beyond the control of the regulator, and indeed, the employer. As can be seen in the data table presented as Attachment 5, for the period 1 July 2008 to 31 July 2016, there has been a decline in the number of incidents (workplace injuries and dangerous events) notified to WHSQ, by a factor of 52 per cent.

That is, for the four year period of the completion of WHSQ’s dedicated audit campaign, there was a total of 705 notified incidents. For the four year period after the completion of WHSQ’s dedicated audit campaigns, the number of notified incidents fell to 340 (52 per cent reduction).

Figure 3 (below) separates out meat processing incidents and complaints reported to OIR highlights the decline of incident notifications since the campaign in 2011-12, while the number of complaints has remained more or less stable over the period. The number of incidents notified also suggests the campaign raised awareness of safety issues within meat processing with 223 incidents reported in 2011-12.

Figure 3. Meat processing incident and complaint notification

The ‘top ten’ employers (ranked by the number of events notified) were examined. As can be seen in the data table presented as Attachment 6, a similar, though more pronounced trend
of falling numbers of events notified is evident during and post WHSQ’s interventions. For the period 1 July 2008 to 31 July 2012 compared with 1 July 2012 to 31 July 2016, all but one of these had a reduction in the number of events notified to OIR as a percentage.

The change in approach is also apparent in the number of notices issued (Figure 4). Through the agreed actions approach, unmanaged or poorly managed risks were being identified and managed. Regulatory activity in the industry was high and was achieving results. If the focus is only on the number of notices issued these achievements might be overlooked. A more detailed breakdown of the notices issued can be found in Attachment 7 and 8.

![Meat Processing Industry Statutory Notices](image)

**Figure 4. Notices issued, for the meat processing industry, by 'Top Ten' employers**

It is worthwhile examining the data for the small number of meat processing businesses included in the IPaM program. Figure 5 (below) shows that, as expected, the total number of incidents notified for all relevant IPAM businesses has declined significantly since 2008-09. This downward trend is similar to the downward trend for notified incidents within the whole meat processing industry over the same period. Figure 5 also shows that the trend for complaints notified for the IPAM businesses also closely matches the trend for complaints notified for the meat processing industry over the period. More information for incidents and complaints for IPaM businesses is shown in Attachments 9 and 10.
The number of statutory notices issued for all relevant IPaM businesses between 2008-09 and 2015-16 is outlined in the chart below. As Figure 6 shows, the trend over the period is volatile; however, the number of notices issued for the IPAM businesses has generally declined since 2009-10 when IPaM started. More detailed information is shown in Attachment 11.

WHSQ has employed a broad range of strategies with the meat industry in Queensland. These strategies are aimed at ensuring that long-term and sustained improvements are made, as well as ensuring that immediate obvious risks are addressed.
Previously notices were the primary tool utilized to improve health and safety outcomes, predominately for singular risks and hazards. Review of this approach resulted in a broader strategy, which combined strategically placed notices, agreed processes and timeframes for longer-term rectification, and working more intensely with particular businesses to improve overall safety management.

Statistics for this industry indicate that this broader approach is effective and workplace health and safety improvements are being realised.
2.2 Construction industry

The construction industry is a high priority for Workplace Health and Safety Queensland (WHSQ), as construction work continues to present high risks to the health and safety of workers and others. In the construction industry, the most significant mechanisms of injury are: body stressing; slips, trips and falls; and, striking or being struck by moving objects.

Construction is characterised by a diverse workforce consisting of unskilled and semi-skilled workers (approximately 40 per cent), skilled trade workers (45 per cent) and the remainder skilled professionals. The industry has a relatively young workforce (43 per cent of workers aged 15-34) and older workers are underrepresented, likely due to physical demands of the high manual labour roles in the industry. Eighty-nine percent of construction workers are male, compared to 54 per cent across all industries.

As with many other industries, to remain competitive, the construction industry needs to embrace innovation to increase productivity. Such innovation is already being seen in the industry as both process innovation and product innovation. Process innovation includes an increase in work specialisation with a resultant effect on where the work is conducted and the business entity which conducts it e.g. building structures, such as timber trusses and tilt-up slabs, manufactured off-site and assembled on-site by specialised sub-contractors.

Product innovation includes equipment which replaces the need for manual labour e.g. giant 3D printers, robotic brick-layers. A significant innovation has been Building Information Modelling (BIM), and this is seen as the future of construction and it is likely that businesses who don’t embrace it will rapidly become uncompetitive. BIM utilises digital technology and a building is digitally designed from the ground up in 3D - traditional 2D drawings are transformed into 3D representative models. This allows input at the design stage by all parties involved in a project, architects, designers, contractors, engineers – even interior designers and end-user clients – using one data platform and the same 3D design. Issues which currently are identified as the construction of the building progresses are identified by BIM before construction even starts. These innovations and particularly BIM provide both challenges and opportunities for improved WHS in construction.

As with other industries, WHSQ takes a regulatory approach which is designed to ensure two main aims:

- that obvious risks to the health and safety of workers and others are being managed and that any breaches with legislative requirements are quickly addressed; and,
- that the businesses and other organisations are fulfilling their duties to ensure WHS by implementing systematic WHS management.

The temporary nature of construction workplaces, the high level of complexity of contracting and sub-contracting arrangements and the complex supply chain for the construction industry, provide additional challenges for effective WHS regulation. Unlike other workplaces, where point-in-time compliance tends to have a sustained effect (particularly for workplace design, plant and equipment issues, less so for work procedures), for construction the issue often recurs, different site, different sub-contractors, same unmanaged hazards and risks. Any one particular hazard or risk may only be present for a short period of time and then, as construction proceeds, different hazards and risks appear and disappear.

Currently, WHSQ takes a multi-pronged approach to regulating the construction industry:

- Focused attention on the most significant risks, ensuring that unmanaged risks are quickly addressed, either immediately by the PCBU or under direction of a notice. WHSQ matches the response to the seriousness of potential consequences. For example, prohibition notices are used to shut down equipment, activities and even whole sites where there is a serious imminent risk to the health and safety of workers and others. Prohibition notices take effect immediately when given verbally by an inspector to a duty holder. When the direction is given orally it is confirmed by written notice as soon as is practicable. Improvement notices are used when there is a
contravention of a provision of the WHS Act but there is not a serious imminent risk
to the health and safety of workers or others.

• Ensuring that Safe Work Methods Statements (SWMS) for high risk construction
work are prepared, available and being complied with. The SWMS sets out the work
activities in logical sequences, identifies hazards and describes control measures.
Both simple and complex activities can be broken down into a series of basic steps
that will allow for full analysis of each part of the activity for hazards and potential
incidents. SWMS provide a basic systematic approach to WHS management and
enhance worker participation and protection of the health and safety of workers and
others, beyond simple hazard identification and risk control. In December 2016,
WHSQ introduced new infringement offences for duty holders who were not utilising
SWMS. Focus on SWMS will lead to better practices and overcomes the need for an
inspector to actually observe workers being exposed to hazards before regulatory
action can occur.

• Using agreed actions to identify all unmanaged hazards and risks, and more broadly
documenting these and ensuring that the PCBU either addresses them immediately
or in a set timeframe, which is discussed and followed-up by the inspector until all are
addressed. Formal documentation of this process occurs less often in the
construction industry than for other industries, but still has relevance for large
projects (e.g. infrastructure, multi-story buildings).

• Intensive work with selected employers with poor history of workers’ compensation
claims to ensure that they are addressing all hazards and risks and improving their
overall management of WHS. This has the advantage of achieving improvement in a
business even though the worksites and construction projects they are involved in
change. These employers are selected for additional focused attention under the
Injury Prevention and Management Program (IPaM). The IPaM initiative works with
these employers to ensure systems are in place to prevent workplace injury and, if
people are injured, to return people to meaningful and appropriate work, as soon as
practical.

In recognition of the innovation occurring in the construction industry, WHSQ is now
examining ways in which WHS issues could be addressed during the design and pre-
construction phases, and embedding of systematic WHS management and worker
participation as business-as-usual for every construction project. This is an approach which
was used effectively for the construction of Legacy Way and offers great opportunity with the
adoption of BIM. This involves WHSQ working with the construction industry around the
following four aspects:

  • healthy and safe by design – structures, plant and work processes are designed to
eliminate or minimise hazards and risks before they are introduced into the workplace
  • supply chains and networks – commercial relationships within supply chains and
networks are used to improve work health and safety
  • health and safety capabilities – industry and inspectors and other staff of the
regulator have the capabilities to effectively perform their roles
  • leadership and culture – effective consultation, cooperation and coordination exists
through all levels of the industry.

2.2.1 Rationale for focus on the construction industry

During 2015-16, there were on average 208,207 people employed in the construction
industry in Queensland. Approximately nine per cent of workers in Queensland were
employed in the construction industry during 2015-16.
Table 2. Construction: Total accepted non-fatal workers’ compensation claims and rates in Queensland

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Claim numbers</td>
<td>9,875</td>
<td>9,086</td>
<td>8,743</td>
<td>8,037</td>
<td>8,714</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Claim rates (per 1,000 workers)</td>
<td>44.4</td>
<td>39.7</td>
<td>38.2</td>
<td>37.1</td>
<td>41.9</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Source: QEIDB Data extracted April 27, 2017; ABS Labour Force, Australia, Catalogue 6291.0.55.003

In 2015-16, there were 8,714 total accepted non-fatal workers’ compensation claims for the construction industry in Queensland.

Over the five years 2011-12 to 2015-16, there has been an average annual reduction in the number of total accepted non-fatal workers’ compensation claims for the construction industry in Queensland of 3.1 per cent per annum. However, Queensland as a whole has experienced a fall in the number of total accepted non-fatal workers’ compensation claims over the same period.

Table 3. Construction: Total accepted serious injury workers’ compensation claims and rates in Queensland

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Claim numbers</td>
<td>2,996</td>
<td>2,873</td>
<td>2,975</td>
<td>3,006</td>
<td>2,998</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Claim rates (per 1,000 workers)</td>
<td>21.2</td>
<td>16.4</td>
<td>16.7</td>
<td>21.4</td>
<td>20.6</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Source: CPM 18, QEIDB Data extracted April 28, 2017; ABS Labour Force, Australia, Catalogue 6291.0.55.003
Note: * 2015-16 data is preliminary.

In 2015-16, there were 2,998 total accepted serious injury workers’ compensation claims for the construction industry in Queensland. The claim rate for serious injuries in Queensland construction was 20.6 claims per 1,000 workers in 2015-16, a lower rate than that recorded five years ago at 21.2 claims per 1,000 workers.

Over the five years 2011-12 to 2015-16, the number of accepted serious injury workers’ compensation claims has remained relatively constant.

The top causes of injury leading to workers’ compensation claims for the Queensland construction industry over the five year period 2011-12 to 2015-16 were:

- body stressing (28 per cent),
- hitting objects with a part of the body (18 per cent),
- falls, trips and slips of a person (18 per cent) and
- being hit by moving objects (18 per cent).

Whist there has been a slight decline in the injury rates for construction, these are not substantial and the claim rate is significantly higher than the rate for all industries. This indicates that construction remains a priority for WHSQ, continuation of existing efforts and new approaches to gain sustained improvement are needed.
2.2.2 Regulatory approach

Construction has long been the focus of WHSQ regulatory activity. There are 52 WHSQ inspectors specifically focussed on construction. Other inspectors, including general inspectors and electrical safety inspectors, also have some focus on the construction industry. Specific knowledge of the work processes, hazards and risks, as well as an understanding of the structure and dynamics of the industry, and in-depth knowledge of WHS management practices and application of legislation is required for a construction inspector to be effective. From 2014 to 2017, between 45 per cent and 50 per cent of WHSQ’s total inspector field activity was in the construction industry. To a large extent this activity is on ensuring that obvious risks to the health and safety of workers and others are being managed and that any breaches with legislative requirements are quickly addressed. There is some focus on ensuring that the businesses and other organisations are fulfilling their duties to ensure WHS by implementing systematic WHS management, primarily through ensuring compliance with SWMSs requirements. Construction inspectors ensure that the construction industry is complying with work health and safety obligations in three main ways:

1. Complaints and Incident Notifications: focus on specific hazards and risks resulting from complaints and incident notifications being received by WHSQ.
2. Monitoring of construction projects as they progress and taking action, through notices and agreed actions, to ensure that risks are actively managed and requirements are complied with.
3. Industry Action Plan Campaigns which are aimed at addressing specific risks identified from workers’ compensation data.

In addition, to these three approaches, two additional approaches, by WHSQ advisors, are providing focus on systematic WHS management and worker participation:

4. Injury Prevention and Management program (IPaM): providing a sustained focus on certain employers in the construction industry whose WHS performance requires substantial improvement to be made.
5. Health and Safety Representatives: aimed at increasing the capability and support for HSRs in the construction industry to effectively undertake the role envisaged by the WHS legislation.

2.2.2.1 Complaints and Incident Notifications

Construction inspectors have a strong focus on addressing complaints and incident notification received by WHSQ. This reactive work is primarily aimed at ensuring that obvious risks to the health and safety of workers and others are being managed and that any breaches with legislative requirements are quickly addressed.

When responding to a complaint or incident notification, the primary focus of an inspector is to address the specific issue identified. This includes ensuring that any immediate risks to workers and others are being properly managed and identifying whether any breaches have occurred or are occurring. Typically, when responding to a complaint, the inspector will go to the site office and/or identify who is currently managing the site. They will explain that they are there to investigate a complaint which has been received, to establish whether there is validity to the complaint and to ensure that any WHS issue relating to the issue is being addressed or will be addressed. The inspector will then examine the worksite, plant, equipment or work process that the complaint relates to, generally accompanied by the person managing the site and the HSR (if there is one). In determining the extent of the risk, the inspector will talk to workers in the vicinity and get their views. The inspector will then determine whether a breach is evident and if so, whether it can be addressed immediately while they are on-site or whether a notice is warranted. If a notice is warranted, the inspector collects the evidence required for the notice e.g. taking photographs, recording details from discussions in their notebook. Ideally, the notice is written on the spot but often there are
details that the inspector needs to check on and the notice gets written after the inspector returns to the WHSQ office. For serious imminent risk, a prohibition notice is warranted. The direction to shut down equipment, cease and activity or cease work on the whole site can be given orally and then confirmed in writing as soon as is practicable. When notices are issued, the inspector explains in detail, to the site manager or relevant duty holder, what is required to be done. Depending on the complexity of the issue and the time taken to address it, the inspector may also look at other aspects of the worksite and identify and address any issues which arise.

Whilst complaint and first response incident investigation is a vital activity, it is also apparent that the current level of activity in this area is limiting WHSQ’s ability to implement programs which are likely to achieve sustained improvement in the construction sector. However not addressing the complaints and incident notifications (or at least the most significant ones) is unacceptable and in any case would increase the number of unmanaged risks, resulting in more notifications.

Whilst WHSQ has refined the approach to complaint handling, it is apparent that additional efforts are required to find a solution. To this end, WHSQ is currently examining recent regulatory research by Professor David Weil (Boston University) which provides a mechanism to take a more strategic approach to complaint responses. A key aspect is rather than dealing with each complaint as an individual issue, also use the incoming complaints as a vital source of information about compliance and as a key part of system-wide enforcement activities. This research relates to regulation of payments to vulnerable workers but also appears to be applicable to other workers’ conditions, including work health and safety. It is particularly applicable to industries, such as construction, which have a high level of contracting and subcontracting.

2.2.2.2 Monitoring of construction projects (using notices and agreed actions)

Ongoing monitoring of construction sites by inspectors is an important aspect of ensuring that standards are maintained. Unlike fixed workplaces, many of the WHS improvements on construction sites that result from an inspector visit are not sustained beyond the life of the construction phase or engagement of the particular sub-contractors. Regular communication and site visits with construction businesses, by the inspector, are required to ensure that the construction business and all contractors and sub-contractors are complying with their duties. Three main monitoring approaches are used: general construction workplaces; major projects; and, construction electrical wiring.

2.2.2.2.1 General construction projects

WHSQ uses on ground intelligence from inspectors and reference to QLeave data to determine when new construction projects are commencing. For significant projects, an inspector will establish who the principal contractor is, make contact, introduce themselves and establish an appropriate mechanism for ongoing contact. Inspectors will make regular proactive visits to the worksite, particularly when there is complex or high-risk work happening. These site visits generally involve a walk-through of each level of the workplace with the PCBU, and the HSR and/or WHS committee members, to identify potential WHS issues.

During this process, if a significant risk is identified, the inspector will determine whether the criteria for issuing a statutory notice is met, and if so will issue the notice. However, it is recognised that ensuring compliance by writing notices has limitations in that the inspector generally has to observe plant, equipment or activities which present a risk to workers before a notice is issued. The inspector cannot be present at all times when work is being conducted and due to the fast changing nature of construction sites, the hazards and risks to workers frequently arise and disappear when an inspector is not present.
To address this, construction inspectors take a proactive approach with construction projects and use an agreed actions approach to ensure that hazards and potential risks are addressed before they present a significant risk to workers and others. This involves the PCBU detailing every issue identified by the inspector, prioritizing them and carrying-out work to plan and implement rectification work. Often issues are rectified and resolved whilst the inspector is on site or the PCBU undertakes to rectify as soon as possible. The inspector then either follows up with a site visit or by reviewing evidence from the PCBU that verifies the issue has been resolved. There are also longer term actions identified to be resolved when there is no immediate risk to a person. For example, an inspector discussing and providing guidance in relation to the planning and design of appropriate scaffolding or the plant that that might be required further on in the construction schedule.

Ideally, these types of site visits would typically take place each 4-8 weeks as the construction project progresses. The nature of the construction industry means handwritten documentation of the issues (e.g. PCBU notes and inspector notebook) and verbal follow-up, either in person or by phone, generally occurs, rather than written confirmation, such as by email.

