

In this issue:

Welcome	1
Upcoming information sessions	1
STARSWeb licences	1
Performance of the Fund	2
Claims estimates seminar	3
Legal decisions made by the DPP	3
TRMF Procedures Manual	3
Integrated Risk Management Project – interview with Peter Wise of the DHHS	4
Ian Deayton's tips for good Risk Management	5
DIER's business risk review project	5
Open Disclosure Project	6
Personal Liability in the Public Sector	6
Fleet Safety Forum	7
Workplace Safe Week	8
Treasury Contacts	8

Upcoming information sessions

Risk Management Seminar

Interest from Agencies in running a two day risk management seminar has been very positive. Two seminars will be held at Hadleys Hotel in Hobart on 8 to 11 October 2002. The seminars will be presented by Marsh Pty Ltd and will include topics such as:

- the evolution of risk management;
- risk identification;
- rating and assessing risks;
- treating risks;
- developing and implementing risk management plans; and
- strategic risk management.

Speakers include Stuart Bassett, Director, Marsh Risk Consulting (Australia) and Alan Champness, Consultant, Champness Risk Consulting.

If you would like to know more about these seminars, please contact Bindi Knoop on 6233 6597.

Welcome

Welcome to the second edition of the Tasmanian Risk Management Fund (TRMF) newsletter, *riskmatters*, published by the Department of Treasury and Finance.

The Tasmanian Risk Management Fund performed well throughout 2001-02. For information on the performance of the Fund for the year ended 30 June 2002 see page 2.

The Fund's next step is to enhance the provision of information to agencies to assist in their risk management, to reduce the likelihood of claims occurring and to reduce the severity of claims that do occur. In order to achieve this goal, Treasury is focusing on the following issues:

- developing a fleet purchase and use policy (see page 7);
- increasing the focus on claims management of workers' compensation claims; and
- facilitating regular forums for agency representatives to share and discuss common issues.

I would appreciate your comments on the usefulness of the newsletter, and any suggestions you may have for topics that you would like to see covered in future editions.

Philip Mussared

Chairman

Tasmanian Risk Management Fund Steering Committee

STARSWeb licences

A number of Agencies will soon be purchasing licences for a Web-based read-only version of STARS, Marsh Pty Ltd's claims administration system.

The web version, STARSWeb, enables agencies to read and print their own agency-specific reports. However, STARSWeb does not allow agencies to input or change any data on the system's database.

Agencies will have the opportunity to attend training on the use of STARSWeb in late October 2002.

Please note that, regardless of whether or not agencies choose to purchase a STARSWeb licence, agencies will continue to receive hardcopy monthly reports from Marsh Pty Ltd.

If you have any queries about the STARSWeb licences, please contact Bindi Knoop on 6233 6597 or e-mail bindi.knoop@treasury.tas.gov.au.

Performance of the Fund

Following are some facts and figures regarding the performance of the Fund in 2001-02. This information covers workers' compensation claims, public liability claims, property claims and other claims.

Workers' compensation

Claim numbers

The number of workers' compensation claims reported (regardless of when the accident occurred) has shown a general downward trend over the past three years.

1 548 claims were reported in 2001-02, compared with 1 667 in 2000-01 and 1 810 in 1999-00.

Claim payments

Although the number of claims has decreased over the past three years, claim payment costs increased in 2001-02, due in part to an increase in common law payments and legal fees.

Workers' compensation claim payments in 2001-02 were \$19.1 million, compared with \$17.1 million in 2000-01 and \$19.6 million in 1999-00.

Public liability

A total of 50 public liability incidents/claims were reported in 2001-02. The outstanding estimated value of these claims is around \$1.5 million, the largest of which relates to an injury to a contractor.

Property

Housing Tasmania

Total claims costs and claim numbers for Housing Tasmania in 2001-02 were higher than in 2000-01. There were 3 014 claims in 2001-0, compared with 2 921 claims in 2000-01.

The average cost per claim has increased from \$567 in 2000-01 to \$604 in 2001-02, but this is less than the average cost in 1999-00 of \$670.

