

## Industry-wide safety indicators Final

Each year, EEA prepares an *Electricity Supply Industry - Safety Performance Indicators Report* to assist the electricity supply industry in monitoring and analysing its safety performance. The report gathers information on total recordable injuries to ESI workers and contractors.

In 2017, EEA decided to review the measures included in the report. Our objective was to broaden the scope of our current reporting and provide a more accurate picture of occupational safety performance in the industry. The review focused on the implementation of two components:

- actual/potential exposure to serious harm, and
- leading indicators, to complement the analysis of performance with measures relating to safety controls in place further upstream.

The review involved two rounds of industry consultation. A first draft of proposed leading indicators was presented at the EEA H&S Workshop in October 2017. An online consultation was then carried out in February 2018, involving all safety statistics survey participants. The EEA Safety Standards and Procedures Group (SSPG) and StayLive Generators Health & Safety Group were closely involved throughout the review process. The final proposed measures were discussed and approved at the EEA SSPG meeting in May 2018.

You will find on page 2 of this document the full list of industry-wide safety indicators for implementation from July 2018. Detailed definitions for each of these indicators are provided in the Appendices from page 3.

### Contact:

Marion Sorez, Industry Analyst, EEA

[marion@eea.co.nz](mailto:marion@eea.co.nz)

04 282 1816

Lagging indicators	Leading indicators <b>(all new)</b>
<p><b>Total recordable injuries and illnesses (TRIs)</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Fatalities</li> <li>• Lost time injuries and illnesses (LTIs)</li> <li>• Restricted work injuries and illnesses (RWIs)</li> <li>• Medical treatment injuries and illnesses (MTIs)</li> </ul> <p><i>Collating incident numbers, associated time lost, and employee/contractor numbers to calculate the frequency and severity rates of injuries and illnesses.</i></p> <p><b>Harm mechanisms / Significant risk exposure</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Number of events resulting in more than 7 days off work (this measure aligns with WorkSafe's indicator #3)</li> <li>• Description of all significant events (accidents or near misses that have or could have caused a fatality or serious harm to a worker) <b>(new)</b></li> </ul> <p><i>Presenting a breakdown of the significant events by incident mechanism / risk type.</i></p>	<p><b>Systems</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• <u>Audits and inspections.</u> Number of audits and inspections per 100 operational FTEs over the reporting period</li> <li>• <u>Corrective actions.</u> Percentage of corrective actions completed within agreed timeframe out of all corrective actions scheduled to be completed in the reporting period</li> </ul> <p><b>Resources</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• <u>Staff training.</u> Average percentage of operational staff whose training and refreshment training are up-to-date at the end of the reporting period (average based on monthly results)</li> </ul> <p><b>People</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• <u>Worker fitness for work.</u> Percentage of personnel randomly tested for drugs and alcohol, and percentage of positives received out of all tested, over the reporting period</li> <li>• <u>Leadership engagement.</u> Number of health and safety site visits from Executives and General Managers, per 100 operational FTEs, over the reporting period</li> </ul> <p><i>As this is the first stage of industry-wide leading indicator development, we propose to test up to six indicators relating to compliance and improvement for a start. Indicators focusing on continuous learning and safety culture could be implemented at a later review. We organised the indicators using some of WorkSafe's assessment focus points in their Health and Safety Performance Requirements Guidelines: the other assessment focus points are Behaviours, Attitudes, Culture and Perceptions.</i></p>

## Appendices

### Lagging indicators – Definitions

---

The definitions for the industry’s existing lagging indicators are included in the ESI Safety Statistics - Survey Guide, accessible on [EEA’s website](#).

**Significant event:** any incident or near miss that resulted, or could have resulted, in serious harm to a worker.

*Near miss:* any unplanned or uncontrolled incident in relation to a workplace that exposed a worker or any other person to a serious risk to that person’s health or safety. (This definition is based on the Health and Safety at Work Act’s definition of “notifiable event” but is not limited to the lists of exposure under the Act or other relevant Regulations.)

*Serious harm:* any fatality or injury or illness causing permanent impairment, e.g. amputation, serious burns, loss of eyesight, serious lacerations, asbestosis. (This definition is based on the work done by the StayLive Group – note that the definition of “serious harm” under the Electricity Act is much broader and includes non-permanent severe injuries such as broken bones, as well as loss of consciousness.)

### Leading indicator – Definition

---

#### Leading indicators

#### Definition provided by WorkSafe in its guidance *SafePlus H&S Performance Requirements*

*“Measurements that provide information that helps the business respond to changing circumstances and take actions to achieve desired outcomes or avoid unwanted outcomes. Lead indicators normally monitor what is happening in the present, and help improve future performance promoting action to correct potential weaknesses without waiting for demonstrated failures. Examples include training, safe conditions, safe behaviour, coaching, and similar safety seeking actions.”*

### Proposed leading indicators – Definitions

---

#### -Systems-

#### Audits and inspections

##### **Metrics:**

Number of health and safety audits and inspections (external or internal, mandatory or voluntary) over the reporting period, per 100 operational FTEs. If possible, specify the percentage of audits and inspections where no conformance or compliance issues with regard to health and safety regulations, standards or company procedures were raised.

**Purpose:** Audits and inspections are used not only to ensure compliance with legislation and with the company’s intended health and safety objectives and procedures, but also to promote the constant review and improvement of the health and safety environment in the workplace.