Whilst these proactive monitoring site visits have the potential to lead to more sustained improvement, in practice, the temporary nature of construction sites and the rapid change in contractors and subcontractors working on site at any one time, limits the actual achievement of this. Experience has shown that geographically broad campaigns on particular issues (e.g. fall protection, electrical equipment, site housekeeping, mobile plant) with strong follow-up (see below under Industry Action Plan Campaigns) are far more effective in achieving sustained improvement. However, in a similar way to complaint and incident notification visits, site visits to monitor construction projects remain an essential activity until widespread and sustained management of WHS significant risks in the construction industry is achieved.

2.2.2.2 Major projects

The strategy utilised by WHSQ in management of major construction projects (i.e. those valued at $1 billion or more) is a multi-faceted approach. Potential major projects are identified at concept stage through a number of sources (industry contacts and consultation, Coordinator-General contacts, media). WHSQ then has opportunity to be involved prior to some projects actually being approved by taking part in setting the Terms of Reference for the Environmental Impact Statement for Coordinated Projects. Once a Client is identified for major projects contact is made to discuss the scope of works and identification of safety issues at an early stage. This can also include other Regulatory Authorities where they have an involvement (for example NT Worksafe for the upcoming Northern Gas Pipeline Project).

Once a Principal Contractor (or builder if the client remains PC) is appointed initial meetings are held regarding the scope of work, timeframes and safety matters identified in the project risk assessment. Each major project is subject to regular proactive workplace assessments (monthly for most projects) involving local and regional inspectors, drawing expertise on particular hazard areas from appropriate Inspectors where required and allowing for upskilling of less experienced Inspectors. These assessments are scheduled to coincide with the key high risk activities being undertaken in the scope of works for a major construction project. The actual format of these inspections differs depending on the type of project, for example building construction projects are generally subject to complete “top down” inspections (i.e. an full inspection of the workplace starting from the top deck to the basement levels), whereas larger engineering, resource or industrial projects may start with “top down” inspections and later focus on specific hazard areas (e.g. comprehensive inspections on cranes and rigging, scaffolding, confined spaces). As part of these regular inspections, emphasis is placed on engaging with HSR’s to promote consultative processes.

Regular meetings are also scheduled to allow for information sharing and WHSQ input into project milestones (e.g. perimeter containment screen design on high rise buildings).
Where issues are identified, they are dealt with in the same way as outlined above for general construction projects, that is, notices are issued where warranted and other required improvements are documented and followed up by the inspector to ensure that rectifications have been actioned.

There are currently 13 major projects that have been receiving regular proactive assessments this financial year (2016-17), although 4 of those projects are either finished or in the finishing stages. There have been 106 assessments for major projects since July 1, 2016. Meetings with senior corporate management of major builders are being undertaken at present. This includes general meetings with principal contractors of major projects to discuss current and upcoming major projects, as well as project specific meetings regarding upcoming major projects.

2.2.2.2.3 Construction wiring

From 1 April to the 30 September 2017 the construction wiring project involves the following activities:

- a joint initiative (WHSQ and ESO) visiting major project sites with an emphasis on electrical safety (e.g. Queens Wharf Rd development, Jewell Apartments)
- visits to construction sites of 10 storeys and under (domestic and townhouse sites)

This will involve electrical safety inspectors targeting compliance relating to:

- wiring - AS/NZS 3000:2007 (wiring rules) and AS/NZS 3012 (Electrical installations – Construction and Demolition sites); and,
- exclusion zones

An overall target for both activities is for 200 audits. In the previous compliance program 1 September 2016 to 30 March 2017 electrical safety inspectors conducted 173 audits of construction wiring. These audits were located on construction sites that generally excluded domestic and townhouse sites.

2.2.3 Industry Action Plan Campaigns

Two Industry Action Plans, ‘Construction Trades’ and ‘Civil Construction’, are aimed at targeting the activities of WHSQ on the risks to the blue-collar workforce in construction.

Under the classifications used by WorkCover Queensland, the construction industry consists of three subdivisions: building construction, heavy and civil engineering construction and construction services.

Due to the nature of the work involved, the construction industry typically uses high levels of specialised sub-contracting. As such, the organisations engaged as principal contractors rarely directly employ their own labour. Principal contractors for residential or commercial buildings will generally be classified as ‘Building Construction’ and their direct employees are likely to be Managers or Professionals.

‘Construction Trades’ generally refers to the sub-contractors engaged to perform residential or commercial construction work and include Trades Workers, Machinery Operators and Drivers, and Labourers. These workers are more likely to be performing high-risk work and have higher levels of work-related injuries based on workers’ compensation statistics.

The heavy and civil engineering sector generally refers to construction of infrastructure rather than buildings. This includes roads, bridges, tunnels, jetties/harbours, pipelines, railways and power generation/transmission.

The following compliance campaigns have been undertaken in the construction trades and civil construction industries.
2.2.3.1 Mobile and operational plant (MOP) in construction

Between May 2013 and March 2015 WHSQ undertook 699 audits of risks associated with mobile and operational plant in construction (70 earthmoving equipment, 34 personnel and materials hoist, 464 Elevated Work Platform, 326 tower and mobile cranes).

The audits were aimed at high risk activities utilising MOP on construction sites and ensuring compliance particularly in the areas of:

- the interaction of workers with MOP
- traffic management on and around sites
- planning and scheduling of work being done near MOP
- operator competency
- evaluating the quality and relevance of safe work method statements (SWMS)
- on-site compliance with SWMS
- worker knowledge and understanding of SWMS

A total of 55 notices were issued as part of the campaign – 39 (71 per cent) improvement notices, 15 (27 per cent) prohibition notices, and 1 (2 per cent) electrical safety protection notice.

2.2.3.2 Residential construction safety – back to basics

Workers’ compensation data indicates that workers are at risk of injury from basic construction activities. Workers in both civil construction and construction trades industries are typically present at residential construction developments, performing site preparation/earthmoving and building trades (e.g. plumbing, carpentry, bricklaying) respectively. As a result, WHSQ initiated a ‘Back to Basics’ campaign that aimed to reduce levels of non-compliance and prevent injuries in the residential construction sector associated with the following categories:

1. site housekeeping
2. using the right tool(s) for the job
3. planning for safety, including preparation of Safe Work Method Statements (SWMS)
4. falls prevention (including through voids, from ladders, trestles and other work platforms)
5. site supervision
6. site security
7. additional issues (e.g. electrical)

Three phases of organised, sequential, team blitzes were conducted, with construction inspectors undertaking site assessments in residential developments. This approach of targeted enforcement activity within a relatively short period, reinforced by industry associations promoting compliance, was proposed to increase this industry sector’s motivation to comply with legislative requirements and ultimately lead to a reduction in non-compliance.

A total of 1754 assessments have been completed as part of the project between August 2015 and May 2017. A total of 287 statutory notices were issued by inspectors as a result of Back to Basics assessments: 88 per cent of notices issued were improvement notices, 11 per cent were prohibition notices and 1 per cent were electrical safety protection notices. The most notices issued against a category were for site security (63), followed by falls prevention (45), housekeeping (44) and additional (mainly electrical) issues (44).

There was a significant upward trend in compliance levels in the majority of categories across the three phases of the project. This indicates that the campaign had a positive effect on compliance levels within the industry as a result of increasing industry awareness and motivation.
2.2.3.3 Material delivery and site management in residential construction

The material delivery and site management in residential construction campaign aimed to reduce the number of musculoskeletal injuries associated with the tasks of delivering and storing building materials at residential construction worksites. Over 50 per cent of accepted workers’ compensation claims within the Queensland construction industry are for musculoskeletal disorders (MSDs). More than half of these claims are caused by hazardous manual tasks.

This campaign engaged directly with small and medium-sized residential builders across Queensland to focus on:

- hazardous manual tasks caused by ineffective delivery of bulk construction materials to worksites (e.g. plasterboard, fencing, tiles and bricks)
- processes used by builders to manage risks associated with the delivery of materials to worksites
- how builders consult, cooperate and coordinate with other stakeholders regarding site management practices.

During the campaign, WHSQ inspectors completed 198 desktop assessments, which involved a review of builders’ documented systems and procedures. Where it was identified that a builder had consultation mechanisms in place for the safe delivery and storage of building materials, inspectors then completed 56 site verifications to assess how these mechanisms were being implemented.

A key finding was that a significant proportion of builders did not consult with workers, subcontractors and suppliers about hazards prior to work commencing and often relied on verbal communication rather than documented processes. Recognising the complexity of this issue, and difficulties in identifying specific breaches, builders were provided with advice and guidance to improve practices rather than statutory notices being issued.

2.2.3.4 Onsite traffic management project

In Queensland, from 2009 to 2014, there were 138 serious injuries to workers as a result of being hit or trapped by moving plant and vehicles in the Construction Trades industry, and a further 53 in the Heavy and Civil Engineering industry. The majority of these injuries were a result of being hit by workplace plant on the worksite (e.g. excavators, forklifts, cranes) with a lesser proportion resulting from being hit by cars and trucks around the worksite. These figures are based on accepted workers’ compensation claims for injuries resulting in five or more consecutive days off work.

As a result, WHSQ commenced a project in November 2015 that aimed to reduce the incidence of injuries and fatalities which result from persons being struck by mobile plant or moving traffic at workplaces. Importantly, the project was focused on all types of traffic that are likely to interact with people at workplaces, and not just focused on traffic control and guidance arrangements on public roads. In addition to the construction industry, this project was also implemented in the manufacturing, transport/logistics and agriculture industries.

One hundred worksite assessments were completed at construction workplaces between July and September 2016. The assessments focussed on six areas:

1. understanding the site’s traffic needs (e.g. risk assessment, consultation)
2. developing a traffic management plan
3. controlling the risk of plant/vehicles hitting people, other vehicles or obstructions (e.g. eliminating, substituting, isolating or engineering the hazard; administrative controls)
4. observing traffic and pedestrian behaviour (e.g. procedures, inspections, licensing, housekeeping)
5. preparing for an emergency
6. construction-specific requirements (e.g. safety documentation, traffic control, road closures)
In 2016, 47 notices were issued for traffic management-related issues. About a third of these notices were issued as part of the proactive assessments – the remainder resulted from reactive work (e.g. notifications, complaints). The majority of these notices were issued against principal contractors for WHS Regulation 315c relating to control of traffic in vicinity of construction work.

### 2.2.4 IPaM businesses within the construction industry

The Injury Prevention and Management (IPaM) initiative works with selected employers to ensure systems are in place to prevent workplace injury and, if people are injured, to return them to meaningful and appropriate work, as soon as practical. IPaM advisors work with employers who have comparatively high workers' compensation claims rates and costs compared to other businesses of similar size and nature.

A total of 133 employers have participated or are participating in the program. This represents approximately 11 per cent of the 902 employers engaged in IPaM. These employers are in varying phases of participation:

- 39 employers have completed the program.
- 48 employers are currently engaged in the ‘active’ phase of the program (first 12 months).
- 10 employers are currently in the ‘Supported Self-Management’ (SSM) phase of the program (second 12 months).
- 36 employers are currently in discussions with IPaM Senior Advisors regarding future participation in the program.

Table 4 below shows a breakdown of the number of these key IPaM activities that have been undertaken with construction industry employers since the commencement of the program.

Table 4. IPaM milestone activities with construction employers

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>IPaM activity:</th>
<th>Hazard reviews</th>
<th>Systems reviews</th>
<th>Climate reviews</th>
<th>Other worker engagement activities</th>
<th>BIPs established</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Number Undertaken:</td>
<td>55</td>
<td>84</td>
<td>32</td>
<td>59</td>
<td>61</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

An analysis of all Business Improvement Plan (BIP) developed for Construction industry employers participating in IPaM was undertaken in January 2017. Figure 7 below shows the breakdown of BIP items for construction industry employers by category.
Figure 7. IPaM BIP items by category of action item for construction employers.

Unlike transport, where approximately 17 per cent (108 in total) of the OFIs were issued in relation to training and supervision, the construction industry did not have a focus area with a significantly low number of BIP items. Instead, the focus areas are approximately even with the exception of risk assessment and control and training and supervision which had more attention. The construction industry has the most even spread of issued advice when compared with the other two industries. The range (difference) between the BIP category area with the highest and lowest number of BIP items was roughly 7.5 per cent.

Table 5 below provides a breakdown of BIP items for a sample of construction industry employers located throughout the state.

Table 5. IPaM BIP items by category for sample of construction employers

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Employer</th>
<th>Systems development</th>
<th>Hazard Identification</th>
<th>Safe Work Method Statements or Procedures</th>
<th>Reporting and recording</th>
<th>Training and supervision</th>
<th>Communication and consultation</th>
<th>System review and maintenance</th>
<th>Injury management</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>9</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>8</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
2.2.4.1 Communication and consultation

The Systems Review also looks at the broad topic of consultation and communication in the workplace specifically testing an employer’s arrangements for Health and Safety Representatives and Committees (HSRs and HSCs). Since 2014, employers participating in the IPaM program have surveyed 11,140 workers to better understand their perception of the WHS and Injury Management culture in their workplace. In addition to this workers are also given the opportunity to participate in focus groups, which provide context for issues identified through the surveys. Information gathered in this process is reviewed (along with other workplace assessments completed) and incorporated into an employer’s BIP as ‘opportunities for improvement’.

A review of the communication and consultation element contained within the systems review showed that 31 IPaM employers (23 per cent) within the construction industry had some form of consultation mechanisms in place. These included WHS committees, WHS representatives, regular worker consultation in purchasing equipment and developing safe work method statements and WHS as a standard item on meeting agendas. As shown in Figure 7, 84 OFIs were include in BIP.

Detailed below are examples of the types of improvement strategies implemented by construction industry employers to improve their consultation mechanisms:

- ‘Maintain consultation arrangements within the workplace (monthly tool box BBQ, fortnightly tool box talks) and ensure these encourage proactive involvement from staff regarding management of WHS (staff safety share during team meetings, suggestion boxes). Ensure all staff receive information regarding WHS issues / alerts, and are allowed the opportunity to provide input / suggestions’.
- ‘Detail the consultation process in the induction program and re-induct all workers on a periodic basis’.
- ‘Continue to educate workers on the importance of reading all procedures, JSAs, SWMS and risk assessments and asking questions to ensure they understand the processes, before they sign off on them’.
- ‘Consider developing a competency checklist for apprentices and buddying them with a senior tradesperson to ensure they receive onsite instructions for health and safety’.
- ‘Safety Committee members identified on all sites and escalation method for unsafe work practices clearly identified’.
- ‘Introduce regular toolbox meetings at each site to include:
  ▪ agenda and minutes
  ▪ signed attendance
  ▪ purchase and changes to the workplace
  ▪ changes to SWP’s
  ▪ section for worker input
  ▪ section for outstanding actions with resolution dates
  ▪ minutes distributed to employees or displayed on notice board’.
- ‘Facilitate the election of HSRs and ensure all staff are aware of the identity and function of these parties. HSRs should be involved in WHS Committee meetings and opportunities provided to give feedback to workgroups on WHS issues discussed/addressed’.
- ‘Continue to develop SWPs (Safe Work Procedures) in consultation with workers, using pictures, attaching a checklist if applicable (for example, working from heights checklist)’.

Currently the IPAM program relies on workers compensation data to identify employers for participation in the program. The IPAM Action Plan 2017 – 2020 includes a number of key strategies that aim to broaden the scope of employers eligible to participate including:
• Introduction of IPAM Evolve program that facilitates systems improvement with small to medium size business. This program offers a 3 to 6 month intervention for businesses at varying stages of maturity, not currently suited to the 2 year IPAM intervention.
• Development of eligibility criteria to prioritise engagement with employers who choose to self-refer into the program.
• Collaboration with the Industry Strategy Units to identify alternate mechanisms for identification with particular focus on inspectorate referrals.
• Engage with Tier 1 employers to identify strategies to better engage with contactors across the supply chain.
• Partner with industry associations and other government departments to utilise IPAM interventions and resources to improve WHS and HR processes with a focus on reducing red-tape for small to medium business.

2.2.5 Health and Safety Representatives

Prior to 2012 and the introduction of the Work Health and Safety Act 2011, regulation of many construction projects was assisted by the strong presence of dedicated Workplace Health and Safety Officers (WHOSOs) and Workplace Health and Safety Representatives (WHSRs), which were statutory positions under the Work Health and Safety Act 1995. These positions were on-ground WHS advocates, supported by certain legislative powers, who were in a position to address many WHS concerns without the need to involve an inspector. This constant attention at the workplace was of particular benefit at construction sites where the hazards and risks, to workers and others, rapidly change. These two positions were also of considerable assistance to the inspector when they went on site, generally making it easier and quicker for the inspector to identify, understand the causes of, and address unmanaged hazards and risks and ensure that non-compliances were addressed (including being provided with relevant details to include on notices).

The process of national harmonization, which resulted in the Work Health and Safety Act 2011, saw the removal of requirements to have a WHSO. This occurred despite Queensland’s positive experience with WHOSOs and considerable efforts to include them in the harmonised legislation. Common belief was that companies would retain the position to assist in complying with the due diligence requirements under s27 Duty of Officers. Anecdotal evidence suggests that while this may have been the case immediately after the change in legislation, over time these positions are declining. With respect to WHSRs, who became Health and Safety Representative (HSRs) under the harmonised legislation, the changes were more subtle, although it is now considered that the changed requirements for training HSRs is contributing to these worker representatives having less knowledge and awareness of significant hazards and risks and effective ways to manage these.