Other property claims

During 2001-02, there were three significant property claims - two at Springfield Gardens Primary School and one at Fairview Primary School.

Other claims

Following are the number of claims made in 2001-02 under other categories of cover:

- Travel – 15 travel claims were lodged due to the Ansett collapse, together with one claim for lost luggage;
- Marine transit - four claims were made;
- Machinery breakdown - one claim was made;
- Marine hull - one claim was made; and
- Personal accident - no claims were made.

Motor vehicle claims

The following facts and figures were extracted from the Fund Administration Agent's report as at 30 June 2002.

Claim numbers and costs

Light motor vehicle fleet

In 2001-02, there were 158 claims, three less than in 2000-01. The average cost of claims has dropped from \$2 374 in 2000-01 to \$1 720 in 2001-02. This represents a reduction of more than \$110 000 in claims costs.

Police and Public Safety vehicle fleet

There has been an increase in the number of claims incurred by the Department of Police and Public Safety (115 claims for 2001-02, compared with 78 claims in 2000-01). There has also been an increase in the average claim cost (\$2 549 for 2001-02, compared with \$1 397 for 2000-01).

Other vehicles

The number and cost of claims in relation to miscellaneous vehicles have remained consistent with 2000-01. The claims made by the Tasmanian Ambulance Service doubled from the previous year in both claim numbers and total cost, from eight claims at a cost of \$16 007 in 2000-01 to 17 claims at a cost of \$42 986 in 2001-02.

Types of vehicle accidents

In 2001-02, the 158 claims for the light vehicle fleet (excluding Police and Public Safety and 'other' vehicles) cost \$271 965.

A number of trends are evident from the 2001-02 claims experience, including:

- single vehicle accidents are the most significant type of claims in terms of cost, comprising approximately 52 per cent of the total claims costs (and 49 per cent of claim numbers);
- 84 per cent of single vehicle claim numbers have been classified as either "lost control", "hit object" or "reversing";
- approximately 25 per cent of total claim numbers (ie 39 claims) relate to reversing incidents;
- out of the 39 reversing accidents, approximately 69 per cent were single vehicle or "at fault" accidents; and
- excluding single vehicle accidents, accidents in which agency drivers were "at fault" were 19 per cent of claim numbers and 23 per cent of claim costs.

Approximately 54 per cent of claim numbers and 68 per cent of claims costs are generated as a direct result of accidents that involve the fault of agency drivers. This is an area in which agencies can have an influence over the ultimate cost and number of claims.

Claims estimates seminar

The workers' compensation sub contractor, NRMA, will be focussing on estimates at file review meetings and encouraging agencies to conduct regular file reviews. A Claims Estimates Seminar was held on 15 May 2002 for all participating agencies of the Tasmanian Risk Management Fund (TRMF). Ben Bessell of NRMA, and Paul Turner and Luci Wilkins of the Office of the Director of Public Prosecutions (DPP), presented the Seminar.

Estimating claims enables a snapshot of what claims are worth. It is important for accurate claims estimates to be made. It is also important to make an estimate early and to regularly review that estimate as estimations change continuously. After a period of 12 months from the date of the claim, an agency should have enough information to estimate the ultimate cost of each claim. For example, if an employee is not back at work within 12 months, the probability of that employee resuming normal duties will be increasingly remote. Thus, the agency would need to estimate the totality of that claim.

Estimating claims involves quantifying the future liabilities. There are two categories of risks - long tail and short tail. Personal injury accounts for most of the long tail portfolio – eg workers' compensation, public liability and medical negligence.

It is important to know what information is required for a claim and how to obtain the information to be able to accurately assess the quantum. It is wise to talk to a range of people, such as the worker, medical providers and legal advisers to gather sufficient information. As an example, workers' compensation claims costs are generally made up of six elements:

- weekly payments;
- lump sum – permanent impairment;
- common law;
- medical;
- rehabilitation; and
- legal/investigations/other.