**Description:** Audits and inspections will be combined in one single measure. We would define audits and inspections as follows, but are aware that internal company definitions may differ (for instance, considering audits as only external, mandatory health and safety evaluations), hence the decision to merge the two types of evaluations together.

- Audits relating to evaluations of a company’s health and safety systems and practices.

- Inspections relating to evaluations of hazards/risks and unsafe practices on a work site.

Both external and internal evaluations, as well as mandatory and voluntary evaluations, will be considered in these measures. Any documented processes looking at improving practices and making a positive change can be considered as part of the audits and inspections definition. Companies will have the opportunity to provide details on their audit and inspection practices, if they wish to do so.

##### **Challenges:**

- Companies may be unwilling to provide details about the percentage of conformance vs. non-conformance issues found during audits and inspections.
- If companies report on the percentage of conformance during audits and inspections, consider any biases that may arise from companies not having the same work procedures and conformance standards.

### **Corrective actions**

**Metric:** Percentage of corrective actions completed within agreed timeframe out of all corrective actions scheduled to be completed in the reporting period

**Purpose:** The objective of this measure is to check that corrective actions are completed proactively and within a reasonable timeframe. A high percentage of overdue corrective actions may reflect issues such as insufficient resources, or lack of planning or engagement.

**Description:** The measure focuses on corrective actions taken following the identification of an undesirable situation (during an audit, after an incident, etc.). The measure does not look at preventative actions at this stage. Should be considered in the measure only the corrective actions that were scheduled to be completed within the reporting period (not those initiated during the reporting period).

**Challenges:**

- This measure is likely to look at the completion of corrective actions with varying levels of complexity and priority. Consider any biases that may arise due to this difference.

### **-Resources-**

#### **Staff training**

**Metric:** Average percentage of operational FTEs whose training and refreshment training are up-to-date at the end of each month during the reporting period. The percentage of operational FTEs that have up-to-date training should be calculated at the end of every month during the reporting period, and an annual average provided as the main measure.

**Purpose:** This indicator should help demonstrate whether core training of operational staff is conducted and maintained in a proactive manner, ensuring that they are capable to perform the work they are assigned to safely.

**Description:** Core training areas include site access training (inductions), work control training (access permits, test permits), task or equipment specific training (as relevant to each worker, for example confined space training, MEWP training, etc.), as well as safety training. For all staff whose training is not up-to-date, details on the main reasons explaining the expired training need to be provided (for example: workers with expired training to go on a refresher course at a later date while still within the grace period, etc.).

Target of 100% operational staff with up-to-date training.

**Challenges:**

- Competency or training requirements and assessments may vary across organisations. Gathering details from individual companies about what core training they focus on and the systems they have in place to check their workers' training is up-to-date could provide relevant complementary information.
- Lack of clarity as to whether asset owners can easily check their contractor staff training.
- This measure does not identify whether staff training is always checked prior to work starting, but the scale of reporting here (industry-wide) makes it difficult to go into that level of detail.

### **-People-**

#### **Worker fitness for work**

**Metrics:**

- Percentage of personnel tested randomly for drugs and alcohol
- Percentage of positives received out of all personnel tested

**Purpose:** Drug or alcohol impaired workers are recognised as a potential hazard in the workplace. Having a drug and alcohol free policy not only reduces the risk exposure in the workplace, but it also improves staff health, the quality of work and the productivity of workers. The measure covers random testing only, not pre-employment checks or post-accident testing (in particular as pre-employment checks are less effective in uncovering ongoing drugs and alcohol issues, while post-accident testing is a reactive rather than a proactive measure). Personnel covered by this measure should include all direct employees, whether operational or non-operational staff, and contractors.

**Description:** The first measure should look at the percentage of staff, out of all employees and contractors, whether operational or non-operational staff, randomly tested on-site for alcohol and drug use over the reporting period.

The second measure would look at, out of all those tested, the percentage of confirmed positive results and refusals to consent to testing, applying the zero tolerance rule for alcohol testing (results positive if over 100 µg/L).

**Challenges:**

- Check whether asset owners also conduct these tests with their contractors, or can get this information from their contractors.
- Keep in mind any biases that may arise from companies not testing the same drugs. Check the details the types of drugs that are being tested with individual companies as data is being provided, if necessary.

**Leadership engagement**

**Metric:** Number of health and safety site visits from Executives and General Managers, per 100 operational FTEs, over the reporting period

**Purpose:** This metric is indicative of the opportunities for field staff and management/executive staff to interact on health and safety issues and improvements, and to discuss how safety policies decided at the top are implemented at the bottom, and vice versa.

**Description:** Should be included in the count all site visits from Executives and General Managers with a specific focus on health and safety. Any other site visits not primarily related to health and safety, or any visits from staff that are not in an Executive or General Management position, are not to be counted.

**Challenges:**

- The challenge in implementing this metric may arise from the lack of records on the discussions held during the site visits (and whether the visit was health and safety focused or not).
- The measure does not in itself indicate the outcomes from these visits (actions taken). Consider looking at this sub-metric if companies can easily access this information.
- The main opportunity from this measure would be to identify the frequency of such visits (on a monthly basis for instance), therefore how engaged and communicative leaders are with their field staff.