It is noted that for a HSR to undertake the role and functions intended by the legislation, considerable time and resources may be required, in addition to the knowledge and skills that they need to properly carry out the rights and powers that they have under the WHS Act 2011. This capability is built up over time. Changes to the Work Health and Safety Act 2011, in 2014, restricted the right of entry for WHS permit holders when they suspected that there were safety concerns, restricted the ability for HSRs to direct unsafe work to cease, and required 24 hour notice before allowing entry on site for a person to assist the HSR. These laws had a disempowering effect on HSRs and although these changes were overturned by the current government in 2015, work is required to address the impact that this has had on the effectiveness of HSRs. Arguably, the loss of WHOSOs and the disempowerment of HSRs, has negatively affected progress which was being made to improve systematic WHS management in the construction industry. Progress made in other industries, where inspectors are able to get sustained improvements rather than having to repeatedly address simple obvious hazards, does not appear as rapid in the construction industry.
To address this, a specific program of work has commenced, which will involve examining and implementing mechanisms which better support HSRs and safety committees to work in the way that the legislation intended. Consultation with the Plumbers’ Union, the Electrical Trades Union (ETU), the Australian Workers’ Union (AWU), the Construction Forestry Mining and Energy Union (CFMEU) and a broad range of HSRs, has identified that many (though not all) HSRs are also union delegates and that HSRs are not commonly found on non-unionised worksites. Further to this, it appeared that there is a reluctance by workers to become HSRs for fear of intimidation by the PCBUs and not being re-employed when jobs are completed. The program of work is at a very early stage of development. Whilst it is envisaged that case studies, self-assessment tools, workshops, information sessions, and possibly a review of the current HSR training will be involved, to a large extent the direction it takes will be informed through the consultation process with HSRs and safety committees regarding the barriers and facilitators to them effectively working as the legislation intends.

An expected outcome of this process is increased collaboration between WHSQ and HSRs that will lead to better management of WHS and decreased injuries on construction sites.

2.2.6 Effectiveness of approach

Whist there has been a slight decline in the injury rates for construction, these are not substantial and the claim rate is significantly higher than the rate for all industries. This indicates that construction remains a high priority for WHSQ. Continuation of existing efforts and new approaches to gain sustained improvement are needed.

As outlined above, some of WHSQ’s new initiatives for the construction industry are only just commencing and it is expected that these will have a positive effect on the workers’ compensation claims incidence rates. Improvements are being noted for more intensive regulatory activities for the construction industry, such as IPaM, and for specific interventions, such as Back to Basics.

2.2.7 Conclusion

WHSQ has employed a broad range of strategies with the construction industry in Queensland. These strategies are aimed at ensure that long-term and sustained improvements are made, as well as ensuring that immediate obvious risks are addressed.

Currently high levels of construction activity and limited numbers of construction inspectors mean that much of the work with the construction industry is reactive (i.e. addressing complaints and incidents) and/or focussed on simple obvious risks which are only addressed following inspector action. Inspector work aimed at achieving sustained improvements through systematic WHS management has had traction for major projects, although the complex contracting and subcontracting arrangements make this more difficult in construction than for fixed workplaces.

Specific focus on individual employers through the IPaM program has shown that systematic WHS improvements can be made and these improvements can be sustained by the business and applied to the changing worksites that they operate on.

Increasing the capability of construction company employed safety professionals (to assist in compliance with s27 due diligence requirements) and HSRs (requirements under Division 3 of the WHS Act) to identify likely hazards and risks on construction sites, and to assist PCBUs and workers to implement safe work methods, is more likely to achieve sustained reductions in work-related injuries and illnesses than by continuing to take a reactive or point-in-time compliance approach.
2.3 Transport industry

The transport industry, and particularly, the road freight industry sub-sector, is a high priority of Workplace Health and Safety Queensland (WHSQ), due to the high number of fatalities experienced in the industry, the high workers’ compensation claim rates for serious injury and the unique position it holds as an integral part of the supply chain for virtually all other industries. Nationally, based on 2013-14 statistics, transport, postal and warehousing has the highest number of serious workers’ compensation claims per million hours worked (9.3 compared the all industries average of 6.6).

Businesses under the industry code, Transport, Postal and Warehousing, are diverse in nature. They range from a multitude of small one-or two person operations, who might own a single truck, to complex multinational operations who cover all modes of transport. Technology is having a profound effect on the industry, both in terms of equipment (e.g. driverless trucks, driverless trains, robotic loading/unloading) and the business technology driving customer contact, tracking, scheduling, payments and compliance (e.g. online ordering systems, GPS tracking, regulatory telematics). Much of this technology has the potential to reduce the risk from this industry to the health and safety of workers and others. However, some technology has the potential to significantly increase risks. The so-called “gig economy” (e.g. Uber), whilst potentially providing benefits in terms of work flexibility, also has the risks of making work in the transport sector even more precarious. Smaller operators are likely to be forced into sub-contracting arrangements where profit margins are marginal or even negative and in these situations WHS risks can be greatly increased.

WHSQ’s improvement strategies for transport, postal and warehousing, take a risk based approach and focus on the that two industry sub-sectors that present the most significant risks to workers and others. The road freight industry involves significant risks from: falls from a height; vehicle accidents; muscular stress, handling objects; muscular stress, lift, carry, put down; falls at the same level; and, being hit by moving objects. The passenger transport sector, e.g. bus, tram and ferry service providers, have significant risks of client aggression and violence against drivers and other on-board staff.

WHSQ recognises that a broad range of strategies are required to ensure that long-term and sustained improvements are made, as well as ensuring that immediate obvious risks are addressed. Extensive analysis of the dynamics of the industry has identified that while notices are effective for some significant risks, a broader strategy, which combines strategically placed notices, agreed processes and timeframes for longer-term rectification, and working more intensely with particular businesses to improve overall safety management, will be more effective than notices alone.

Employers who continue to have comparatively high workers’ compensation claims rates and costs compared to other businesses of similar size and nature are selected for additional focused attention under the Injury Prevention and Management Program (IPaM). The IPaM initiative works with these employers to ensure systems are in place to prevent workplace injury and, if people are injured, to return people to meaningful and appropriate work, as soon as practical. Ninety-six employers from the transport industry have participated or are currently participating in IPaM.

WHSQ takes a three pronged approach to regulating the transport industry:

- Focused attention on the most significant risks, ensuring that unmanaged risks are quickly addressed, either immediately by the PCBU or under direction of a notice.
- Using agreed actions to identify all unmanaged hazards and risks, and more broadly documenting these and ensuring that the PCBU either addresses them immediately or in a set timeframe, which is discussed and followed-up by the inspector until all are addressed.
• Intensive work with selected employers with poor workers’ compensation claims experience to ensure that they are addressing all hazards and risks and improving their overall management of WHS.

2.3.1 Rationale for focus on road freight and passenger transport services

WHSQ’s focus on these two industry subsectors are for quite distinct reasons.

Road freight transport consistently has the highest, or near highest, rate of serious workers’ compensation claims for any industry subsector. This industry subsector is the largest contributor to transport, postal and warehousing having the second highest fatality rate (10.6) per 10,000 workers (in the period 2003-2015). This was only exceeded by agriculture, forestry and fishing at 17.0. By comparison, construction had a fatality rate of 3.8. Due to the highly mobile nature of road freight transport, with work being conducted at a huge number of geographically diverse worksites and across the entire road network, effective WHS regulation is more difficult than for fixed workplaces.

Passenger transport services receives particular focus because of the significant risks to workers resulting from client aggression and violence. These risks were tragically demonstrated when a Brisbane bus driver was killed in 2016 after being set alight with a homemade fire bomb. Lower level assaults and verbal abuse can also have a significant effect on worker health.

2.3.2 Regulatory approach

Transport received a somewhat peripheral focus by WHSQ prior to 2009. This focus mainly occurred in response to incidents, often at workplaces under other industry classifications, e.g. manufacturing, construction, agriculture. Increased evidence from analysis of workers’ compensation statistics which demonstrated the extent of serious claims occurring in transport, combined with an alarming spike in fatalities in 2008, focussed attention on this industry. WHSQ facilitated a Transport and Storage Safety Summit in 2009 to address the high rates of injury and fatality occurring. It was recognised that this was a complex problem and the then Industrial Relations Minister Cameron Dick described the summit as “…a great opportunity for industry and government to work together to specifically address the rate of injury in the transport industry”. It was recognised that road freight transport had significantly different dynamics to fixed workplaces and needed an approach which focused not only on the road freight businesses, but also on the whole supply chain of all industries who used transport as a vital link for the movement of goods and materials. A specific focus area was created in WHSQ in 2010 which undertook in-depth analysis of workers’ compensation statistics and detailed consultation with industry employer representatives (including the Queensland Trucking Association and a range of individual employers) and worker representatives (including the Transport Workers Union) and individual transport health and safety representatives. Following this strategic examination, the approach was reformulated with specific risks being identified and programs developed to address these risks, using key aspects of the harmonised WHS legislation. Two key elements were identified as being essential to the success of improvement strategies for the industry: firstly worker participation in WHS decision making (essential since driver’s work individually and often in isolation); and, secondly, consultation, cooperation and coordination between duty holders. The pre and post 2010 approaches are described below.

2.3.2.1 Approach prior to 2010

The approach prior to 2010 mainly consisted of a direct focus on the fixed workplace component of transport industry workplaces as part of general inspectorate activity. Inspectors from the WHSQ offices closest to transport depots would undertake inspections and issue notices for non-compliances identified at the depot. Inspections conducted at transport customer workplaces would also extend to the loading and unloading activities.
from trucks if they happened to be present when the inspection occurred, although this was usually a matter of chance rather than design. Complaints or incidents involving transport operators were also followed up by WHSQ, and notices, generally specific to individual hazards or risks, would be issued. The extensive contracting and subcontracting arrangements in the road freight industry often made it difficult to identify the duty holder responsible for the breach.

The issues in the individual notices, for example, worn or faulty webbing or chains used for load restraint, would be addressed and the notice thereby complied with. This often resulted in a short-term and low level control being implemented, one which only addressed the specific task or equipment identified in the notice. For example, a notice to replace webbing for a particular truck would result in action for the individual truck rather than consideration of all webbing used in that trucking business. Often this was complicated in that the trailer, and the load restraint equipment used on the trailer, may not belong to the business driving the prime mover which towed the trailer. Another common approach to complying with the notice involved declaring the equipment specified in the notice to be “out-of-service” – that is, the webbing would be moved from being used on the trailer and put into the trailer toolbox to be “repaired”. This approach meant the notice was complied with and was closed, or if done while the inspector was on-site, meant that the notice could not be issued. Often there was little that the inspector could do to ensure that the equipment did not “accidently” go back into service without the issue being fixed. Often issues were identified by a transport company as being the fault of the individual driver who was not an employee but was an owner driver or a sub-contractor and therefore difficult for the transport company to control. Whilst issuing notices undoubtedly did raise awareness and start to act as a catalyst for change for some issues, it was apparent that many issues went beyond the ability of an individual business or PCBU to change and overall WHS improvements were not occurring rapidly enough or being sustained.

2.3.2.2 Approach from 2010 - road freight transport

From 2010, after the transport safety summit in 2009 and the strategic analysis which followed, WHSQ developed a program of work around the road freight industry. Comprehensive analysis of the most significant risks occurred by analysis of workers’ compensation data (see Table 6 – risk clusters highlighted) and analysis of industry operations and management practices.

Table 6. Most significant risks for the transport industry 2007-08

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Agency of Injury</th>
<th>Mechanism of Injury</th>
<th>Workdays Lost</th>
<th>Most Common Mechanism by Agency of Injury, Transport and Storage, Qld, 2007-08 (Number)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Falls From a Height</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Falls on Same Level</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Vehicle Accident</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Being Hit by Moving Objects</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Muscular Stress No Objects Handled</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other and Not Specified Trucks, Semi-trailers, Lorries</td>
<td>Muscular Stress, Lift, Carry, Put Down</td>
<td>320</td>
<td>675</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Agency Not Apparent</td>
<td>Muscular Stress, Lift, Carry, Put Down</td>
<td>878</td>
<td>261</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other and Not Specified Cars, Station Wagons, Vans, Utility</td>
<td>Muscular Stress, Lift, Carry, Put Down</td>
<td>328</td>
<td>62</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other and Not Specified Forklifts</td>
<td>Muscular Stress, Lift, Carry, Put Down</td>
<td>2,249</td>
<td>626</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Baggage and Luggage</td>
<td>Muscular Stress, Lift, Carry, Put Down</td>
<td>3,345</td>
<td>1,136</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Buses, Trailbuses, Motorcoaches</td>
<td>Muscular Stress, Lift, Carry, Put Down</td>
<td>2.53</td>
<td>2.53</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other and Not Specified Traffic and Ground Surfaces</td>
<td>Muscular Stress, Lift, Carry, Put Down</td>
<td>158</td>
<td>67</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>Muscular Stress, Lift, Carry, Put Down</td>
<td>5,176</td>
<td>10,767</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The most serious hazards and risks (expressed as mechanisms of injury) in the industry are:

- falls from a height
- vehicle accidents (noting that WHSQ does not directly address vehicle accidents as these are dealt with under specific road laws administered by other State and Federal agencies)
- muscular stress, handling objects
- muscular stress, lift, carry, put down
- falls at the same level
- being hit by moving objects
In combination, three critical areas were identified for improvement strategies:

- moving and securing loads
- working at heights
- working around moving plant and traffic

The program of work developed for these critical areas recognised that, due to the inherent mobility of road freight workplaces, the high level of contracting and sub-contracting in the industry, and the high number and proportion of workers in small or micro businesses, it was not feasible to undertake comprehensive workplace inspections of all or even a significant proportion of businesses. A strong deterrence focussed approach, e.g. directive approach using notices to highlight and correct all non-compliances, whilst considered, was rejected as being extremely unlikely to be effective because of the low penetration that would occur in this type of industry. That is, the deterrence message would either not be communicated or it would be misconstrued leading to defiance rather than compliance. The program of work involved working directly with a fewer number of workplaces, providing them with information regarding the risks of common transport industry practices to the work health and safety of workers and others, and ensuring that management and workers collaborated to identify their own significant risks and developed solutions which not only could be applied to their own businesses but also could be shared widely throughout the industry, including their supply chains.

2.3.2.2.1 Moving and securing loads – safe handling when securing loads

In 2012, Workplace Health and Safety Queensland (WHSQ) completed a campaign to help workers, operators and employers understand the risks involved with securing and releasing loads on heavy vehicles. The campaign aimed to:

- reduce work related traumatic injuries and musculoskeletal disorders in Queensland
- identify areas of improvement and implement new processes by working with industry.

There were 574 site visits conducted across Queensland by WHSQ inspectors between 2012 and 2015, with a focus on workplaces where general freight, steel, concrete products, timber and logs are loaded and unloaded. The use of gates, curtains and tie-down equipment (chains, webbing and tensioners) were inspected with a focus on dogs and cheater bars (chain tensioning devices which are prolific in the industry but are considered dangerous to use), while securing or releasing loads. Unsafe practices were identified by the inspector, documented and corrective actions agreed with the transport operator. Follow-up only occurred in cases where the relevant duty holder was able to be easily located again. In many cases, this did not occur because it was determined to be logistically impossible due to the high mobility of the industry and difficulties in identifying the specific PCBU responsible for identified non-compliances (e.g. the driver of the truck may be a sub-contractor who travels 1000s kilometres each week, the trailer may be owned by a different party to the truck, loading and load tensioning may have been performed by yet another party). Information from the site visits was reviewed and used to develop enhanced guidance materials for wide dissemination in the industry. These included: an industry case study; a short film; written guidance materials including a self-audit checklist; and, a webinar.

2.3.2.2.2 Working at heights – preventing workers falling from trucks

The transport industry has a high rate of injuries and fatalities resulting from workers falling off trucks and trailers. Falls from trucks was identified as being responsible for the highest number of days off work of all workers compensation claims for the transport industry (see Table 6 above). Falls from trucks do not have a simple aetiology, falls are a complex problem which have a broad number of contributing factors including, the design of a vehicle, the equipment used, and the work practices and behaviour including organisational and broader industry factors. The risks should be identified and controlled by businesses operating in the road transport industry and their supply chains.
In 2013 WHSQ commenced a campaign to reduce fall related incidents within the transport industry and its supply chain. The campaign’s main objective is to work with industry to identify all the contributing factors and develop practical tools and information to assist the industry in addressing these.

Thirty workshops at transport industry workplaces were conducted. These involved working with groups of management and workers at a particular workplace to facilitate an understanding of falls risks associated with working around trucks and to encourage consultation and collaboration between workers and management to identify the most effective ways to address the risk of falls. Each workshop was different, some were specific to a single PCBU, others included contractors and the wider supply chain. One objective of each workshop was to produce a case study which could be published and assist other workers and businesses to address their falls risks. The case study produced by Australian Amalgamated Terminals provides a great example of what was achieved:

### Preventing workers falling from trucks

The potential dangers involved with numerous different operators, freight and vehicles on one site are something Australian Amalgamated Terminals (AAT) face on a daily basis. AAT operate a multi-user terminal at the Port of Brisbane.

With a number of businesses operating various vehicles, trailers and load types within one terminal, the risk of falls from trucks was identified as a serious issue requiring attention. AAT decided to take a consultative approach to identifying and managing the risks associated with falls from trucks.

AAT participated in a workshop run by Workplace Health and Safety Queensland (WHSQ) on preventing workers falling from trucks and used this to start an internal safety group. This group undertook consultation, including discussion with major transport contractors within their supply chain, to identify the load types and relevant operators involved.

The coordinator of the internal safety group then formed four consultative groups, one for each of the load types that AAT receives:

- steel transporters
- “roll-on, roll-off” heavy machinery transporters
- general freight, and
- car.