There is no particular formula for estimating claims – they should be conducted on a case by case basis. There are many variables in each case – eg types of injuries, financial, psychological, social and economic climate. There is no correlation between injury type and cost, thus every claim needs to be looked at differently. And you must have the facts to back up any figure that you come up with.

Any settlement of a complex claim must be referred to the Office of the DPP. Any related legal advice must also be obtained from the Office of the DPP.

Legal decisions made by the DPP

At the Workers' Compensation Sub-Committee meeting of 16 May 2002 a question was raised as to the correct legal basis for calculating weekly compensation under the *Workers Rehabilitation and Compensation Act 1988* for an employee who is not currently in receipt of weekly payments and who has taken sick leave and annual leave, pending determination of a dispute under section 81A of the Act.

In summary, Crown Law's advice to agencies is not to re-credit sick leave and annual leave, as there is no legal obligation to do so. Treasury sent a memo on 9 July 2002 to all agencies notifying them of Crown Law's advice.

If any agency has a query in relation to the DPP's advice, please contact Paul Turner or Luci Wilkins at the Office of the DPP.

TRMF Procedures Manual

Version 2 of the Tasmanian Risk Management Fund Procedures Manual has now been completed. The electronic version of the Procedures Manual is available in pdf format from the Fund's web site, which can be accessed through Treasury's web site at www.treasury.tas.gov.au.

Version 2 of the Manual has expanded on existing sections in Version 1, and incorporates new sections. The section "Definitions of Classes of Risk" has been significantly expanded to provide a fuller explanation of the cover provided by the Fund for each type of risk and their excess levels, while the section "Claims Procedures" has also been significantly expanded to include procedures for workers' compensation, motor vehicle and building claims. The following are the new sections that have been developed and incorporated in Version 2 of the Manual:

- The roles of each of the stakeholders in the Fund
- Guidelines for Referring Workers' Compensation Matters to the Office of the Director of Public Prosecutions
- Hold Harmless and Indemnity Issues in Contracts
- Frequently Asked Questions
- Standard/Proforma Letters for Motor Vehicle Under Excess Claims; and
- Issues Register to track agency suggestions/ amendments.

If you would like to comment on Version 2 of the Manual or make any suggestions for future versions, please contact Sarah Hazell on 6233 4751, or by e-mail at sarah.hazell@treasury.tas.gov.au.

Integrated Risk Management Project - interview with Peter Wise, Department of Health and Human Services

The Department of Health and Human Services (DHHS) is implementing a risk management project, known as the Integrated Risk Management Project (IRMP). The IRMP is being staged over two years and is into its second year. It is based on a methodology, now widely utilised internationally, known as Enterprise Risk Management.

The Project Manager, Peter Wise, gave a presentation to the Liability Sub-Committee on 18 July 2002, outlining the scope of the project, the success factors and the lessons learned. The following provides us with an insight into the IRMP and DHHS's experiences in implementing the Project:

What is Enterprise Risk Management?

Fundamentally, Enterprise Risk Management (ERM) has been developed as a mechanism to assist organisations to meet their business objectives. It does so by identifying, assessing, mitigating and monitoring risks in a holistic manner. In effect, ERM demonstrates in a 'big picture' sense, how an organisation should be operating.

What is the Scope of the DHHS Project?

The scope of the project is to identify business risks across DHHS and to integrate these with other established risk management processes, such as Occupational Health and Safety and Strategic Asset Management.

What timeframe was given for the Project?

Implementation is to take two years, working on a Division by Division basis. However, organisational changes made early on in the year slowed the momentum of the project rollout to some extent.

What resources were required to implement the Project?

Less than three full time staff facilitated implementation of the Project in a very complex and diverse Division (consisting of about 3 000 full time staff) over a three month period. One of those three staff members spent much of the time enhancing and administering the supporting information system (the need for this level of technical support has since decreased).

What's involved in the Project implementation?

The DHHS methodology utilises workshops at two levels – executive management groups and vertical slices of management/staff. Vertical slice workshops have up to ten participants (excluding facilitators). In the most complex and diverse Division in the Agency, 26 workshops were held.

What happens after these workshops?

