

# Results of 2014 perceptions survey of Resources Safety stakeholders

**Reported October 2014** 

1 Adelaide Terrace, East Perth WA 6004
Postal address: Mineral House, 100 Plain Street, East Perth WA 6004
Telephone: (08) 9358 8002 Facsimile: (08) 9358 8000
ResourcesSafety@dmp.wa.gov.au
www.dmp.wa.gov.au/ResourcesSafety

### **Contents**

1	Introduction	3
2	How the survey was conducted	
3	Presentation of results	5
4	Overview of results for mining professionals	6
5	Overview of results for mines safety and health representatives	7
6	Overview of results for petroleum stakeholders	8
7	Overview of results for MHF stakeholders	9
8	Regulator's observations and response	10
Apı	pendix 1: Comparison of survey responses from mining professionals	12
Apı	pendix 2: Comparison of survey responses from mines safety and health representatives	17
Apı	pendix 3: Comparison of survey responses from petroleum stakeholders	22
Apı	pendix 4: Comparison of survey responses from MHF stakeholders	27
Apı	pendix 5: Survey questions for mining and petroleum stakeholders	32
Apı	pendix 6: Survey questions for MHF stakeholders	37

### 1 Introduction

In 2010, the Department of Mines and Petroleum started implementing the State Government's Reform and Development at Resources Safety (RADARS) strategy. For the Department's Resources Safety Division, this initiative addresses issues of legislation, staff capacity and competency at the safety regulator, and introduces a cost recovery approach to fund safety regulation of the Western Australian resources industry. It also aims to support positive cultural change across the industry.

The RADARS initiative is now over four years into a plan expected to take at least six years for the major changes to be implemented across three regulatory areas covering mining, petroleum (and geothermal energy), and dangerous goods. Consolidation and improvement of regulatory practices will be ongoing.

The biennial stakeholder perceptions survey is conducted to monitor changes in industry's perception of Resources Safety's performance as a safety regulator before, during and after completion of the RADARS strategy. It is a qualitative external assessment of regulatory performance that is combined with a range of internal measures to inform Departmental planning processes.

The survey specifically addresses:

- importance of the roles of a safety regulator and how well Resources Safety performed those roles
- perceptions of Resources Safety's performance when working with industry to reduce the likelihood and consequences of serious incidents
- perceptions of the value that various initiatives could add to clients' safety outcomes.

The survey also seeks industry's view of its own performance in achieving a proactive, consultative safety culture and how advanced it is in having the attributes of a resilient safety culture.

The original survey was conducted in 2010 to establish a baseline against which to measure progress. The first of the biennial follow-up surveys was conducted in 2012.

This report reviews the results from the 2014 survey and compares them with the previous survey results to determine whether and how industry perceptions of Resources Safety's regulatory activities are changing. It identifies those compliance and awareness raising activities that stakeholders consider the regulator to be performing well or where there has been a significant improvement in perception ratings, as well as areas of concern where industry perceptions are less favourable or ratings have decreased.

### 2 How the survey was conducted

### Baseline survey and biennial follow-up

In 2010, the Department commissioned Research Solutions to survey stakeholders about their perceptions of Resources Safety's roles, services and functions, with the aim of establishing a robust baseline against which to measure the Division's progress towards achieving the aims of the safety reform initiative. The results of the 2010 baseline perceptions survey were reported in February 2011.

In 2012, using the same questions, similar groups of industry representatives were surveyed by DMP in the first of a biennial series of follow-up surveys to see if industry's perceptions of Resources Safety as a safety regulator had changed since the introduction of RADARS. Three regulatory areas are covered — mining, onshore petroleum operations and major hazard facilities (MHFs). The results were reported in March 2013. Stakeholders are grouped as mining professionals (comprising managers and occupational safety and health professionals), mine safety and health representatives, site managers and other safety representatives from onshore petroleum operations, and site managers and other safety representatives from major hazard facilities (MHFs).

Note: Only MHFs are included in the perceptions surveys. Other dangerous goods sites and activities are addressed in separate surveys following site visits.