Each group looked at identifying the known risks about falls specific to that load type. From this, the group began identifying and developing best practice solutions to managing the risk of falls.

As a result of this program, AAT have implemented a number of control measures since the consultation commenced. One of the more significant controls has been the introduction of truck stands. To support this, AAT prepared instructions on their use, and conducted training for both internal staff and their supply chain. They have just completed a short safety video that includes how to use the truck stands.

AAT will reflect these changes in their site policies and procedures and ensure that they are effectively communicated to existing and new operators coming on site. It is expected that the uniform policies and procedures will improve efficiencies when loading and unloading.
Following the workshops, WHSQ conducted 145 workplace assessments. These were aimed at further assisting PCBUs and workers to identify equipment and activities which exacerbate the risk of falls, and to implement effective risk management. Inspectors found that issuing notices during this assessment process was difficult because workers avoided high risk activities while the inspector was on-site and there was insufficient evidence to support a reasonable belief of a breach. Further to this, inspectors found PCBUs and workers were receptive to identifying the risks and implementing action to address the risks when the “agreed actions” approach of discussion, documentation and follow-up was used. To further facilitate changed approaches, WHSQ developed a falls risk identification process that was piloted at 12 workplaces in 2014, released a short film in 2015 and facilitated a webinar about falls in 2016. A new industry case study about how one business managed to reduce falls at their workplace will be released in early 2017.

2.3.2.2.3 Working around moving plant and traffic

Two campaigns aimed at reducing injuries associated with the movement of vehicles and other mobile plant on-site commenced in 2016.

_Safely immobilising heavy vehicles and trailers_ was aimed at raising industry awareness and assisting workplaces to find ways to control the risks related to the immobilisation of heavy vehicles and trailers. Two hundred and fifty workplace assessments were conducted with inspectors taking an agreed actions approach, utilizing a simple checklist approach to focus attention on key risks (Figure 8.):
Figure 8. Extract of safely immobilising checklist

Where high risk activities were observed, inspectors considered whether a notice was warranted. In most cases, the unsafe practice was addressed immediately whilst the inspector was on-site, meaning that the criteria for issuing a notice was not satisfied. All issues identified were recorded by the inspector on the checklist and then discussed in detail with the PCBU to ensure that the unsafe practices did not reoccur.

The *Onsite traffic management campaign* commenced in 2016 and is being undertaken in three phases, with the final phase to be completed by the end of October 2017. This campaign aims to reduce the rate of fatalities and severity of injuries involving people being hit by mobile plant and vehicles at Queensland workplaces. This campaign is aimed at workplaces predominantly in the construction, agriculture, manufacturing, transport and logistics industries where there is mobile plant (e.g. forklifts, elevating work platforms, order pickers, earthmoving equipment, and cranes) or other vehicle traffic (e.g. cars, trucks). Although not transport industry specific, this campaign has particular significance for the transport industry since, in many cases, trucks or mobile plant interacting with trucks are the focus. Three hundred and twenty-two workplace assessments were conducted in Phase 1 of the campaign in 2016. Inspectors used an agreed actions approach, utilizing a comprehensive assessment tool, with issues and required corrective actions clearly identified (Figure 9).
2.3.2.3 Approach from 2010 – Passenger transport

In October 2010, the Queensland Minister for Transport formed the Bus Safety Committee (BSC), with representatives from the Department of Transport and Main Roads (TMR), TransLink Transit Authority (TransLink), Queensland Police Service (QPS), Department of Education and Training (DET), Office of Industrial Relations (Workplace Health and Safety Queensland), Queensland Bus Industry Council (QBIC), Transport Workers Union (TWU), Rail Tram and Bus Union, and the Queensland School Bus Alliance. The BSC’s key aims were to: seek solutions to reduce the level of assaults against bus drivers, and passengers; and, provide a forum to share information and expertise between the BSC, industry stakeholders and relevant experts.

In 2009-10, 363 assaults on a bus driver were reported in Queensland, with almost all (99 per cent) occurred in South East Queensland (SEQ). Over the same period, over 4.55 million scheduled bus services operated in SEQ, resulting in one assault being reported for every 12,639 services. Reported assaults fell into three main categories:

- physical - 22 per cent (80) of reported assaults including behaviours such as spitting, pushing and striking the driver,
• verbal - 71 per cent (256) assaults were reported, and
• objects thrown at the bus or its driver made up the remaining 7 per cent (27).

The fatal assault of Manmeet Sharma in 2016 provides an extreme example of the risk that bus drivers face.

WHSQ conducted a safety campaign between July and December 2016, across the passenger service providers in the bus, tram and ferry industries. This campaign aims to reduce injury rates in the bus, tram and ferry industries by assisting service providers to better manage risks of client aggression and violence against drivers and other on-board staff. This was informed the latest research (from Bond University) regarding the issues of client aggression and violence towards workers in the bus industry and consultation with key stakeholders including, Translink, Queensland Police Service, WorkCover Queensland, the Queensland Bus Industry Council, the Rail, Tram and Bus Union, and the Transport Workers’ Union.

WHSQ conducted on-site visits to provide information and assess work health and safety systems for risk management regarding client aggression and violence. This involved the inspector conducting:
  • a desktop review
  • an assessment of communication and incident response processes
  • discussions with managers, supervisors, team leaders and employees (full time, part-time, casuals).

Action plans (agreed actions) for each site were developed, where necessary, in consultation with the workplace to address any WHS system improvements. Follow-up and monitoring of the action plan progress occurred after the initial site-visit.

2.3.3 IPAM businesses within the transport industry

The Injury Prevention and Management (IPaM) initiative works with selected employers to ensure systems are in place to prevent workplace injury and, if people are injured, to return them to meaningful and appropriate work, as soon as practical. IPaM advisors work with employers who have comparatively high workers’ compensation claims rates and costs compared to other businesses of similar size and nature.

A total of 96 employers have participated or are currently participating in the program. This represents approximately 10 per cent of the 902 employers that have participated, or are participating in IPaM. These employers are in varying phases of participation, as follows:
  • 38 employers have completed the program.
  • 30 employers are currently engaged in the ‘active’ phase of the program (first 12 months).
  • 13 employers are currently in the ‘Supported Self-Management’ (SSM) phase of the program (second 12 months); and
  • 15 employers currently in discussions with IPaM Senior Advisors regarding future participation in the program.

Table 7 below shows a breakdown of the primary IPaM activities that have been undertaken with Transport industry employers since the commencement of the program.
Table 7. IPaM milestone activities with transport employers

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Primary IPaM activity:</th>
<th>Hazard reviews</th>
<th>Systems reviews</th>
<th>Climate reviews</th>
<th>Other worker engagement activities</th>
<th>BIPs established</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Number Undertaken:</td>
<td>68</td>
<td>54</td>
<td>40</td>
<td>39</td>
<td>64</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

An analysis of all Business Improvement Plan (BIP) developed for Transport industry employers participating in IPaM was undertaken in January 2017. Figure 10 below shows the breakdown of BIP items for Transport industry employers by category.

Figure 10. IPaM BIP items by category of action item for transport employers

For the transport companies reviewed as part of the 2017 BIP analysis, approximately 25 per cent (36 in total) of the Opportunities for Improvement (OFI) were issued in relation to System Review and Maintenance. Similarly to manufacturing, the OFIs issued in the transport industry were highest in relation to system review and maintenance, however in contrast the lowest focus area was hazard identification, being less than 5 per cent. Whereas in comparison to the construction industry, training and supervision OFIs were the most identified area with reporting and recording being the least identified. The analysis demonstrated that there are significant differences in the distribution of BIP items for each industry. The factors that could influence the distribution include but not limited to; differences in organisational characteristics, organisation risk profiles, gaps in WHS management systems and differences in the evidence provided by the employer.

For example, a large transportation company may have more critical risks to evaluate than a small manufacturing company; therefore, significantly more advice may be directed towards identifying hazards in the transport company than the manufacturing company. Or perhaps the transport company already has an efficient system in place for hazard identification; therefore, requires very minimal development/growth within this area when compared to a manufacturing company that does not have any system in place, so more advice in relation to hazard identification may be issued to the manufacturing company.

Table 8 below provides a breakdown of BIP items for a sample of Transport industry employers located throughout the state.
Table 8. IPaM BIP items by category for sample of transport employers

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Employer</th>
<th>Systems development</th>
<th>Hazard identification</th>
<th>Risk assessment and Control (including Safe Work Method Statements or Procedures)</th>
<th>Reporting and recording</th>
<th>Training and supervision</th>
<th>Communication and worker consultation</th>
<th>System review and maintenance</th>
<th>Injury management</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

2.3.3.1 Communication and consultation

The Systems Review also looks at the broad topic of consultation and communication in the workplace specifically testing an employer’s arrangements for Health and Safety Representatives and Committees (HSRs and HSCs). Since 2014, employers participating in the IPaM program have surveyed 11,140 workers to better understand their perception of the WHS and Injury Management culture in their workplace. In addition to this workers are also given the opportunity to participate in focus groups, which provide context for issues identified through the surveys. Information gathered in this process is reviewed (along with other workplace assessments completed) and incorporated into an employer’s BIP as ‘opportunities for improvement’.

A review of the communication and consultation element contained within the systems review showed that 33 IPaM employers (34 per cent) within the transport industry had some form of consultation mechanisms in place. These included WHS committees, WHS representatives, regular worker consultation in purchasing equipment and developing safe work method statements and WHS as a standard item on meeting agendas.

Detailed below are examples of the types of improvement strategies implemented by transport industry employers to improve their consultation mechanisms:

- Choosing HSRs, provide training and start WHS Committee that will be used to review WHS and RRTW policies etc. Will include driving health and wellbeing initiatives.
- Review and Improve communication and consultation with staff in regard to WHS and rehabilitation matters. Implement a program of monthly safety toolbox talks. Advise workers of their rights to nominate a Health and Safety Rep (HSR) and completing the appointment of a HSR.
- All staff participating in the IPaM climate survey, worker consultation and involvement when rolling out the “Preventing Workers Falling from Trucks” action plan. Supervisors and all workers watching resource material highlighting WHS responsibilities and continue with the already implemented safety improvements: Tool box talks, truck inspections (with workers), worker inductions.
- PCBU has facilitated the election of health and safety representatives and a Health and Safety Committee has been established, Regular OHS meetings involve Qld Regional Manager and HSE Coordinator - meetings consist of Monthly Pit stop Meetings (HSRs and Mgrs), Monthly staff Toolbox Meetings and a monthly management OHS meeting. All HSRs on site have been through formal election processes and given appropriate training.
• HSRs and HSC now present at all depots and all elected HSRs trained as per Act. All HSC members have undergone a customised external one day course on being a HSC Member. Monthly workplace consultative committee meetings held feedback to all committees of all accident/incident and injury reports at all monthly meetings weekly and ad hoc toolbox sessions now being held.
• Review of SWPs in consultation with workers (beginning with high risk/priority areas); and in consultation with workers considered some proactive health and wellbeing ideas.

Currently the IPAM program relies on workers compensation data to identify employers for participation in the program. The IPAM Action Plan 2017 – 2020 includes a number of key strategies that aim to broaden the scope of employers eligible to participate including:

• Introduction of IPAM Evolve program that facilitates systems improvement with small to medium size business. This program offers a 3 to 6 month intervention for businesses at varying stages of maturity, not currently suited to the 2 year IPAM intervention.
• Development of eligibility criteria to prioritise engagement with employers who choose to self-refer into the program.
• Collaboration with OIR Industry Strategy, Technical and Operational Units to identify alternate mechanisms for identification with particular focus on safety performance i.e inspector referrals, enforceable undertakings, targeted campaigns.
• Engage with Tier 1 employers to identify strategies to better engage with contactors across the supply chain.
• Partner with industry associations and other government departments to provide assistance using IPAM interventions and projects that deliver simplified tools and resources for small business.

2.3.4 Effectiveness of approach

Data for the road freight transport industry sector show that there has been a general decline in the claim incidence rate (time lost claims) over the past five years (Table 9). In 2015-16, road freight transport (WIC 461002) had a claim incidence rate of 33.2 claims per 1,000 employees.

Table 9. Claim incidence rate per 1,000 employees (time lost claims)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Sector</th>
<th>2011/12</th>
<th>2012/13</th>
<th>2013/14</th>
<th>2014/15</th>
<th>2015/16</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Road Freight Transport</td>
<td>43.1</td>
<td>40.3</td>
<td>38.2</td>
<td>36.3</td>
<td>33.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(WIC number 46002)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Transport, Postal and</td>
<td>25.2</td>
<td>24.3</td>
<td>22.8</td>
<td>22.9</td>
<td>20.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Warehousing</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>


There has been an overall reduction in the total number of accepted non-fatal claims across all industries in Queensland over the period from 2007-08 to 2015-16 in the order of 25 per cent. A reduction of approximately 27 per cent has been seen in the transport, postal and warehousing industry in Queensland over this time.

More specifically, the heavy road freight sector which is the highest risk area, and the main target of the interventions, shows a significant decline in the workdays lost for mechanisms
of injury focussed on (Table 10). This clearly demonstrates the effectiveness of the intervention approach.

Table 10. Workdays lost (where the agency of injury is trucks, semi-trailers and lorries)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>2007/08</th>
<th>2015/16</th>
<th>per cent change</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Falls from a height</td>
<td>11168</td>
<td>6761</td>
<td>-39 per cent</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Muscular stress, handling objects</td>
<td>4817</td>
<td>3896</td>
<td>-19 per cent</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Muscular stress, lift, carry, put down</td>
<td>320</td>
<td>173</td>
<td>-46 per cent</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Falls at the same level</td>
<td>1363</td>
<td>1372</td>
<td>+1 per cent</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Being hit by moving objects</td>
<td>283</td>
<td>No data</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Vehicle accident</td>
<td>7931</td>
<td>4945</td>
<td>-38 per cent</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Source: QEIDB all accepted claims (extracted Mar 20, 2012 and Jan 12, 2017).
Note: excludes fatalities, asbestosis and mesothelioma claims.

2.3.5 Conclusion

WHSQ employs a broad range of strategies with the transport industry in Queensland. These strategies are aimed at ensuring that long-term and sustained improvements are made, as well as ensuring that immediate obvious risks are addressed. These strategies recognise the highly mobile nature of the industry, the high level of contracting and sub-contracting arrangements, and the high level of work conducted outside a fixed workplace or on the premises of customer businesses. They are particularly aimed at enhancing the industry’s capacity to develop and implement their own improvements and share these widely throughout the industry and their supply chains.

Previously notices were the primary tool utilized to improve health and safety outcomes, predominately for singular risks and hazards. Review of this approach resulted in a broader strategy, which focusses on finding solutions for entrenched WHS issues, improving consultation and collaborations between workers and management of businesses and ensuring that timeframes are met for longer-term rectification. For particular businesses, more intense work through the IPaM program is used to improve overall safety management.

Statistics for this industry indicate that this broader approach is effective and workplace health and safety improvements are being realised.
2.4 Agriculture industry

The agriculture industry (encompassing agriculture, forestry and fishing and also referred to as the rural industry) is a high priority for Workplace Health and Safety Queensland (WHSQ), with specific consideration for the subsectors of Livestock and Horticulture. Agriculture is one of the most hazardous industries in Queensland, with a compensated fatal claim rate two to three times the state average in most years in recent times. Over the past 5 years, agriculture has accounted for 27 per cent of work-related fatalities notified to WHSQ, despite workers employed in the industry only accounting for approximately 3 per cent of the total Queensland workforce.

The agriculture industry has the highest proportion of self-employed workers of any industry. Farm workers also tend to work alone, in remote locations often without easily accessible first aid and medical intervention, and also lack mobile phone and internet services coverage. The nature of the work undertaken by agriculture workers sees this continuing to be one of the most dangerous industries to work in in Australia. Whilst agriculture is a physically dangerous industry, due to the isolation and economic challenges associated with the industry, mental health has continued to feature as a growing concern.

Since 2010-2011, the number of workers in the agriculture industry in Queensland is estimated to have decreased by over 20 per cent. Whilst the number of workers in the agriculture industry is declining, as with general trends, it is also an ageing population of workers. Though there was a decline in employees across age categories from 15 to 59 years of age, there was an increase in workers aged over 60. As a result, the rural sector has the most experienced workforce in Queensland. Older workers in the rural sector also tend to have much lower claim rates than younger workers; the shift in the age profile of the sector may have contributed significantly to a decrease in claims observed in the period since 2010.

Agriculture has a high proportion of non-employees, meaning those that are employers, self-employed own account workers, contributing family members, and unpaid voluntary workers. Many of these work on family owned and operated farms. The percentage of non-employees in the agriculture industry is much higher than other industries in Queensland. Furthermore, horticulture has a high rate of transient workers, with many backpackers and visa workers employed on a temporary, seasonal basis. Many of these businesses are also small businesses, with limited capacity and competence concerning appropriate WHS management practice. These factors increase the complexity of WHS management for the sector. This has continued to influence the approach taken by WHSQ in regulating the industry, and working to obtain positive WHS compliance outcomes.

Workers in the rural sector are much less likely to make a workers’ compensation claim, with a rate of 23 claims per 1,000 workers for rural workers compared to the state average of 40.4 claims per 1,000 worker. WHSQ data suggests that rural workplaces tend not to report minor injuries. Data from 2009-2010 demonstrate that 73 per cent of workers’ compensation claims for the industry involved time off work, as compared to a state average of 53 per cent in Queensland. By comparison, agriculture had the lowest percentage of claims for medical expenses only at 21 per cent, half of the state average of 42 per cent. Factors that may result in under-reporting of injuries in the agriculture industry include: geographical isolation, lack of understanding of workers’ compensation claim requirements, production pressures, and the culture of the workplace. In addition to this, many workers are not supported by the workers compensation scheme as they are business owners. When workers in rural workplaces do make claims, these tend to be of a serious nature. The national serious injury claim rate for agriculture, Forestry and Fishing is 21.6 claims per 1,000 workers, nearly double the national average of 12.6. In Queensland, this industry has the highest average lost days per claim at 26.5, which is also approaching the state average of 14.9 days. It is
likely that the overall industry claim rate would be higher if less serious injuries were to be captured.