After implementation, ERM operates seamlessly within existing governance processes. This is presuming that line management regularly meets with the relevant staff and senior and executive managers meet regularly as a group. It has been proposed that an annual review should be held within each Division, in the form of a workshop. These workshops will be of a much lower intensity and duration than the implementation workshops and will largely consist

of reviewing the existing risk register and assessing new programs.

How does the Project work?

For guidance, DHHS uses the ten Key Performance Indicators for risk management from the Australian National Audit Office (ANAO), the Australian Risk Management Standard AS/NZS 4360:1999 and the Enterprise Risk Management framework.

At the vertical slice workshops, risks are identified and analysed/scored using a risk analysis matrix. The risks are then evaluated and treated appropriately. The risk scores derived at workshops are used as a guide by executive management when they perform their final evaluation. Agency guidelines are available for treatment of risks, according to their score.

The ERM process develops a profile of risks – both potential barriers and missed opportunities – through the Agency. This is developed from a local site level, across a service, across a sub-Division, across a Division, and finally across the Agency. The process integrates all methods of risk management, all of the Agency's operations and both strategic and operational planning.

The risk profile is developed by establishing the commonality of risks and their levels of seriousness, whether any extreme risks exist in isolation, the interrelationships between risks (particularly causal links), common sources of risks and their impacts. The use of a list of generic risks at the workshops greatly assists in collating results of workshops. Profiling provides an opportunity to:

- identify risks that create a cascading effect, allowing the opportunity for significant efficiencies when mitigating risks;
- determine the underlying causes, sources and impacts of risks; and
- identify the appropriate level of management to treat individual risks, in the interests of efficiency and effectiveness.

What are the limitations of ERM?

There are some limitations of ERM, but these are far outweighed by its advantages. The limitations are that:

- it will not provide a finite picture of exposures;
- it may not identify the risk of fraud;
- it doesn't completely negate the need for independent appraisal (eg. to evaluate compliance with policy, legislation etc.); and
- auditing is still necessary, although its need is diminished.

What have been the major factors for the Project's success?

One of the most significant factors for the Project's success in DHHS, to date, has been the support from management and staff. The Secretary of DHHS is the Project's sponsor and champion. The Deputy Secretary was also very supportive of the Project. All levels of management and staff, who have been involved with the Project, have embraced the process. And of course, the contribution of

skills and tenacity from the Project Team in Internal Audit has been of major value to the outcome.

What tips would you give other Agencies considering the implementation of a similar risk management project?

- research the subject;
- be cautious and use a proven project implementation methodology;
- benchmark where you can; and
- network.

Piloting the Project implementation initially in one Division worked extremely well, as the benefits could be seen by other Divisions.

Ian Deayton's tips for good risk management *

Ian Deayton, Risk Manager, at Heath Lambert, recently spoke at a conference hosted by the Association of Risk and Insurance Managers of Australasia (ARIMA) where he defined "Risk Management" as "a total approach to the protection of an organisation's reputation, personnel, income, assets and liabilities".

Ian Deayton's advice to organisations is to find out what the organisation's risks are, look at the potential treatments and see what the probability of occurrence is. Tips for good risk management are:

- know your organisation – the more you know, the more you understand what must be done to keep the organisation afloat. Be inquisitive, find things out;
- write your own philosophy and risk management plan - what do you want risk management to achieve? If you don't know, "you don't deserve to have a consultant write it for you";
- take control and be practical; and
- outsource wisely - many organisations tender for risk management services without understanding what they need or what specialists they need to do the job.

**The information above has been reproduced with the permission of Ian Deayton.*

Department of Infrastructure, Energy and Resources' business risk review project

Following a Business Continuity workshop conducted by Marsh Pty Ltd, the Department of Infrastructure, Energy and Resources (DIER) saw the benefit of developing an integrated risk management approach, which had two elements.

The first was a Business Risk Review which brought together all of the major risks for the Department and which built on a number of other initiatives which had been undertaken over previous years.

