

Health, Safety and Environmental Protection (HS&EP) in the Army Policy Statement by the Chief of the General Staff

I attach the highest priority to the health and safety of military personnel and MOD civilians within the Army TLB, and to the protection of the environment. As the Army's Senior Duty Holder (SDH), I am personally responsible to the Secretary of State for Defence for such matters and for compliance with the Health and Safety at Work Act 1974, managing exemptions and derogations where they apply. This Policy applies to all those in the Army TLB and its requirements are:

- Work-related fatalities, injuries, ill health and adverse effects on the environment are minimised and that associated risks are managed so that they are as low as reasonably practicable (ALARP).
- We comply with all applicable HS&EP legislation when in the UK. When overseas, we apply UK HS&EP standards where reasonably practicable and also respond to host nations' HS&EP expectations; where the Army has exemptions and derogations from HS&EP legislation, our arrangements produce outcomes that are, so far as reasonably practicable, at least as good as those required by UK legislation.
- Those in positions of command or management, from ECAB downwards, lead by example on HS&EP; there must be visible commitment to supporting my HS&EP Policy.
- We take reasonable care of the health and safety of our personnel, those working alongside us and others who might be affected by our acts or omissions at work; we protect the environment and apply in place arrangements to enable us to discharge the duties placed upon us.
- We constantly strive for a more positive, just and informed safety culture.
- Army personnel detached to other TLBs, but for whom I retain FULL COMMAND are subject to the HS&EP management policies of the host TLB. Notwithstanding, I expect detached Army personnel to adhere to my direction regarding HS&EP, referring disparities to the chain of command for resolution at the TLB level.

ECAB, under my leadership, is to receive regular updates on HS&EP performance. As a minimum this will be delivered quarterly and I will chair an annual Army Safety Committee. Key responsibilities include:

- **DCGS** - as the Army's nominated Safety Champion - is to ensure that effective governance is in place to ensure this Policy Statement is complied with. He is to chair the biannual Army Safety Sub-Committee, which is the forum in which best practice is shared, policy is developed, risk is managed and through which ECAB is routinely updated. DCGS is the Army representative on the Defence Safety Committee.
- **CESO(A)** - supported by the Army Inspector - is to produce an Annual Assurance Report for ECAB consideration.

Leaders at every level are responsible for the safety of personnel under their command. The Army's Duty Holding model, based on the chain of command, provides a mechanism for the ownership, management and assurance of risk. If a risk from activity cannot be mitigated at a level in the chain of command to a point that is ALARP or is tolerable, it is to be referred up the chain of command to the level where responsibility, accountability and authority for the risk can be aligned. The chain of command is responsible for ensuring that subordinates are competent and have adequate resources to perform their duties safely and in such a way that reasonably protects the environment.

I require the Army to strive for a more positive, just and informed safety culture set within an appropriate compliance, inspection and assurance regime that allows the chain of command to delegate and empower its subordinates. In doing so we must analyse the instructions we issue to ensure that they are genuinely workable given the available resources. We must create a culture in which leaders properly and confidently address risk through educated and informed assessment and agile management, tolerating it where appropriate, and accepting genuine errors as a natural part of leader development. Good safety management must be encouraged and recognised, and recklessness must be corrected. Micro-management and over assurance has no place on the battlefield, and it must not be a feature in peacetime either. Winning requires our soldiers to have the confidence to be bold, to seize the initiative and to take calculated risks when the opportunity arises.

CGS