WHSQ recognises that a broad range of strategies are required to ensure that long-term and sustained improvements are made, particularly given the complexity of the industry. In 2015, WHSQ’s regulatory approach to the agriculture industry became more focussed, with a group of highly mobile inspectors and advisors dedicated to regulating WHS in the agriculture forming the Agriculture Strategy Unit. This allows for specialist, targeted responses to some of the unique WHS issues encountered within the sector, and also acknowledges the need for responsiveness given the rural and often remote nature of many agriculture workplaces. WHSQ has been able to cultivate an approach and broader strategy, which combines strategically issued notices, agreed actions, campaigns, stakeholder engagement, and education and awareness initiatives that will lead to longer-term rectification of WHS issues across the industry. This is supplemented by working more intensely with particular businesses to improve overall WHS management. WHSQ has focussed programs on:

- targeting interventions at key hazards and risks
- increasing awareness about safety in agriculture
- improving understanding of WHS legislation and requirements
- ensuring campaigns and regulatory programs encompass relevant education
- maintaining continued efforts to ensure sustained improvements to WHS
- engaging with a range of expert and industry stakeholders and other government agencies to inform programs and deliver collaborative and sustainable programs and strategies.

For agriculture, WHSQ places emphasis on using an agreed actions approach, which achieves compliance and enhances the knowledge and skills needed by agriculture businesses to continue improving their WHS management and protection for the WHS of workers and others. Due to the small nature of many agriculture businesses, and the lack of knowledge employers and workers often have around WHS management, it is often more effective for an inspector to work through a WHS issue with the business and support rectification of breaches, rather than issuing notices that the businesses and workers may struggle to understand. By the time an inspector explains how a business might rectify a breach, the business has often taken action to apply rectifications, withdrawing the need for notices to be issued. By working collaboratively with businesses, inspectors are better able to educate and facilitate ongoing improvements to WHS management that result in greater general compliance. The geographic isolation of many of these businesses (and travel time for an inspector to visit) is another factor that impacts compliance monitoring and enforcement. An agreed actions approach which clearly outlines risks to be managed, and provides opportunity for agriculture business owners to use photographic evidence to demonstrate their compliance, allows for effective monitoring while minimising physical site visits. Inspectors and Advisors spend a considerable amount of time working with the businesses to encourage cultural change and improve OHS outcomes.

Employers who continue to have comparatively high workers’ compensation claims rates and costs compared to other businesses of similar size and nature are selected for additional focused attention under the Injury Prevention and Management Program (IPaM). The IPaM initiative works with these employers to ensure systems are in place to prevent workplace injury and, if people are injured, to return people to meaningful and appropriate work, as soon as practical. Forty-five employers from the agriculture industry have participated or are currently participating in IPaM.

### 2.4.1 Rationale for focus on agriculture

Claims in the agriculture industry are concentrated in select sub-sectors. Five subgroups account for over 75 per cent of all claims and workdays lost, including: fruit and tree nut growing, mushroom and vegetable growing, nursery and floriculture production, sheep, beef
and cattle grain farming, and agriculture and fishing support services. The most serious injury clusters for agriculture include: falling from or being hit by animals, vehicular accidents including falling from vehicles, knives, and falls on the same level. Animals and vehicles tend to present the greatest risk to the health and safety of workers in agriculture.

From January 2011 to January 2016, there were 45 work-related fatalities in agriculture investigated by safety inspectors; over 20 per cent of these were quad bike fatalities (a total of 10 since January 2011). Fatalities in agriculture are generally concentrated among the young and old, with heavy machinery, quad bikes, tractors, and motorbikes a major cause of fatalities.

Whilst the general rate of fatalities has decreased, agriculture continues to have one of the highest rates of fatalities of all industries in Australia. It is for this reason that WHSQ continues to work on strategies that achieve improved outcomes for this sector.

Livestock and horticulture are sub-sectors of specific focus for WHSQ. A broad range of intervention activities to address the most prevalent workers’ compensation claims in this industry, e.g. slips, trips and falls, MSDs, vehicular incidents, and fractures, were developed under Priority industry Action Plans for these two sub-sectors.

2.4.2 Regulatory approach

Agriculture has long been the focus of WHSQ regulatory activity, however, in the past the focus has been on general education about improving on-farm WHS and responding to complaints and incident notifications. More recently the approach has been to focus on the highest risk activities and sub-sectors with specific campaigns. Examples of the regulatory approaches, and how statutory notices are used strategically with an agreed actions approach, are given below.

2.4.2.1 Quad bikes

Quad bikes were identified as an emerging issues for farm safety several years ago. In 2010, three quad bike fatalities were recorded in Australia; this jumped considerably to 18 in 2011. In 2011, there were nearly twice as many quad bike fatalities as tractor-related fatalities. Furthermore, over 240 quad bike-related fatalities occurred in Australia since 2001, and over 70 of these have occurred in Queensland alone. In addition to fatalities, hundreds of hospitalisations have occurred in Queensland as a result of quad bike-related injuries. Due to the alarming increases of quad-bike related incidents, in 2015 the Queensland Deputy State Coroner conducted an inquest and made a number of recommendations aimed at preventing quad bike-related fatalities.

In response to the unacceptable rate of quad bike-related incidents in Queensland, the Office of Industrial Relations (OIR) established the Quad Bike Interagency Group in 2015. The Interagency Group’s role was to develop a whole-of-government State-wide plan for quad bike safety aimed at creating awareness of the risks of using quad bikes in a wide range of settings and to reduce the high rate of incidents involving quad bikes across Queensland. Establishing the Interagency Group (IAG) recognised the complexity of this issue, as quad bike use is not limited to the workplace, with many being used in recreational activities, rural activities, or for adventure tourism.

The Queensland Government has launched the Statewide Plan for Improving Quad Bike Safety in Queensland 2016-2019. The Office of Industrial Relations played a significant role in the development of these guidelines, including having procured QUT to undertake an analysis of quad bike-related injuries in Queensland.

Leading on from the Plan, WHSQ has engaged in major campaigns to address quad bike safety. In June 2016, the Ride Ready awareness campaign was launched, addressing key issues raised through the Queensland Quad Bike inquest. OIR ran the Ride Ready advertising campaign in 2016-17 at an estimated cost of $585,000 to encourage the safe
use of quad bikes. Advertising concepts were developed through extensive market research and industry and IAG consultation. Advertising was promoted leading up to and during each school holiday period—when quad bike-related injury and fatality statistics traditionally peak. Post campaign research was conducted in October 2016 showed a positive influence of rider attitudes.

WHSQ continues to monitor compliance with the use of quad bikes and side-by-side vehicles on farms, and in the agri-tourism and tourism industries. Inspectors promote the resources compiled through the Ride Ready campaign, promote the importance of selecting the right tool for the task, and ensure quad bike users have enough information, instruction and training to use the quad bikes safely. Where non-compliance issues are identified, statutory notices are issued.

As part of WHSQ’s focus on improving safety outcomes for quad bike users, the Quad Bike Industry Reference Group (QBIRG) was formed in late 2015 following the Queensland Quad Bike Inquest. This key group of stakeholders meet regularly, share information and work towards standardising messaging, improving training and greater awareness of the risks quad bikes and side-by-side vehicles in Queensland.

2.4.2.2 Horticulture industry

Itinerant workers are integral to the horticulture industry due to the low stable population base surrounding the intensive horticulture growing areas across Queensland. Language barriers, cultural diversity and the nature of the work in the horticulture industry makes these travelling workers vulnerable to exploitation. The exploitation of backpackers and students on work visas working in the horticulture industry in Queensland has been well reported in the media over a number of years.

In July 2015, the Deputy Director-General, Office of Industrial Relations (OIR) approved the establishment of an interagency group to progress the safety, rights and well-being of travelling migrant workers in the horticultural industry.

The Horticulture Workers Interagency Group (HWIG) is chaired by WHSQ and has representatives from thirteen State and three Commonwealth government agencies. The HWIG established working groups around four streams:

- information about rights and responsibilities on arrival (Arrival)
- safe and compliant work (Work)
- safe and fit accommodation (Accommodation)
- building supportive communities (Community)

WHSQ chairs the “Work” working group which has representatives from the Queensland Police Service (QPS), Transport and Main Roads (TMR), Fair Work Ombudsman (FWO), Office of Fair Trading (OFT), WorkCover Queensland, Department of Agriculture and Fisheries (DAF) and Office of Industrial Relations (OIR). From 2016 WHSQ partnered with the FWO, QPS, Industrial Relations Compliance, TMR, and WorkCover Queensland on compliance campaigns in all the major horticulture growing regions as part of a body of work under the HWIG. All major horticulture growing areas have been visited. During 2016, WHSQ led the on farm assessments which were completed in all major horticulture growing areas under the “At Work” working group focussing on the issues relating to travelling migrant workers.

2.4.2.2.1 An example of strategic work in the pineapple industry

The horticulture industry is a high priority for Workplace Health and Safety Queensland (WHSQ) as recent statistics show that although 3 per cent of the Queensland workforce is employed in this industry, it is responsible for 30 per cent of the fatalities. As part of this approach, WHSQ designed a program of work focusing on high production areas of horticulture through Queensland, and as such the pineapple industry in the Yeppoon was selected as a focus area. The local industry comprises of approximately 20 growers who
employ around 400 people through the production season. This industry has grown significantly after rebuilding following cyclone Marcia in 2015, with many businesses expanding and purchasing more properties and some working in cooperative arrangements to value take control over their supply chain. As businesses have re-established and reformed, risks to WHS have increased. Whilst WHSQ had been working with high level stakeholders in this industry and had been focusing generally on the horticulture industry across Queensland, it was recognised that the data available from the workers’ compensation system was not adequately reflecting the actual risk to the health and safety of workers and others in this particular area.

As a first step, WHSQ participated in a ‘farm walk’ where growers, industry specialists and WHSQ all walked and talked together to highlight various business risk areas growers. It was apparent from this that local industry representatives had little working knowledge of the WHS legislation and risk management was ad-hoc and high risk issues not adequately addressed.

WHSQ used a mobile team of inspectors with a high skill set and extensive knowledge of the agriculture industry to monitor compliance, a similar approach that is used across Queensland. They conducted 19 coordinated assessment site visits which focused on a systems approach to managing WHS, rather than hazard spotting. The assessments found low levels of compliance with most aspects and an agreed actions approach to improvements was implemented. This process has resulted in the following outcomes:

• Formation of a sound working relationship with the growers
• Debunking some of the myths created better discussion on enhancing safety
• Growers appear to have a better understanding of what minimum compliance looks like
• The uptake of a documented health and safety system is now more obvious with some growers well on the way and others with more work to do.
• Five growers in the Bungundarra area of Yeppoon are forging an alliance to create a common documented Health and Safety Management system.
• More growers are moving towards custom built mobile plant
• Substantial changes to pineapple growing blocks has occurred and will continue in order to accommodate the wider body harvesting trailers
• The new trailers have greater built in safety features and have also proven to be slightly more economical for time taken to harvest
• Communication channels between WHSQ and Growers has eased in to a 2 way discussion rather than just a grower being reactive to an inspector identifying a defect or non-compliance. This one benefit alone will improve the ability of the stakeholders to comply.

2.4.2.2.2 An example of strategic work in the macadamia industry

Macadamia Australia are one of the largest group of macadamia producers in Queensland and Australia, with plantations across Central and Northern Queensland. Maintaining 130,000 macadamia trees, and promoting best practice and innovation in growing and handling, 2000 tone of nuts are harvested each year. Due to this huge task, over 200 people are employed for field work, operating machinery and working in their processing plant.

Macadamia Australia have a non-negotiable code of ethics for all suppliers to their businesses, the consequence of breaching this code is potential cancellation of supply agreements. Meeting requirements of various statutory legislation is part of this code, so all suppliers have an interest in keeping on top of their legislative requirements, including WHS.

A supplier to Macadamia Australia in North Queensland came to the attention of WHSQ through a mobile team of inspectors who were monitoring compliance with WHS in the horticulture industry. On first visit the property appeared in good shape, but further inspection located old and poorly designed plant with very rudimentary guarding, the hazardous chemical plant was in poor condition and unmaintained, posing a risk to both
people and the environment. Staff, including backpackers, were not supervised or provided adequate training on the high risk tasks and general housekeeping of the packing shed was poor.

Further to that, the PCBU was in a highly emotive state and extremely critical of the government, as another of his farms had just been quarantined through a bio-security issues by DAF, and further testing had confirmed a false diagnosis, thus leaving the farmer with considerable production and reputational loss. The farmer made it known that he was seeking legal action against DAF and the staff involved. Had WHSQ been aware of this ongoing dispute inspectors would not have visited the workplace at that time.

To gain compliance with legislative requirements and diffuse the highly emotive and agitated state of the PCBU, the Inspector felt they needed to be extremely flexible to seek compliance and use all methods possible to persuade the PCBU to comply.

The inspectors used a mix of enforcement methods in the following order:
- statutory notices for high risk issues that placed workers at immediate risk, taking time to explain the necessity with the PCBU
- agreed actions captured through work plans for longer term rectifications such as major redesign of guarding, housekeeping and training of staff doing lower risk work

These agreed actions were closely monitored, through regular conversation, the sharing of photographs, work orders and receipts as an indication that work was ongoing, and site visits to confirm the work was actually being done.

Utilising this method enabled the business to work towards best practice and not just meeting legislative requirements. The Inspector also put the PCBU in touch with the Queensland Workforce Development Officer who, as part of their role, research business management and skills based training for the agriculture sector, this enabled quality training, on site at a reduced cost.

2.4.2.3 Livestock Industry

The livestock industry is a focus for WHSQ due to the high risk nature of the work and the high number of incidents. The serious claim rate is 45 per cent higher than the whole of industry rate for agriculture. WHSQ has carried out a body of work under two projects focussing on the livestock industry. The Beef project on-farm activities were restricted due to the severe drought which affected over 80 per cent of the state for the last four years. However WHSQ undertook stakeholder engagement and education activities working through the Grazing Best Management Practice program throughout the state and with Agforce to deliver presentations and workshops to the beef industry.

The Intensive Livestock project involved WHSQ in the completion of audits on feedlots and saleyards throughout the state focussing on safety in yards and loading facilities and safety by design. This work is ongoing.

An example of the collaboration with corporate beef producers and industry organisations is the Beef Industry Advisory Group (BISAG) that was formed in 2013 to bring safety managers from corporate agriculture together to share information and improve safety outcomes for their own enterprises and mentor smaller producers. Activities include – industry booklet, on farm field days focusing on cattle yard design, a film of yard design and more recently a strong interest in safety leadership through the beef supply chain.

2.4.3 IPAM businesses within the agriculture industry

The Injury Prevention and Management (IPaM) initiative works with selected employers to ensure systems are in place to prevent workplace injury and, if people are injured, to return them to meaningful and appropriate work, as soon as practical. IPaM advisors work with
employers who have comparatively high workers’ compensation claims rates and costs compared to other businesses of similar size and nature.

A total of 45 Agriculture industry employers have participated or are currently participating in the program. This represents approximately 5 per cent of the 902 employers that have participated, or are participating in IPaM. These Agriculture industry employers are in varying phases of participation, as follows:

- 16 employers have completed the program.
- 14 employers are currently engaged in the ‘active’ phase of the program (first 12 months).
- 4 employers are currently in the ‘Supported Self-Management’ (SSM) phase of the program (second 12 months); and
- 11 employers currently in discussions with IPaM Senior Advisors regarding future participation in the program.

Table 11 shows a breakdown of the number of these key IPaM activities that have been undertaken with the agriculture industry employers since the commencement of the program.

Table 11. IPaM milestone activities with Agriculture employers.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Primary IPaM activity:</th>
<th>Hazard reviews</th>
<th>Systems reviews</th>
<th>Climate reviews</th>
<th>Other worker engagement activities</th>
<th>BIPs established</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Number Undertaken:</td>
<td>28</td>
<td>28</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>22</td>
<td>26</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Through this comprehensive review and engagement process worker participation is notably improved, as is the business’ ability to comply with legal obligations. Worker involvement in this process and feedback through participation in safety climate reviews is critical to ensuring Business Improvement Plans (BIP) are realistic and sustainable.

Table 12 provides a breakdown of BIP items for a sample of agriculture industry employers located throughout the state.

Table 12. IPaM BIP items by category for sample of agriculture employers

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Employer</th>
<th>Systems development</th>
<th>Hazard identification</th>
<th>Risk assessment and Control (including Safe Work Method Statements or Procedures)</th>
<th>Reporting and recording</th>
<th>Training and supervision</th>
<th>Communication and worker consultation</th>
<th>System review and maintenance</th>
<th>Injury management</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

2.4.3.1 Communication and consultation

The Systems Review also looks at the broad topic of consultation and communication in the workplace specifically testing an employer’s arrangements for Health and Safety Representatives and Committees (HSRs and HSCs). Since 2014, employers participating in...
the IPaM program have surveyed 11,140 workers to better understand their perception of the WHS and Injury Management culture in their workplace. In addition to this workers are also given the opportunity to participate in focus groups, which provide context for issues identified through the surveys. Information gathered in this process is reviewed (along with other workplace assessments completed) and incorporated into an employer’s BIP as ‘opportunities for improvement’ (OFI).