The second element was to develop an "all hazards" approach to managing risk events that might occur

infrequently. The "all hazards" approach develops a generic process for managing containment and recovery rather than having contingency plans for every possible event.

In December 2001, with the assistance of Marsh Pty Ltd, DIER started to implement a Business Risk Review Project. The first step was to identify all of the risks that the Department faced. A list of risk headings was provided to Departmental staff, who used their expertise and experience to identify as many risks as possible.

Each risk identified was given a score according to a consequence rating scale. Rating one was insignificant (no injuries and/or minor loss of asset or other financial loss less than \$5 000 and/or reporting, not front page, in suburban newspaper and/or brief pollution but no environmental harm and/or no disruption to services). Rating five was catastrophic (single death through accident and/or significant asset destruction or other financial loss greater than \$10 million, to DIER or to the community if the loss is the result of DIER's action or inaction, and/or adverse major national TV news headlines for several days and/or parliamentary intervention eg. Royal Commission and/or catastrophic, long term environmental harm and/or total cessation of service for six months).

The risks were also scored on a likelihood rating. One being rare (will occur less than once every 20 years) and five being almost certain (will occur more than 10 time(s) each year).

For each risk the likelihood rating and consequence rating were multiplied which gave a possible rating range of one to 25. For any risk with a final rating of 12 or above, a set of mitigation strategies was developed. Any risk that had a rating below 12, but included a consequence rating of five (catastrophic) was also included.

Strategies were devised on the assumption that no existing controls were in place. From the list of risks, an action list was created to help manage the identified risks. The information was then provided to all sections of the Department for review, to ensure the proposed strategies and actions were appropriate and the right area had lead responsibility for implementing the agreed strategies.

This action list has become an integral part of the Department's Corporate Plan Cycle and is used to inform the review of the Corporate and Divisional plans each year. The Internal Audit provider will also play a key role in monitoring progress as divisions implement the mitigation strategies. Successful implementation will lead to reduced overall ratings.

The major project difficulty encountered was in underestimating the level of expertise required to continue the work of the consultant engaged. However, the transfer of knowledge to the Department as a result of its staff taking a lead role in the project better places the Department to have risk management become integrated into the business of the Department.

DIER was pleased with the support provided by Marsh Pty Ltd. Marsh's involvement included helping establish the process to be followed, running workshops, identifying risks and helping to develop the ratings system and mitigation strategies.

Open Disclosure Project

On 4 March 2002, the Department of Health and Human Services (DHHS) hosted a Consultative Workshop as part of the consultative phase of the National Open Disclosure Project, an initiative of the Australian Council for Safety and Quality in Health Care (the Council).

The Council defines "Open Disclosure" as "the open discussion of incidents that resulted in unintended harm to a patient while receiving health care". Open disclosure includes:

- an expression of regret;
- a factual explanation of what happened;
- an appreciation of the potential consequences;
- steps being taken to manage the event; and
- an explanation of steps to prevent recurrence.

The Open Disclosure Project aims to improve the practice of open disclosure by providing health care professionals and health services with:

- the practical tools to adopt good practices;
- a national Standard setting out specifications and procedures; and
- an organisational support and education package.

Consultation Workshops, held at the DHHS, were the primary method of consultation with stakeholders and consisted of information sessions, small group discussions and general discussion of the issues. The workshops clearly supported the element of open disclosure that includes a process of review, assessment and changes to prevent recurrence.

The Open Disclosure Project is also concerned with overcoming obstacles to open discussion of adverse events by health care providers – attitudes of infallibility, fear of litigation and inadequate organisational systems for discussing and learning from mistakes. Almost all stakeholders indicated that the systems they have in place for monitoring and reporting adverse events are inadequate.

The Open Disclosure Project will produce a national Standard to provide guidance on open disclosure and an education and organisational support package to facilitate implementation. The acute hospital setting is the focus of the Standard but the process may be extended to other health care environments in the future such as community and aged facilities. The Standard and support package will be completed by December 2002.

As a result of the initial consultation phase, the Council has recommended that a further program of workshops is held nationally to promote implementation of the standard and support package in 2003.