The Department conducted the second biennial survey between February and April 2014. The only change from the 2012 survey was the addition of a demographic question that asks mining and petroleum stakeholders to indicate their inspectorate. This is only applicable to mining operations and the information will be used by the mines inspectorate for planning purposes.

### Distribution of survey

There has been a concerted effort to increase participation in the 2014 survey. An invitation to participate in the second biennial survey, including a link to the online survey, was emailed in February 2014 to all mine and exploration managers, mines safety and health representatives, and petroleum and MHF stakeholders for whom Resources Safety had email addresses. An invitation and hard copy of the survey were posted to stakeholders for whom no email address was held.

A reminder email was sent to all stakeholder groups in March, and several Resources Safety news alerts issued to prompt mining safety and health representatives to complete the survey.

In late March, the petroleum and MHF stakeholders were telephoned and sent another follow-up email asking them to forward the survey link to other members of their team.

Access to the online survey closed in mid-April.

### Response

The survey was completed by:

- 293 mining managers and other professionals
- 255 elected safety and health representatives from the mining industry
- 38 professionals and safety representatives from onshore petroleum industry
- 38 professionals and safety representatives from MHFs.

The additional communication with stakeholders in March improved the number of responses for all stakeholder groups compared to the 2010 and 2012 surveys. Unfortunately, however, despite the focus on increasing participation, it was still difficult to obtain a statistically valid sample size for the petroleum and MHF stakeholders as the number of contacts available is limited due to the nature of the industries.

Changes in the industry's workforce, and not being able to guarantee that the same respondents are completing the survey at the different stages, also makes comparison between survey cycles difficult.

Note: Some questions were not answered by all respondents.

### 3 Presentation of results

The 2010, 2012 and 2014 data are listed separately for each stakeholder group (Appendices 1 to 4) in the same order as the survey questions (Appendices 5 and 6).

The Department aspires to regulatory best practice so ratings of 8 to 10 out of 10 (8-10/10) are used as the benchmark for excellence in all reports. Over time, if industry considers that Resources Safety's performance is improving, the proportion of respondents assigning a rating in this range should increase.

The average rating is also listed to indicate the mid-point of the stakeholder ratings — the higher the value, the more positive the overall perception of the respondent group.

The magnitude of changes in average ratings from 2012 to 2014 have been categorised for ease of interpretation.

- Purple indicates an improvement in the average rating of 15% or more

  Green indicates an improvement of between 5% and 14.9%

  Amber indicates the improvement or decline in average rating is less than 5%

  Red indicates a decline of between 5% and 14.9%
- Grey indicates a decline in the average rating of 15% or more

Note: Findings should be interpreted with caution because of the limitations imposed by small sample sizes for some groups and unavoidable changes in the pool of respondents, as well as individual's changes in understanding and expectations over time. Looking for trends and clusters is probably more useful than quantitative analysis as there may be significant margins of error for some results, and hence the degree of confidence with which changes should or can be interpreted.

### 4 Overview of results for mining professionals

Note: Based on 293 responses

### Interaction with Resources Safety

Mining professionals reported having less contact with Resources Safety in 2014 than in 2012. Similar to 2012, the most common frequency of contact in 2014 was several times.

### Value of regulatory roles

In 2014, most mining professionals considered all regulatory roles listed under *compliance activities* and *raising awareness and promoting safety outcomes* as being essential for the safety regulator. The average ratings are similar to 2012, with all except two being in the 8 to 10/10 range.

### Regulatory performance

About 30% of mining professionals gave Resources Safety a rating of 8 or more out of 10 for performance as a proactive safety regulator. Almost 24% gave a rating of 8 to 10/10 in relation to adding significant value.

The table below shows the percentage change in average ratings between the 2012 and 2014 surveys for survey questions specifically asking about performance in a range of activities. A positive value indicates an improvement while a negative value indicates that the average rating decreased.