A number of employers in this sector are in the early stages of engagement with IPaM and are yet to undertake a detailed system review. For those employers where the communication and consultation element contained within the systems review showed that 12 IPaM employers (57 per cent) within the Agriculture industry had some form of consultation mechanisms in place. These included WHS committees, WHS representatives, regular worker consultation in purchasing equipment and developing safe work method statements and WHS as a standard item on meeting agendas.

Examples of BIP action items undertaken by Agriculture industry employers to improve their consultation mechanisms include:

- ‘Agreed Consultation arrangements are established - Tool Box Meetings - Tool Box Training Sessions (documented). Encourage and promote the implementation of a Safety Committee (sections 75-79 WHS Act 2011). Encourage and promote the Implementation of Health and Safety Representatives (sections 50-57 WHS Act 2011). Assist those selected as committee members and or Health and Safety Representatives by having them trained in risk assessment and investigation processes. Develop a formal documented consultation process (Sections 46-49 WHS Act 2011). Workers must be given reasonable opportunity to express views or raise issues. Must be consulted when identifying hazards and assessing risks. Proposing any changes that may affect the health and safety of workers and encouraging staff to report near misses in a safe environment – the more workers are recognized for reporting the more they will report’

- Employees - be involved in the development, implementation and review of policies, procedures for hazard identification; Be consulted where there are any changes that affect the workplace OHS, Select those who will represent them regarding OHS matters, Be informed as to who is/are their employee OHS reps and management reps. Those representing employees should have appropriate training to undertake effectively their involvement. Procedures for ensuring that OHS information is communicated to and from employees and other interested parties. At monthly or weekly meetings make mention of the below items, any changes to the system, new equipment etc’.

2.4.4 Effectiveness of approach

The effectiveness of the approach taken to address compliance in agriculture, particularly the establishment of the Agriculture Strategy Unit, is evident and appears to be supporting positive shifts in WHS management for the sector. The Unit has been focused on ensuring responsiveness to complaints and incidents, whilst undertaking a range of proactive assessments and advisory work. Table 13 demonstrates number of activities for the past three years (with the 16/17 data as at April 19 2017).
Table 13. Regulatory activities in agriculture

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Financial year</th>
<th>14/15</th>
<th>15/16</th>
<th>16/17 to date</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Advisories</td>
<td>184</td>
<td>314</td>
<td>220</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Proactive assessments</td>
<td>312</td>
<td>469</td>
<td>284</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Reactive assessments</td>
<td>96</td>
<td>99</td>
<td>120</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Improvement Notices</td>
<td>41</td>
<td>73</td>
<td>131</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Prohibition notices</td>
<td>22</td>
<td>17</td>
<td>11</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The agriculture industry has experienced a significant reduction in the number and rate of fatalities over the past five years, and a consistent annual reduction in the number and rate of injuries:
- there has been a 75 per cent reduction in the annual number of fatalities over the past five years
- permanent injury claims each year have reduced by 60 per cent over the last five years.

2.4.5 Conclusion

WHSQ has employed a broad range of strategies with the agriculture industry in Queensland. These strategies are aimed at ensuring that long-term and sustained improvements are made, as well as ensuring that immediate obvious risks are addressed.

WHSQ has a specific focus on the agriculture industry and a dedicated group of inspectors. Emphasis is placed on using an agreed actions approach, which achieves compliance and enhances the knowledge and skills needed by agriculture businesses to continue improving their WHS management and protection for the WHS of workers and others. Notices are still used when warranted, however, these are used more strategically and inspectors fully explain why a notice has been issued and what is needed to comply with the notice. Notices tend not to be used in isolation; an agreed actions approach supplements the notices with more in-depth processes and timeframes for longer-term rectification. For businesses which need additional attention, the IPaM program provides the opportunity for WHSQ to work more intensely with particular businesses to improve overall safety management.

Statistics for this industry indicate that this broader approach is effective and workplace health and safety improvements are being realised.
2.5 Metals manufacturing

The metals manufacturing industry is a high priority for Workplace Health and Safety Queensland (WHSQ), as it forms a critical aspect of the broader manufacturing industry, which is identified as a priority within the national strategy adopted by Safe Work Australia. For 2006-07, Queensland’s manufacturing claim rate was around 30 per cent higher than the Australian average and in 2010 WHSQ commissioned Marsden Jacob Associated (MJA) to evaluate the potential sources of this higher claim rate, considering differences between Queensland and other jurisdictions. Through this review, a small number of high risk sectors were identified as particularly prominent and therefore problematic in high risks for the Manufacturing sectors. These high risk sectors included:

- fabricated metal product, and
- structural metal product

As a result of this review, a major strategy for the metals manufacturing Industry was developed.

WHSQ recognises that a broad range of strategies are required to ensure that long-term and sustained improvements are made, as well as ensuring that immediate obvious risks are addressed. Previously, there was less focused effort and strategy regarding metals manufacturing, with notices used as the primary tool for securing compliance. Review of this approach resulted in a broader strategy, which combined strategically placed notices, industry engagement, and working more intensely with particular businesses to improve overall safety management.

To provide ongoing support to businesses, two metals manufacturing industry networks (Brisbane north and Brisbane south) were established in 2013 to provide a forum for responding to the immediate needs of the industry. The networks initially held around eight meetings a year and were guided by the interests of participants. The metals manufacturing industry now participates as part of a broader manufacturing network meeting process, and meets quarterly. These safety network meetings provide safety professionals and managers with a forum to discuss ideas, issues, problems and solutions specific to their industry.

Metals manufacturing has also more recently been targeted through education, with specific focus on key hazards as well as general duties, including topics such as safety leadership, chain of responsibility, and consultation and communication.

The Metals Manufacturing Industry experience has shown that taking a three pronged approach to regulating the industry provides more sustained outcomes than a single approach. The three aspects are:

- focused attention on the most significant risks, ensuring that unmanaged risks are quickly addressed, either immediately by the PCBU or under direction of a notice
- using agreed actions to identify all unmanaged hazards and risks, and more broadly documenting these and ensuring that the PCBU either addresses them immediately or in a set timeframe, which is discussed and followed-up by the inspector until all are addressed
- intensive work with selected employers with poor workers’ compensation claims experience to ensure that they are addressing all hazards and risks and improving their overall management of WHS

In 2012, WHSQ purchased the copyright and licence to host, on our website, the Metal Fabrication Improving Safety through Layout and Design (known as the ‘Metal Fabrication Tool’). This is an online interactive tool that supports workplaces to improve safety through layout and design. The aim of adopting this tool from Victoria was to support Queensland’s metal fabrication workplaces by providing a visual and interactive tool to upskill employers around making their workplace safer for redesigning the layout of their factory floor. The tool guides the employer through specific tasks and areas common to fabricated metal
workplaces, such as welding and grinding, storage, vehicle loading/unloading and in the office.

A link can be found here: https://www.worksafe.qld.gov.au/?a=85703

2.5.1 Rationale for focus on metals manufacturing

In 2013-14, the serious injury claim rate for metal manufacturing, at 22.2 claims per 1000 workers, was approximately 20 per cent higher than for the overall manufacturing industry (18.1) and almost double the all industries claim rate (12.6). Half of the serious claims were for musculoskeletal disorders, such as body stressing from repeated handling of pieces of metal.

Metals manufacturing is a specific focus for WHSQ. A broad range of intervention activities to address the most prevalent workers’ compensation claims in this industry, e.g. cuts and lacerations, objects in the eye, and body stressing, were developed under a Priority Industry Action Plan.

2.5.2 Regulatory approach

Metals manufacturing has long been the focus of WHSQ regulatory activity. Strategic examination of the regulatory approach, which included consideration of the MJA report, indicated that the approach being taken was not leading to sustained improvement in the industry. Furthermore, large numbers of serious incidents (notifiable events) at these workplaces were being reported.

Since 2010, WHSQ has undertaken a number of campaigns and initiatives to work with metals manufacturing to improve WHS performance across the industry. In 2010, nine state-wide workshops, in collaboration with QMI Solutions, were delivered around Queensland on how improve the bottom line in the manufacturing industry by reducing work-related sprains and strains. These workshops delivered information on managing hazardous manual tasks while incorporating LEAN manufacturing practices. The workshops were titled: ‘Building Better Business - Manufacturing Industry Workshops’.

From 2011, WHSQ targeted metals manufacturing in a campaign focussed on risks associated with manual tasks, housekeeping and traffic management. This program was piloted in the metals and plastics industry in 2011 and then extended in 2012 and 2013 to employers operating in:

- fabricated and sheet metal product manufacturing
- transport equipment manufacturing
- machinery and equipment manufacturing

A feature of this program was that inspectors worked flexibly with employers using an agreed actions approach to focus on their priority safety issues. Prior to full implementation, WHSQ trialled this new relationship management approach with select companies with a history of high injury claim rates. Inspectors made up to three visits per site. Where appropriate, employers were invited to attend small business workshops, Participative Ergonomics for Manual tasks (PErforM) group coaching sessions or PErforM one-on-one coaching. Improvements were identified and the business worked progressively to implement them, with follow-up and additional action (e.g. notices), where necessary by inspectors.

In 2014, new initiatives in the metal industry strategy were developed. Interventions planned for metal manufacturing were incorporated into the Manufacturing Industry Action Plan and the associated consultation process. An important new program for metals manufacturing at this time was the ‘eyes and hands’ injury prevention initiative. This program aimed to reduce the incidence rate of injuries resulting from fragments in eyes and lacerations to hands and fingers, within fabricated metal and metal product manufacturing workplaces. The focus has
now shifted to production and non-production tasks, including maintenance, cleaning tasks and unplanned stoppages, as this is recognised as a key risk area.

2.5.2.1 Eyes and hands in manufacturing campaign

The eyes and hands campaign was a two-phase engagement project conducted between November 2013 and September 2015. An assessment tool for inspectors was developed (see Figure 11), focused on identifying workplace systems and processes for managing risks relating to eye and hand injuries. The subsectors captured within the campaign included:

- primary metal and metal product manufacturing (i.e. Non-ferrous metal coating, steel pipe and tube manufacturing)
- fabricated metal product manufacturing (i.e. boiler, tank, sheet metal, prefabricated, iron and steel forging manufacturing)
- transport equipment manufacturing (i.e. motor vehicle and trailer manufacturing)
- machinery and equipment manufacturing (i.e. pump and compressor manufacturing)

During inspector visits within the campaign, inspectors worked with businesses to identify common tasks undertaken within the workplace that might result in an injury to eyes and/or hands, scoring workplace performance against best practice criteria. This allowed for identification of gaps in managing risks, and development of industry capability to controls these risks. This agreed actions approach provided the basis for documenting deficiencies, enabling the businesses to address these and the inspector to follow-up to ensure that corrective action had been taken.

During the campaign, 200 workplace assessments were conducted. Of these workplaces, 34 per cent had ad-hoc processes or gaps in risk assessments, 66 per cent demonstrated good practice, and 74 per cent of workplaces actioned changes following the visit by WHSQ.

Outcomes of the campaign by way of industry action included:

- updating policies, procedures and manuals
- creating risk registers
- conducting additional audits
- maintaining hand tools and bandsaws
- maintaining and replacing defective guards
- maintaining and replacing defective PPE
- changing internal consultation processes to manage risk.
### 1. Management commitment

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Elements</th>
<th>Best practice examples</th>
<th>Evidence/comments</th>
<th>Rating</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>
| 1.1 Does management demonstrate commitment to health and safety in the workplace? | • Participate in safety meetings/forums.  
• Substantial resources for purchase of appropriate PPE.  
• WHS Policy displayed and up-to-date.  
• Safety/whs training given in pre-start meetings/teams.  
• Safe work processes exist.  
• Management maintain health and safety knowledge and skills.  
• Safety issues are identified and acted on  
• Ask descriptions have safety components and safety 10% | Policy in induction and well displayed, updated to reflect current legislation.  
Monthly injury report procedure exists.  
Completed SWPS – review for CNCs, trade press, slowly adding other SWPS.  
Risk Assessment training done. Viewed hazard report form. | 2 |
| 1.2 Health and safety responsibilities specifically allocated at the workplace? | • WHS responsibilities outlined in all position descriptions.  
• Health and Safety contact accessible and active in the workplace.  
• WHS Training identified and given.  
• WHS Training identified and given.  
• Safety/whs training given in pre-start meetings/teams.  
• WHS Training identified and given.  | WHS responsibilities not in position descriptions.  
Health and Safety person – one in management, one on floor. One selected.  | 2 |
| 1.3 How are safety issues identified and acted on? | • Risk register is current and reflects all processes in the workplace.  
• Controls are in accordance to the hierarchy of controls.  
• Communication outcomes.  
• Management signs off on safety issues | No specific risk register.  
Hazard reporting forms in place. Tool box talks held.  
Viewed management sign off of hazard reports.  
Hierarchy of control followed. | 3 |
| 1.4 Is safety considered when purchasing items? | • Risk assessments of work processes and equipment undertaken.  
• Risk assessments of work processes and equipment undertaken.  
• Risk assessments of work processes and equipment undertaken.  | Risk assessments for some tasks in SWPS.  
Workshop consulted before purchasing PPE. | 2 |
| 1.5 Is safety considered when designing/changing work processes? | • Risk assessments of work processes and equipment undertaken prior to design change or modification.  
• Managers wear required PPE.  
• Managers participate in safety activities.  
• Managers report on ‘red’ indicators, for example.  
• Monthly safety audits conducted.  
• Training sessions held.  
• Safety observation reports.  
• Hazards identified and controlled | Actively that risk assessments of work processes and equipment undertaken prior to design change.  
Monthly reports.  
Manager signs off on hazard reports. Tool box talks held.  
No documented accidents, possibility vertebrae to the right. | 3 |

**Rating for management commitment:**  
8.23 Improvement required  
12 Working towards a systematic approach  
13.86 Good practice

### 2. Risk management and control — eye and hand

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Elements</th>
<th>Best practice examples</th>
<th>Evidence/comments</th>
<th>Rating</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>
| 2.1 How are risks identified? | • Potential for eye and hand injuries have been identified in the risk register.  
• Plant risk register exists.  
• Documentation procedures exist for hazard identification and risk assessment.  
• Risk register updated and reviewed to reflect recent incidents. | Hazard reporting forms, induction spells out obligations to report.  
Corrective measures. Tool box talks. Some risk assessments documented | 2 |
| 2.2 Are risk assessments conducted? | • Risk assessments are carried out.  
• A plant risk register in accordance with legislation i.e. High risk plant register.  
• Risk assessments are reflective of consequence and likelihood of eye and hand injuries. | Risk assessments in SWPS.  
Viewed tool kit SOP contains risk assessment.  
Reflective of possible eye and hand injuries. Not all activities and equipment here had risk assessments conducted. | 2 |
| 2.3 What controls are in place for managing risk? | • The hierarchy of control is followed when managing risk to eye and hand.  
• Controls are appropriate to the hazard and risk.  
• Corrective measures are in place.  
• Clear graphics to indicate the use of PPE.  
• PPE is fit for purpose, appropriate to the risk and hazard. | Viewed risk assessment for grinders – eyes and hands injuries identified, controls identified. | 3 |
| 2.4 How are safe work procedures developed and implemented in the workplace? | • Safe work procedures are developed in line with risk assessment.  
• Reviewed periodically and when changes in an incident occur.  
• Workshops are conducted.  
• Changes to SWPS are communicated to staff.  | Work is in line with risk management.  
Reviews periodically. Tool box talks. Changes communicated to staff. | 3 |

**Rating for risk management and control — eye and hand:**  
6.44 Improvement required  
12 Working towards a systematic approach  
16 Good practice

---

**Figure 11. Extract of assessment tool - hands and eyes**
2.5.2.2 Production and non-production tasks

Production tasks in manufacturing are often the main focus of WHS improvements made, however, these activities continue to cause injury. In some instances, workers have been seriously injured due to in-house modifications to fixed plant and equipment, with the associated risks in their use not being communicated to end users. More generally, ‘leadership fatigue’ is a common problem in many workplaces where supervisors and management may be inconsistent in their implementation of procedures or complacent with managing the risks. This can lead to normalising poor safety behaviours.

Non production tasks often receive less attention. Non-production incidents and injuries often occur in the manufacturing industry during maintenance and cleaning activities and during unplanned stoppages to the use of fixed plant and equipment (e.g. clearing blockages, power outages). Exposure to risks of injury can also result where workers take short cuts and/or override safety controls, due to operational demands during ‘peak production periods’ and when undertaking non-standard manufacturing tasks. Given this broad range of non-production activities and scenarios, the focus of this project will be on the overarching systems of work at manufacturing workplaces required to ensure the safe use and operation of fixed plant and equipment.

Recent industry data from Victoria indicates that 26 per cent of manufacturing workers perform maintenance and non-production tasks. The data shows that these workers made up 60 per cent of plant-related injury and fatality claims over a 12-month period. This data suggest a disproportionate level of serious risk and fatalities for manufacturing workers who undertake maintenance and non-production tasks. While this equivalent data is not available in Queensland, it anticipated that Queensland workers are performing a similar amount of non-production tasks. Common issues leading to incidents include:

- poor and inappropriate levels of machine guarding
- poor adherence to isolation processes, particularly during emergency shut downs and repairs
- poor change management for those workers not familiar with a new process, and
- inadequate levels of information, training and supervision provided to young workers, new recruits and labour hire personnel

Incidents and injuries from fixed plant often occur in the manufacturing industry during periods of maintenance, cleaning activities, clearing blockages, and power outages. Exposure to the risk of injury can also result where workers take short cuts and/or override safety controls. Systems are sometimes circumvented due to operational demands during ‘peak production periods’ and when undertaking non-standard manufacturing tasks. The focus of this project will be primarily on machine guarding, isolation, lockout and tag-out (LOTO), safe use and systems of work. Targeted manufacturing industry subsectors will include food production, and metal and metal fabrication manufacturing workplaces.