If you would like to find out more about the Open Disclosure Project, please contact the Project Manager, Louise Kershaw, either by phone on (02) 9926 5991 or by e-mail at Lkershaw@doh.health.nsw.gov.au.

Personal Liability in the Public Sector

The Institute of Public Administration Australia held a lunchtime seminar on Personal Liability in the Public Sector on 18 July 2002 at Parliament House. Simon Allston, Principal Crown Counsel of the Solicitor-General's Office, was the presenter. The following article summarises Mr Allston's presentation.

Mr Allston examined the potential legal liability that public servants, statutory office holders and directors of Government Boards are exposed to in undertaking their duties for the Crown and the protection provided by the Crown to its officers, in carrying out those duties.

The key message of Mr Allston's seminar was that a servant or agent of the Crown is exposed to personal liability only in the case of bad faith.

A person will be taken to have acted in good faith if the person honestly and diligently purports to do their duty. Honesty in this respect includes the absence of both dishonesty and malice.

Protection by the Crown

The Committee on Actions against Public Servants and Others has been established to recommend to the Government those cases where the Crown should accept responsibility for the alleged conduct of an employee or agent.

For the Crown to protect an employee, the alleged wrong must be committed in the course of that person's employment. If the conduct is reasonably incidental to employment, or a wrong way of doing what the person is employed to do, it would still be deemed to be in the course of employment. However, if the employee's behaviour was criminal or the employee was engaged in a private escapade, then the conduct would not be in the course of the person's employment. In the case of an agent of the Crown, the alleged wrong must be committed within the apparent scope of the agency in order for the Crown to accept responsibility for their conduct.

It is very rare for an indemnity not to be granted. If the employee or agent acted in good faith and in the course of their employment or within the apparent scope of the agency, then the Crown will generally accept responsibility for their actions. The indemnity would normally extend to legal costs properly incurred, and if there is no conflict of interest, representation is usually given by the Office of the Director of Public Prosecutions.

The protection extends to all employees and agents of the Crown.

Statutory Protection

Employees or agents of the Crown may also be protected under statute.

The *Statutory Authorities (Protection from Liability of Members) Act 1993* provides that a member of a statutory authority does not incur any personal liability in respect of any act or omission undertaken in good faith in the performance of his or her duties in the administration of the Act under which the statutory authority is established. Also,

section 34A of the *Government Business Enterprises Act 1995* states that a GBE may indemnify an employee against civil liability (other than liability to the GBE) in all cases except where the liability arises out of conduct involving a lack of good faith. A GBE may also indemnify an employee against liability for costs and expenses incurred in defending a proceeding where judgement is given in favour of the employee and for costs incurred in connection with an application in relation to a proceeding where relief is granted to the employee by the court.

There are also many provisions in specific Acts that protect employees where the act or omission is performed in good faith. Examples include the *Liquor and Accommodation Act 1990*, section 221, the *Ben Lomond Skifield Management Authority Act 1995*, section 28, and the *Tasmanian Development Act 1983*, section 40.

Tort of negligence

The law of negligence comprises three basic elements:

1. a duty of care, to take reasonable care to avoid foreseeable risk of injury or damage to others;
2. a breach of that duty; and
3. injury or damage caused to a person by the breach of that duty, which is not too remote in law.

There is no single principle governing the liability in negligence, thus making this area unpredictable.

In difficult cases, there has been an increasing tendency to find liability in negligence against a statutory authority where a vulnerable plaintiff has suffered loss by reason of the failure to exercise a statutory duty or power. This is an area of risk where:

- it is reasonably foreseeable that a failure to exercise a statutory power will most likely cause loss or damage to an identifiable party or parties;
- the parties are vulnerable in the sense of not being able to satisfactorily protect their own interests; and
- in cases where core policy-making or quasi-legislative matters are not involved.

A duty of care arises where a maker of a statement realises, or should reasonably have realised, that the recipient intends to rely on the information or advice in some matter of business or serious consequence (and such reliance is reasonable).