MINING PROFESSIONALS								
Change in average rating 2012 to 2014	≥ 15% Significant improvement	5% to14.9% Improvement	< 5% to -4.9% Little or no change	-5% to -14.9% Decline	≤ -15% Significant decline			
Number of activities	1	23	18	0	0			

In 2014, Resources Safety is perceived as doing well in undertaking compliance activities, raising awareness and promoting safety outcomes. When compared to 2012 results, the average ratings for over half the activities improved by at least 5% in 2014.

In 2014, the average ratings for Resources Safety's performance in working with the minerals sector to reduce the likelihood and consequences of serious incidents have improved across-the-board for the regulator overall, mines inspectors as a group, and the guidance material provided. However, although mining professionals think performance has improved in this area, only two average ratings are in the excellent range (8-10/10).

### Value of suggested activities

While most mining professionals continue to think that the regulatory activities suggested could add value to industry operations, activities that are now viewed less favourably in 2014 than in 2012 include ensuring mandatory training for safety and health representatives, and facilitating the development of industry networks.

### Industry self-assessment of safety culture

The 2014 survey results indicate that mining professionals' perception of their industry in terms of being a proactive, consultative safety culture is similar to that in 2012. Furthermore, about a quarter of the stakeholder group think the minerals sector has some of the attributes of a resilient safety culture, although the average ratings are comparable to the 2012 results.

### 5 Overview of results for mines safety and health representatives

Note: Based on 255 responses

### **Interaction with Resources Safety**

Mines safety and health representatives reported having more contact with Resources Safety in 2014 than in 2012, with 40% reporting contact. As for previous surveys, the frequency of contact was once to several times.

### Value of regulatory roles

In 2014, around three-quarters of mines safety and health representatives considered all regulatory roles listed under *compliance activities* and *raising awareness and promoting safety outcomes* as being essential for the safety regulator. The average ratings are similar to 2012, with all being in the 8 to 10/10 range.

### Regulatory performance

Some 32% of mines safety and health representatives gave Resources a rating of 8 or more out of 10 for performance as a proactive safety regulator. Almost 36% gave a rating of 8 to 10/10 in relation to adding significant value.

The table below shows the percentage change in average ratings between the 2012 and 2014 surveys for survey questions specifically asking about performance in a range of activities. A positive value indicates an improvement while a negative value indicates that the average rating decreased.

MINES SAFETY AND HEALTH REPRESENTATIVES								
Change in average rating 2012 to 2014	≥ 15% Significant improvement	5% to14.9% Improvement	< 5% to -4.9% Little or no change	-5% to -14.9% Decline	≤ -15% Significant decline			
Number of activities	9	36	0	0	0			

In 2014, Resources Safety is perceived by many mines safety and health representatives as doing very well in undertaking compliance activities, raising awareness and promoting safety outcomes. When compared to 2012 results, the average ratings for all activities have improved by at least 5% in 2014, with three showing significant improvement.

In 2014, there has been a significant increase in the proportion of mines safety and health representatives giving excellent ratings to Resources Safety for its performance in working with the minerals sector to reduce the likelihood and consequences of serious incidents. This result is matched by improvements in the average ratings for the regulator overall, mines inspectors as a group, and the guidance material provided. The lowest average rating is 7.4, while 14 activities are assessed as being in the excellent range (8-10/10).

### Value of suggested activities

Most mines safety and health representatives continue to think that the regulatory activities suggested could add value to industry operations, with roadshows and other presentations being viewed more favourably in 2014 than in 2012.

### Industry self-assessment of safety culture

The 2014 survey results indicate a decrease in the proportion of mines safety and health representatives who think their industry has met the goal of having a proactive, consultative safety culture, down from 40% in 2012 to about 35% in 2014. However, the average ratings for selected cultural attributes are comparable to those for 2012.

### 6 Overview of results for petroleum stakeholders

Note: Based on 38 responses

### Interaction with Resources Safety

The proportion of petroleum respondents who had contact with Resources Safety was lower in 2014 than in 2012. Of those who interacted with the regulator, multiple contacts were most common.