A review of 218 dangerous events and serious injuries, in manufacturing, reported to WHSQ from 2013 to early 2016, and manufacturing prosecutions from 2012 to early 2016 identified that 156 (66 per cent) of the incidents were related to tasks associated with fixed plant in manufacturing. These 156 incidents were mainly caused by:

- an absence of or inadequate machine guarding
- a failure to provide or comply with safe work procedures, and
- a failure to perform or comply with isolation, lock out, and tag out (LOTO) procedures

Food product processing and metal and fabricated metal workplaces had the highest number of incidents, injuries, and prosecutions in comparison to other manufacturing industry subsectors. Further analysis of these 156 incident reports suggests common behaviours by workers when they are injured include attempting to quickly grab or remove an item while the plant was in operation and maintenance workers performing tasks without following LOTO procedures.
From April 2017 to July 2018, WHSQ will conduct fixed plant assessments at manufacturing workplaces, including, fabricated metal manufacturing workplaces, using a comprehensive assessment tool (see Figure 12), with issues and required corrective actions clearly identified. High risk issues identified, which cannot be addressed immediately whilst the inspector is on site, will warrant statutory notices – clear guidance is provided to the inspector on the sections of the Act and Regulation which may be being breached. Lower risk issues will be discussed with the business operator and a schedule for addressing these issues and providing evidence to the inspector will be agreed on (agreed actions approach). The assessments will focus on: machine guarding; isolation; lockout and tag-out; and, safe use and systems of work.

![Section 1 Complete this section only ONCE for each assessment](image)

**Systems of work**

1. Are there systems of work for fixed plant?  
   
   **ACTION** for inspector: Seek evidence of documented or other reliable processes for a systems of work.  
   
   If no, comment on the reasons given and issue the appropriate notice for non-compliance.

2. Are the systems of work appropriately detailed for workers operating fixed plant (ie. SOP, SWM, risk assessments etc)?

   **ACTION** for inspector: Seek evidence of documented or other reliable processes for a system of work. Also verify with workers if they understand the systems of work to operate fixed plant.

   If no, comment on the reasons given and issue the appropriate notices for non-compliance.

3. If the systems of work is deemed unsafe by this assessment, has the PCBU done all that is reasonably practicable to establish a safe system of work?

   **ACTION** for inspector: Seek evidence of documented or other reliable processes for a safe system of work. If you reasonably believe that a system of work is unsafe and has the potential of causing harm to the health and safety of any worker using the fixed plant, issue appropriate notice. (Refer last page – note 2)

**Figure 12. Extract of Assessment Tool – manufacturing fixed plant**
2.5.3 IPaM businesses within the metal manufacturing industry

The Injury Prevention and Management (IPaM) initiative works with selected employers to ensure systems are in place to prevent workplace injury and, if people are injured, to return them to meaningful and appropriate work, as soon as practical. IPaM advisors work with employers who have comparatively high workers' compensation claims rates and costs compared to other businesses of similar size and nature.

A total of 86 metal manufacturing employers have participated or are currently participating in the program. This represents approximately 9 per cent of the 902 employers that have participated, or are participating in IPaM. These employers are in varying phases of participation, as follows:

- 50 employers have completed the program.
- 21 employers are currently engaged in the ‘active’ phase of the program (first 12 months).
- 7 employers are currently in the ‘Supported Self-Management’ (SSM) phase of the program (second 12 months); and
- 8 employers currently in discussions with IPaM Senior Advisors regarding future participation in the program.

Table 14 below shows a breakdown of the primary IPaM activities that have been undertaken with Metal Manufacturing industry employers since the commencement of the program.

Table 14. IPaM milestone activities with metal manufacturing employers.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Primary IPaM activity:</th>
<th>Hazard reviews</th>
<th>Systems reviews</th>
<th>Climate reviews</th>
<th>Other worker engagement activities</th>
<th>BIPs established</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Number Undertaken:</td>
<td>62</td>
<td>59</td>
<td>30</td>
<td>52</td>
<td>32</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

An analysis of all Business Improvement Plan (BIP) developed for all Manufacturing industry employers participating in IPaM was undertaken in January 2017. Figure 13 below shows the breakdown of BIP items for the Manufacturing industry employers by category.
For the manufacturing companies reviewed as part of the 2017 BIP analysis, approximately 20 per cent (324 in total) of the Opportunities for Improvement (OFI) were issued in relation to System Review and Maintenance, by contrast approximately 9 per cent of BIP OFIs were issued in relation to reporting and recording which was the lowest. Overall, the range of the issued BIP OFIs in each category area for the manufacturing industry was slightly higher than the construction industry. The analysis demonstrated that there are significant differences in the distribution of BIP items for each industry. The factors that could influence the distribution include but not limited to; differences in organisational characteristics, organisation risk profiles, gaps in WHS management systems and differences in the evidence provided by the employer. The distribution of BIP items into focus areas for the manufacturing industry is similar to the construction industry in that it is relatively uniform across all categories.

For example, a large transportation company may have more critical risks to evaluate than a small manufacturing company; therefore, significantly more advice may be directed towards identifying hazards in the transport company than the manufacturing company. Or perhaps the transport company already has an efficient system in place for hazard identification; therefore, requires very minimal development/growth within this area when compared to a manufacturing company that does not have any system in place, so more advice in relation to hazard identification may be issued to the manufacturing company.

Table 15 below provides a breakdown of BIP items for a sample of Metal Manufacturing industry employers located throughout the state.
Table 15. IPaM BIP items by category for sample of Metal Manufacturing industry employers

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Employer</th>
<th>Systems development</th>
<th>Hazard identification</th>
<th>Risk assessment and Control (including Safe Work Method Statements or Procedures)</th>
<th>Reporting and recording</th>
<th>Training and supervision</th>
<th>Communication and worker consultation</th>
<th>System review and maintenance</th>
<th>Injury management</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>2</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

2.5.3.1 Communication and consultation

The Systems Review also looks at the broad topic of consultation and communication in the workplace specifically testing an employer’s arrangements for Health and Safety Representatives and Committees (HSRs and HSCs). Since 2014, employers participating in the IPaM program have surveyed 11,140 workers to better understand their perception of the WHS and injury management culture in their workplace. In addition to this workers are also given the opportunity to participate in focus groups, which provide context for issues identified through the surveys. Information gathered in this process is reviewed (along with other workplace assessments completed) and incorporated into an employer’s BIP as ‘opportunities for improvement’.

A review of the communication and consultation element contained within the systems review showed that 33 IPaM employers (39 per cent) within the metal manufacturing industry had some form of consultation mechanisms in place. These included WHS committees, WHS representatives, regular worker consultation in purchasing equipment and developing safe work method statements and WHS as a standard item on meeting agendas.

Detailed below are examples of the types of improvement strategies implemented by metal manufacturing industry employers to improve their consultation mechanisms:

- ‘Display safety committee member’ names and/or pictures in the workplace. Safety committee members will become a go-to person for workers with issues.’
- ‘Inform workers about their entitlement to elect a workplace health and safety rep in the induction.’
- ‘Ensure multiple consultation processes are available to suit workers on different shifts and at different locations.’
- ‘Implement consultative arrangements with employees and other stakeholders, this can be facilitated by a work health and safety committee, election of work health and safety representatives (HSRs) etc. Inform workers of their right to elect a HSR.’
- ‘Implement procedure whereby the Leadership Management team are more actively involved in promoting work health and safety within the workplace. For example: attend tool box talks, safety meetings, undertake regular workshop floor inspections.’
• ‘Amend the current HR Issues Resolution procedure and incorporate the management of safety related issues and the process to follow when an issue cannot be resolved.’

• ‘Assist those selected as committee members by having them trained in risk assessment and investigation processes.’

2.5.4 Effectiveness of approach

In the manufacturing industry there has been a general downward trend in serious workers’ compensation claims. Although the rate for manufacturing (17.8) is still significantly greater than for all industries (12), the gap is closing (see Figure 14).

![Figure 14. Manufacturing: Incidence rates for serious workers' compensation claims](image)

Table 16 below shows the significant decline in the number and rate of serious claims for primary metal and metal product manufacturing and the fabricated metals manufacturing industries.
Table 16. Metals manufacturing: Incidence rates for serious workers’ compensation claims

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Workers (’000)</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Primary Metal and Metal Product Manufacturing</td>
<td>19.81</td>
<td>18.47</td>
<td>19.18</td>
<td>16.22</td>
<td>13.39</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Fabricated Metal Product Manufacturing</td>
<td>12.35</td>
<td>9.13</td>
<td>15.06</td>
<td>11.61</td>
<td>13.39</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total Metal Product</strong></td>
<td>32.16</td>
<td>27.60</td>
<td>34.24</td>
<td>27.83</td>
<td>26.78</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Serious Claims</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Primary Metal and Metal Product Manufacturing</td>
<td>120</td>
<td>125</td>
<td>103</td>
<td>115</td>
<td>84</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Fabricated Metal Product Manufacturing</td>
<td>866</td>
<td>789</td>
<td>624</td>
<td>607</td>
<td>608</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total Metal Product</strong></td>
<td>986</td>
<td>914</td>
<td>727</td>
<td>722</td>
<td>692</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Serious Claim Rate</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Primary Metal and Metal Product Manufacturing</td>
<td>6.1</td>
<td>6.8</td>
<td>5.4</td>
<td>7.1</td>
<td>6.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Fabricated Metal Product Manufacturing</td>
<td>70.1</td>
<td>86.4</td>
<td>41.4</td>
<td>52.3</td>
<td>45.4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total Metal Product</strong></td>
<td>30.7</td>
<td>33.1</td>
<td>21.2</td>
<td>25.9</td>
<td>25.8</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

2.5.5 Conclusion

WHSQ has employed a broad range of strategies with the metals manufacturing industry in Queensland. These strategies are aimed at ensuring that long-term and sustained improvements are made, as well as ensuring that immediate obvious risks are addressed. WHSQ has a specific focus on the metals manufacturing industry with an industry action plan aimed at addressing the most significant risks in this industry. Comprehensive assessments aimed at the highest risks, e.g. hands and eyes, body stressing, and at workers conducting activities Emphasis is placed on using an agreed actions approach, which achieves compliance and enhances the knowledge and skills needed by agriculture businesses to continue improving their WHS management and protection for the WHS of workers and others. Notices are still used when warranted, however, these are used in a structured way with key risks and likely breaches included in a comprehensive assessment tools for the inspector. This supports the inspector to fully explain why a notice has been issued and what is needed to comply with the notice. Notices tend not to be used in isolation; an agreed actions approach supplements the notices with more in-depth processes and timeframes for longer-term rectification. For businesses which need additional attention, the IPaM program provides the opportunity for WHSQ to work more intensely with particular businesses to improve overall safety management.
Statistics for this industry indicate that this broader approach is effective and workplace health and safety improvements are being realised.

Attachment 1. Example of agreed actions emails

From: xxxxxxxx
Sent: Friday, 23 December 2016 12:28 PM
To: >
Cc: xxxxxxxx@justice.qld.gov.au>
Subject: RE: WHSQ Power Station Inspection Program - xxxxxxxxx

Xxxxxx please find responses on the items raised. Thank you for raising the items, a different perspective is always helpful.

(1) W/Order No. 487522 – Test and Inspect Safety Valve – Confirm status of valve’s operation/maintenance (Work Order has been cancelled with nil reason recorded on JDE);

The valve was scheduled for a routine test/inspect/set during the Unit 1 2012 planned outage. The work order was cancelled with no information in the work management system (JDE), or our outage change work scope system (CWS database) or in emails. After discussing internally, this particular safety valve was removed due to time constraints, with the intention of routine test/inspect/set at the next planned outage in 2014. It was tested in 2014. We check these safety valves on our type B/C planned outages nominally 2-3 years. By AS3788 they are required to be checked each 5 years. This particular safety valve was previously inspected/tested in 2009 and was inspected/tested in 2014 meeting the requirement of AS3788. This valve historically had also not failed testing. The normal process is for the works to be removed with an approved Change of Work Scope. Here there was a failure of our system.

Our Work Management software was modified in 2013, whereby any work orders cannot be closed without comment. Since 2013, we also monitor cancelled work orders. We are confident that with the Work Management software changes in 2013, with the current monitoring of cancelled work orders and better adherence to the Change of Work Scope currently occurring, this issue would not re-occur.

(2) HSR and Operations Internal Audit/Inspection Checklists – Review whether/not XXXXX’s document recording system has ability to identify person carrying out Audit/Inspection (E.g. XXXXX Employee Name/Signature/Date);

The weekly Permit audit inspection checklist is completed by the lead operator on the day with his name and dated, electronically saved on our network, also emailed by that person to stakeholders. At site we feel the email record is proof enough of the “auditors” identity. We will obtain a legal opinion from our head office and if we need to have signatures instead of emails then changes will be made. Planned Complete 31/1/17.

(3) Permit to Work System – Review whether/not XXXXX’s Control Room Permit Issuers are adhering to PTW Policy, Procedures and Document control requirements (E.g. JHA/Document identified non-conformance);

Review of this and past Permits for this work has been undertaken. The Permit you viewed had the hand written note " Gas hazardous area certificate attached ". This was written by the Permit Officer as he’d noticed it had not printed on the permit. During the application lodging process, the maintenance technician had not ticked the appropriate box in the work management system. The permit is consistent with previous permits requiring the hazardous gas certificate. Your visit did highlight a potential improvement to the “Hazardous Area certificate” which would then have clarified the gas testing comments in the JHA. This is a software change done in the US via a UK consultant. It is planned to have this change implemented by 28/2/2017.

(4) Industrial Fork truck Extension Tynes – Ensure tynes are clearly marked with a Safe Working Load (SWL) capacity;

Work Order raised for “Forklift Truck Extension Slippers (tynes) to be engineering certified (due to SWL markings not evident) and load restrictions are to be permanently marked on the items. In accordance with AS1418 and HSEP-232, Section 5.2.1. Order being raised against GHD”. Planned complete 31/1/17.

(5) Coal and Ash Plant LOTO Container – Ensure access/egress door is operational and Air Conditioning (E.g. Room A/C) and interior lighting (E.g., Flexible lead supply) is designed/installed for purpose;

Work Order raised for “LOTO Container to have A/C installed; Lighting cabling to be fitted into conduit; Fire Extinguisher to be fitted. Planned for WK51/52/1/2 with CHP Electricians and Fitters.” Planned Complete 31/1/17.

(6) ROM – Prevention of unauthorised access (E.g. Closed Vs Locked Gate) from top of mezzanine stairs to access Mine coal hardstand loader/Truck unloading work area;

Security lock and key has been fitted to the gate at the top of the southern stairway to access the top of the ROM Truck Unloading Hopper. Communications with Mine Contractor also occurred, access as per procedure OMP-EGA-010. [please note I was there on 22/12/16 and the lock was in place]

(7) Placarding/Safety Signage – Ensure Dangerous Goods storage area(s) are adequately placarded and/or have safety signage installed at the normal worker approach (E.g. Oxygen, H2, Nitrogen and CO2);

Signage is on order and work orders in place for installation will be completed by 31/1/17.

(8) Vehicle Impact Protection – CO2 Cylinder storage work area;

A Plant Modification Proposal (PMP) had already been raised to protect plant piping in the same location (PMP 15M049). We have added the CO2 storage to this PMP. This will be reviewed in January at the monthly PMP meeting and a plan formulated to implement solutions. Implementing whatever solution (funding/ timing) will be scheduled as per other projects.

We can have a phone call to clarify our information if you feel we need to.

Regards

xxxxxxxx
Plant Manager

xxxxxxxxxx
Good Afternoon xxxx:

As discussed with you and your team yesterday during the initial site “Briefing” and again at the “Close-out” meeting, WHSQ is carrying out a series of Power Station audits chemicals and emergency response plan focusing on specific Safety Management System (SMS) elements. The SMS elements include safety critical plant/equipment, automatically/remotely controlled plant, hazardous management.

Yesterday’s desktop and site walk through inspection has identified that xxxx’s SMS has been developed, implemented and maintained to a high standard considering Industry best practice.

For Audit completeness, could you please ensure xxxx addresses the following WHS issues and subsequently provide WHSQ with any proposed corrective action(s) within a fortnight’s time period:

1. Work Order No. 487522 – Test and Inspect Safety Valve – Confirm status of valve’s operation/maintenance (Work Order has been cancelled with nil reason recorded on JDE);
2. HSR and Operations Internal Audit/Inspection Checklists – Review whether/not xxxx’s document recording system has ability to identify person carrying out Audit/Inspection (E.g. XXXX Employee Name/Signature/Date);
3. Permit to Work System – Review whether/not XXXX’s Control Room Permit Issuers are adhering to PTW Policy, Procedures and Document control requirements (E.g. JHA/Document identified non-conformance);
4. Industrial Fork truck Extension Tynes – Ensure tynes are clearly marked with a Safe Working Load (SWL) capacity;
5. Coal and Ash Plant LOTO Container – Ensure access/egress door is operational and Air Conditioning (E.g. Room A/C) and interior lighting (E.g., Flexible lead supply) is designed/installed for purpose;
6. ROM – Prevention of unauthorised access (E.g. Closed Vs Locked Gate) from top of mezzanine stairs to access Mine coal hardstand loader/Truck unloading work area;
7. Placarding/Safety Signage – Ensure Dangerous Goods storage area(s) are adequately placarded and/or have safety signage installed at the normal worker approach (E.g. Oxygen, H2, Nitrogen and CO2); and
8. Vehicle impact Protection – CO2 Cylinder storage work area.