Where a duty is held to be non-delegable, the person owing that duty cannot avoid it by using an independent contractor – ie a duty cannot be passed on to someone else. A non-delegable duty is owed in such relationships as the following:

- school authorities and pupils;
- hospitals and patients;
- occupier of property and contractual entrant; and
- employer and employee in relation to system of work, safety of equipment and premises, and employment of co-workers.

Fleet Safety Forum

A Fleet Safety Forum, hosted by the Department of Infrastructure, Energy and Resources at Launceston's International Hotel, was held on 4 April 2002.

The forum was a half-day management development seminar focusing on the purchase of safer vehicles and fleet safety management principles. The guest speakers were Dr Laurie Sparke OAM, Manager of Advanced Engineering at Holden in Melbourne, and Mr Danny Dougherty, Regional Manager, Workplace Standards Authority. The issues discussed at the forum included a history of road safety in Australia, current crash analysis, airbag technology, fleet safety management principles, purchasing of safer vehicles and OH&S legislation.

Road accidents are the most common cause of work-related death, injury and absence from work. Of all fatal road accidents, 23 per cent occur during work time, and a further 26 per cent occur whilst commuting to or from work. As a result, employers are subjected to costs both directly (ie. workers' compensation) and indirectly (ie. loss of corporate knowledge). Consequently, it is in an employer's interest to actively care for the safety and well being of its employees.

Dr Sparke noted that vehicle safety performance and driver competence, experience, behaviour and fatigue all have a bearing on crash risk. However, most employers do not have strategies to address these issues. The key message of the forum was that employers should develop strategies to address these issues. The development of a fleet purchase and use policy was suggested as a "must" for employers. A fleet purchase and use policy would ensure a safer working environment for employees, plus establish an expectation of safe driving behaviour, but would also ensure an improved standard of safety to the large section of the community that purchase fleet vehicles second-hand.

The Department of Infrastructure, Energy and Resources (DIER) is currently in the process of developing a Departmental fleet safety/fleet management policy. In doing this, DIER is aiming to achieve best practice in the use of motor vehicles. The policy will also include access to safe hire cars.

On 13 June 2002, the Fund's Property Sub-Committee endorsed the development of a motor vehicle fleet purchase and use policy for use by agencies participating in the Fund. Treasury is currently developing such a policy for use by agencies. The policy will draw on information from a number of sources, including accident data collected by the Fund and information from the Road Safety Unit of DIER. It is anticipated that the Fleet Purchase and Use Policy will be finalised by March 2003.

Workplace Safe Week

Workplace Safe Week is being held from 28 October to 1 November 2002. Workplace Safe Week is an initiative of WorkCover Tasmania and Workplace Standards Tasmania.

The theme for Workplace Safe Week is "a week of ways to prevent the strain". The theme highlights the fact that injuries can occur to shoulders, arms, elbows, fingers and hands. Statistics show that after back injuries, these are the most common parts of the body affected by strain.

Agencies are encouraged to organise a safety event in the workplace during Workplace Safe Week.

For further information, please call 1300 366 322 or visit the website at www.wsa.tas.gov.au.

Treasury contacts

Tom Saltmarsh

Principal Policy Analyst

Ph: 6233 3763

E-mail: tom.saltmarsh@treasury.tas.gov.au

Sarah Hazell

Senior Policy Analyst

Ph: 6233 4751

E-mail: sarah.hazell@treasury.tas.gov.au

Bindi Knoop

Senior Policy Analyst

Ph: 6233 6597

E-mail: bindi.knoop@treasury.tas.gov.au

Kate Daley

Senior Policy Analyst

Department of Treasury and Finance

Ph: 6233 6627

E-mail: kate.daley@treasury.tas.gov.au

riskmatters

Subscription Service

Why not become a subscriber to the electronic version of *riskmatters* on www.treasury.tas.gov.au and receive an e-mail alert and link to the site on the day of publication.

To register, contact the Newsletter Editor, Bindi Knoop, at the Department of Treasury and Finance on 03 6233 6597 or e-mail bindi.knoop@treasury.tas.gov.au.