



Survey Response

Review of the Federal Safety Commissioner

Submitted by: Anonymous

Please share your views on the effectiveness of the Federal Safety Commissioner and/or the WHS Accreditation Scheme in improving WHS performance.

1. I believe the WHS Accreditation Scheme is providing some benefit. I believe there should be a benchmark to meet to be able to be awarded government projects. 2. While I support audits, I don't believe this should be the only means to assess capability in safety practices and safety performance. I think the scheme should also extend to some form of competency assessment for senior leadership and safety practitioners. 3. Please stop the emphasis on Lost Time Injuries as valid performance measures in safety. The OFSC should, by now, understand that LTI is not a valid measure of safety risk or injury. It makes industry progress in this space harder to achieve when government contracts and accreditation schemes are linked to this. I would suggest more harm-based measures that provide a true indication of the impact of injury to quality of life. I would suggest smaller accreditations for the design, planning, implementation and verification of critical controls in high-risk-work. 4. More emphasis should be directed to Safety in Design practices (safe by design), the application of high-risk controls (critical controls) and competency of senior leadership in WHS obligations relevant to their work. Such as who in the Board/ Executive is competent? 5. The model client framework should be promoted more. Excellent information in this space that should be adopted more broadly.

Do you recommend any changes to the functions and powers of the Federal Safety Commissioner or the requirements of the WHS Accreditation Scheme?

Non-response