FYI – I have confirmed with WHSQ Principal Industrial inspectors that the XXXX coal stacker/reclaimer (Plant) located at the coal/ash Plant does not require additional control measures to prevent worker contact in this instance. This WHSQ decision/interpretation is based on the following rationale:

1. XXXX operational requirement(s) for authorised worker access only - during normal Plant operation;
2. PTW isolation system in place for Plant during repair/maintenance activities;
3. Minimal worker requirement for access and egress to/from work area;
4. SOP in place for operator to gain access to Stacker/reclaimer in order to operate in “Local” mode;
5. Plant PLC “Emergency Stop” sensor(s) installed at intervals along Stacker/reclaimer rail line; and
6. Plant steel wheel guard(s) installed immediately above wheel/rail line interface minimise likelihood of worker becoming entangled/crushed by Plant.

As discussed, I intend to research further the Regulatory authority and jurisdiction status between DNRM and WHSQ when a work area access is handed over from the adjacent Mine to XXXX for worker access during maintenance activities. DNRM and WHSQ do have a current memorandum of understanding which may address this administrative WHS issue.

Should you have any further questions or concerns regarding this WHSQ Program or the content of this E-Mail, please feel free to contact me directly on (07) xxxxxx.

Regards
xxxxxx
Principal Inspector
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Action Area</th>
<th>Issue</th>
<th>Priority</th>
<th>Frequency</th>
<th>Expected completion</th>
<th>Actual completion</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Health Needs</td>
<td>Pneumonia in workers</td>
<td>Medium</td>
<td>Weekly</td>
<td>9th Jan 2012</td>
<td>9th Jan 2012</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Reduced staff</td>
<td>Medium</td>
<td>Monthly</td>
<td>30th Nov 2011</td>
<td>30th Nov 2011</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Remote work</td>
<td>Low</td>
<td>Every 2nd</td>
<td>2nd Feb 2012</td>
<td>2nd Feb 2012</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Mental health</td>
<td>High</td>
<td>Daily</td>
<td>1st Mar 2012</td>
<td>1st Mar 2012</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Chemical exposure</td>
<td>Medium</td>
<td>Monthly</td>
<td>30th Nov 2011</td>
<td>30th Nov 2011</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Noise exposure</td>
<td>Medium</td>
<td>Monthly</td>
<td>30th Nov 2011</td>
<td>30th Nov 2011</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Redline**

- Ozone layer damage & fallen trees
- Fatigue & sleep disorders
- Noise exposure (high levels)
- Chemical exposure
- Radiation exposure
- Workload

**Emergency Plan**

- Fire alarm system updated
- Exit signs replaced
- Emergency drills conducted
### Attachment 3. Extract from IPaM Meat Industry Business Improvement Plan (Full BIP is longer)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Action items:</th>
<th>Due date:</th>
<th>BIP Review 1: 01/09/2016</th>
<th>BIP Review 2: 01/12/2016</th>
<th>BIP Review 3: 09/03/2017</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>HR Manager do further WHS training e.g. Diploma of WHS Management.</td>
<td>1/03/2017</td>
<td>Sent email to General Manager requesting permission to do the Diploma (RPL) - no response yet.</td>
<td></td>
<td>Cindy has completed a Diploma of WHS Management.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Review all position descriptions and update to ensure they accurately reflect WHS and RRTW responsibilities at every level.</td>
<td>1/03/2017</td>
<td>COMPLETED: Reviewed and completed - in WHS policy and procedures manual.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Review and update WHS policies and procedures manual (already coming up with a schedule to do this).</td>
<td>1/03/2017</td>
<td>Completed sections 1 - 8. Still more to do.</td>
<td>Completed 9-14 SOP [ WHS policies and Procedures manual. Completed 28/10/16 and Updated WHS forms</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Do WHS and RRTW system auditing (already setting up plan to do this as part of WHS system review plan).</td>
<td>1/03/2017</td>
<td>COMPLETED: Have done an audit checklist and audited every floor - will continue to do monthly. Found and addressed lots of issues. Patrick developing audit schedule.</td>
<td>Audit schedule now in place.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Come up with, measure and report to management team on WHS and RRTW objectives and targets.</td>
<td>1/12/2016</td>
<td>Rick top send through information.</td>
<td>Audit checks on PPE; report on some things, but could report on more. Carry over to SSM phase.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Offer having ‘Health and Safety Representatives’ (HSR) to workers and assist with election if they want to have HSRs.</td>
<td>1/12/2016</td>
<td>In progress, have printed forms to elect a member.</td>
<td>HSR elected - yet to do training - carry over to SSM.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Improve consultation with workers when addressing issues that impact on their safety – for example when reviewing JSAs.</td>
<td>Already completed.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Review contractor induction forms to ensure they are clear and easy to complete for people using them.</td>
<td>Already completed.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Action items:</td>
<td>Due date:</td>
<td>BIP Review 1: 01/09/2016</td>
<td>BIP Review 2: 01/12/2016</td>
<td>BIP Review 3: 09/03/2017</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-----------------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
<td>-----------</td>
<td>--------------------------</td>
<td>--------------------------</td>
<td>--------------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Improve communication and consultation:</td>
<td>1/12/2016</td>
<td>a. Flyers done (whs info on display).</td>
<td></td>
<td>Now have HSR. Doing team meetings. Daily memos for everyone - mainly in lunch room. Having WHS meetings every month.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>a. Flyers</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>b. Team talks</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>c. Once a month – safety representative to consult</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Review JSAs in consultation with workers for tasks that have changed</td>
<td>1/06/2016</td>
<td></td>
<td>All done - people on suitable duties contributed.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Develop and implement a purchasing policy to ensure WHS issues are considered when purchasing.</td>
<td>1/06/2016</td>
<td>Completed, we have a purchasing policy in place, was reviewed on 13.09.2016 and introduced to Maintenance manager and purchasing officer</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Do refresher inductions (already planned to do yearly but not yet started).</td>
<td>1/06/2017</td>
<td>COMPLETED: All done in May 2016.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ensure trainers are good at training</td>
<td>1/12/2016</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Not done. Will review training done and develop training schedule in SSM phase.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Raise awareness of importance of reporting near misses.</td>
<td>1/09/2016</td>
<td>COMPLETED: Put signs in all production areas. Discussed at supervisors / managers meeting. Workers now understand why its important to report near misses.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Add area for worker involved in incident to sign off (on incident report / investigation report) once all actions completed.</td>
<td>1/09/2016</td>
<td>COMPLETED: Area for employee signature.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Add section to incident report or investigation report (or both) to identify what work instructions and JSAs are relevant to the incident and if they need to be reviewed.</td>
<td>1/09/2016</td>
<td>COMPLETED: New section in SOP07 - Incident investigation report.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Implement regular analysis (e.g. 3 or 6 monthly) of incidents occurring to identify emerging patterns and possible long term solutions and</td>
<td>1/09/2016</td>
<td>COMPLETED: New forms made and analysis sent off to senior management. Will be ongoing - monthly or quarterly.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Action items:</td>
<td>Due date:</td>
<td>BIP Review 1: 01/09/2016</td>
<td>BIP Review 2: 01/12/2016</td>
<td>BIP Review 3: 09/03/2017</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>--------------</td>
<td>-----------</td>
<td>--------------------------</td>
<td>--------------------------</td>
<td>--------------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>report to management team to keep them up to date.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Review RRTW policy and procedure (IPaM can provide sample policy and a review tool).</td>
<td>29/06/2016</td>
<td></td>
<td>Completed, 28/09/2016, used the WHS rehab tool, and updated our current policy from 2013 - 2016</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Consider increasing contact with injured workers before they return to work, to encourage early return to work and monitor their improvement.</td>
<td>Already completed.</td>
<td>COMPLETED: Contacting injured employees, new document book for all WorkCover info.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Workers are at risk of injury from cuts from use of knives.</td>
<td>Already completed.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
## Attachment 4. Events notified for the meat processing industry

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Events (Incidents and Complaints)</th>
<th>2008-09</th>
<th>2009-10</th>
<th>2010-11</th>
<th>2011-12</th>
<th>4 years campaign</th>
<th>2012-13</th>
<th>2013-14</th>
<th>2014-15</th>
<th>2015-16</th>
<th>4 years post campaign</th>
<th>Total</th>
<th>per cent change pre to post</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Serious injury requiring treatment</td>
<td>83</td>
<td>107</td>
<td>163</td>
<td>117</td>
<td>470</td>
<td>41</td>
<td>30</td>
<td>23</td>
<td>21</td>
<td>115</td>
<td>585</td>
<td>-76 per cent</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dangerous incident exposing worker or other person to a serious risk to their health and safety</td>
<td>104</td>
<td>37</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>30</td>
<td>183</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>49</td>
<td>232</td>
<td>-73 per cent</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Injury requiring a person to have immediate treatment as an in-patient</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>40</td>
<td>38</td>
<td>31</td>
<td>27</td>
<td>136</td>
<td>136</td>
<td>N/A</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Infection reliably attributable to carrying out work</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>21</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>44</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>45</td>
<td>-98 per cent</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Contraction of zoonosis in the course of handling or being in contact with animal hides skins wool hair carcasses or waste products</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>22</td>
<td>23</td>
<td>N/A</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Serious Electrical Incident</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>250 per cent</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Death of a person other than by electricity</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>-50 per cent</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Infection to which the carrying out of work was a significant contributing factor</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>N/A</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dangerous electrical event</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>100 per cent</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Complaints (about health and safety in a workplace)</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>31</td>
<td>25</td>
<td>22</td>
<td>98</td>
<td>33</td>
<td>31</td>
<td>17</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>93</td>
<td>191</td>
<td>-5 per cent</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total Notifications</strong></td>
<td>210</td>
<td>182</td>
<td>223</td>
<td>188</td>
<td>803</td>
<td>133</td>
<td>118</td>
<td>96</td>
<td>86</td>
<td>433</td>
<td>1,236</td>
<td>-46 per cent</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Note: In 2011 when the model laws were implemented, there was a change to the definition of notifiable incidents, which results in a time-series break across the first four categories of this table.
## Attachment 5. Incidents notified for the meat processing industry

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Incidents Only</th>
<th>2008-09</th>
<th>2009-10</th>
<th>2010-11</th>
<th>2011-12</th>
<th>4 years campaigns</th>
<th>2012-13</th>
<th>2013-14</th>
<th>2014-15</th>
<th>2015-16</th>
<th>4 years post campaign</th>
<th>Total</th>
<th>per cent change pre to post</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Serious injury requiring treatment</td>
<td>83</td>
<td>107</td>
<td>163</td>
<td>117</td>
<td>470</td>
<td>41</td>
<td>30</td>
<td>23</td>
<td>21</td>
<td>115</td>
<td>585</td>
<td>-76 per cent</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dangerous incident exposing worker or other person to a serious risk to their health and safety</td>
<td>104</td>
<td>37</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>30</td>
<td>183</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>49</td>
<td>232</td>
<td>-73 per cent</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Injury requiring a person to have immediate treatment as an in-patient</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>40</td>
<td>38</td>
<td>31</td>
<td>27</td>
<td>136</td>
<td>136</td>
<td>N/A</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Infection reliably attributable to carrying out work</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>21</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>44</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>45</td>
<td>-98 per cent</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Contraction of zoonosis in the course of handling or being in contact with animal hides skins wool hair carcasses or waste products</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>22</td>
<td>23</td>
<td>2100 per cent</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Serious Electrical Incident</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>250 per cent</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Death of a person other than by electricity</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>-50 per cent</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Infection to which the carrying out of work was a significant contributing factor</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>N/A</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dangerous electrical event</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>100 per cent</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total Notifications</strong></td>
<td>190</td>
<td>151</td>
<td>198</td>
<td>166</td>
<td>705</td>
<td>100</td>
<td>87</td>
<td>79</td>
<td>74</td>
<td>340</td>
<td>1,045</td>
<td>-52 per cent</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Note: In 2011 when the model laws were implemented, there was a change to the definition of notifiable incidents, which results in a time-series break across the first four categories of this table.
### Attachment 6. Events notified for the meat processing industry, by ‘top ten’ employers

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>40</td>
<td>39</td>
<td>55</td>
<td>46</td>
<td>113</td>
<td>24</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>17</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>52</td>
<td>248</td>
<td>-54 per cent</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>45</td>
<td>29</td>
<td>26</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>115</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>125</td>
<td>-91 per cent</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>41</td>
<td>22</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>72</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>25</td>
<td>97</td>
<td>-65 per cent</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>44</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>64</td>
<td>-55 per cent</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>34</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>17</td>
<td>51</td>
<td>-50 per cent</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>22</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>24</td>
<td>46</td>
<td>9 per cent</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>28</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>38</td>
<td>-64 per cent</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>29</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>37</td>
<td>-72 per cent</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>25</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>35</td>
<td>-60 per cent</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>24</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>29</td>
<td>-79 per cent</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
## Attachment 7. Statutory notices issued for the meat processing industry

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Notice Type</th>
<th>2008-09</th>
<th>2009-10</th>
<th>2010-11</th>
<th>2011-12</th>
<th>4 years campaign</th>
<th>2012 - 13</th>
<th>2013-14</th>
<th>2014-15</th>
<th>2015-16</th>
<th>4 years post campaign</th>
<th>Total</th>
<th>per cent change pre to post</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Improvement Notice</td>
<td>45</td>
<td>60</td>
<td>73</td>
<td>44</td>
<td>222</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>24</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>53</td>
<td>275</td>
<td>-76 per cent</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Directive 91</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>87</td>
<td>30</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>141</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>141</td>
<td>-100 per cent</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Prohibition Notice</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>49</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>17</td>
<td>66</td>
<td>-65 per cent</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Directive 90</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>21</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>29</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>29</td>
<td>-100 per cent</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Directive 94</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>-100 per cent</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Directive 92</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>-100 per cent</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Directive 99</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>-100 per cent</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Infringement Notice</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>-100 per cent</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Directive 93</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>-100 per cent</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Electrical Safety Protection</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>-100 per cent</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total</strong></td>
<td><strong>71</strong></td>
<td><strong>208</strong></td>
<td><strong>125</strong></td>
<td><strong>74</strong></td>
<td><strong>478</strong></td>
<td><strong>22</strong></td>
<td><strong>30</strong></td>
<td><strong>15</strong></td>
<td><strong>3</strong></td>
<td><strong>70</strong></td>
<td><strong>548</strong></td>
<td><strong>-85 per cent</strong></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
### Attachment 8. Statutory notices issued for the meat processing industry, by ‘top ten’ employers

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>‘Top Ten’ Employer</th>
<th>2008-09</th>
<th>2009-10</th>
<th>2010-11</th>
<th>2011-12</th>
<th>4 years campaign</th>
<th>2012-13</th>
<th>2013-14</th>
<th>2014-15</th>
<th>2015-16</th>
<th>4 years post campaign</th>
<th>Total</th>
<th>per cent change pre to post</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>33</td>
<td>29</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>62</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>62</td>
<td>-100 per cent</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>19</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>28</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>31</td>
<td>-89 per cent</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>28</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>31</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>31</td>
<td>-100 per cent</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>24</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>31</td>
<td>-71 per cent</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5</td>
<td>17</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>26</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>27</td>
<td>-96 per cent</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>24</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>25</td>
<td>-96 per cent</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>-100 per cent</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>17</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>-100 per cent</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>-57 per cent</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>-100 per cent</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
## Attachment 9. Events (incidents) for IPAM businesses within the meat processing industry

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Events (Incidents) – IPAM</th>
<th>2008-09</th>
<th>2009-10</th>
<th>2010-11</th>
<th>2011-12</th>
<th>4 years campaign</th>
<th>2012-13</th>
<th>2013-14</th>
<th>2014-15</th>
<th>2015-16</th>
<th>4 years post campaign</th>
<th>Total</th>
<th>per cent change pre to post</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Company 1</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>22</td>
<td>-78 per cent</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Company 2</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>N/A</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Company 3</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>N/A</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Company 4</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>-100 per cent</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Company 5</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>600 per cent</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Company 6</td>
<td>41</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>70</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>25</td>
<td>95</td>
<td>-64 per cent</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total Notifications</strong></td>
<td>45</td>
<td>23</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>90</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>36</td>
<td>126</td>
<td>-60 per cent</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*Pre-Agreement
~Currently Implementing Improvement Plan
^Completed Program
## Attachment 10. Events (complaints) for IPAM businesses within the meat processing industry

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Events (Complaints) – IPAM</th>
<th>2008-09</th>
<th>2009-10</th>
<th>2010-11</th>
<th>2011-12</th>
<th>4 years campaign s</th>
<th>2012 - 13</th>
<th>2013-14</th>
<th>2014-15</th>
<th>2015-16</th>
<th>4 years post campaign</th>
<th>Total</th>
<th>per cent change pre to post</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Company 1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>-75 per cent</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Company 2</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>N/A</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Company 3</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>N/A</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Company 4</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>-100 per cent</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Company 5</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>300 per cent</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Company 6</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>200 per cent</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total Notifications</strong></td>
<td>1</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>14 per cent</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
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Attachment 11. Notices for IPAM businesses within the meat processing industry

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Statutory Notices - IPAM</th>
<th>2008-09</th>
<th>2009-10</th>
<th>2010-11</th>
<th>2011-12</th>
<th>4 years pre campaign</th>
<th>2012-13</th>
<th>2013-14</th>
<th>2014-15</th>
<th>2015-16</th>
<th>4 years post campaign</th>
<th>Total</th>
<th>per cent change pre to post</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Company 1</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>-80 per cent</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Company 2</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>N/A</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Company 3</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>N/A</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Company 4</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>-100 per cent</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Company 5</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>40 per cent</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Company 6</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>-57 per cent</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
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