### Value of regulatory roles

In 2014, fewer petroleum stakeholders regard the regulatory roles listed under *compliance activities* and *raising awareness and promoting safety outcomes* as being essential for the safety regulator. The average ratings are lower than those in 2012, with none in the 8-10/10 range.

### Regulatory performance

About 28% of petroleum stakeholders gave Resources Safety a rating of 8 or more out of 10 for performance as a proactive safety regulator. Almost 28% gave a rating of 8 to 10/10 in relation to adding significant value.

The table below shows the percentage change in average ratings between the 2012 and 2014 surveys for survey questions specifically asking about performance in a range of activities. A positive value indicates an improvement while a negative value indicates that the average rating decreased.

PETROLEUM STAKEHOLDERS								
Change in average rating 2012 to 2014	≥ 15% Significant improvement	5% to14.9% Improvement	< 5% to -4.9% Little or no change	-5% to -14.9% Decline	≤ -15% Significant decline			
Number of activities	0	4	18	21	1			

In 2014, fewer than half the respondents thought that Resources Safety was performing very well in undertaking compliance activities, and the proportion was lower for raising awareness and promoting safety outcomes. When compared to the 2012 results, apart from incident investigations, the average ratings in 2014 showed little or no change or declined.

In 2014, the average ratings for Resources Safety's performance in working with the petroleum industry to reduce the likelihood and consequences of serious incidents declined or showed little or no improvement almost across-the-board for the regulator overall, petroleum safety assessors as a group, and the guidance material provided. There are no average ratings in the excellent range (8-10/10).

### Value of suggested activities

There were mixed responses about which initiatives would add value to an operation but most petroleum stakeholders continue to value activities relating to feedback and consultation. There appears to be a greater appetite for roadshows and other formal presentations, and the facilitation of industry networks.

### Industry self-assessment of safety culture

The 2014 survey responses indicate that, although the average ratings for specific attributes are comparable to the results for 2012, fewer petroleum stakeholders assess their industry as having a proactive, consultative safety culture.

### 7 Overview of results for MHF stakeholders

Note: Based on 38 responses

### **Interaction with Resources Safety**

All MHF respondents reported contact with Resources Safety in 2014, and almost all were multiple contacts.

### Value of regulatory roles

Given the nature of the safety legislation for MHFs, MHF stakeholders were only asked about compliance activities to find out which regulatory roles they perceive as being important as a safety regulator. Overall, more respondents in 2014 considered the activities to be important although average ratings were comparable to those for 2012, and only one activity was in the 8-10/10 range.

### Regulatory performance

About 22% of MHF stakeholders gave Resources Safety a rating of 8 or more out of 10 for performance as a proactive safety regulator. About 22% gave a rating of 8 to 10/10 in relation to adding significant value.

The table below shows the percentage change in average ratings between the 2012 and 2014 surveys for survey questions specifically asking about performance in a range of activities. A positive value indicates an improvement while a negative value indicates that the average rating decreased.

MHF STAKEHOLDERS								
Change in average rating 2012 to 2014	≥ 15% Significant improvement	5% to14.9% Improvement	< 5% to -4.9% Little or no change	-5% to -14.9% Decline	≤ -15% Significant decline			
Number of activities	18	13	8	0	0			

The 2014 survey saw an increase in the proportion of MHF stakeholders who thought that Resources Safety was performing very well in undertaking compliance activities, although responding to safety complaints was the only regulatory role attracting an excellent rating (8-10/10) from more than half the respondents. There were also significant improvements in four of the five average ratings.

In 2014, the average ratings for Resources Safety's performance in working with MHF operators to reduce the likelihood and consequences of serious incidents have improved across-the-board for the regulator overall, MHF authorised officers as a group, and the guidance material provided. However, there are no average ratings in the excellent range (8-10/10).

### Value of suggested activities

There were mixed responses about which initiatives would add value to an operation but most MHF stakeholders continue to value activities relating to feedback. There appears to be a greater appetite for consultation and the provision of guidance on preparing safety plans.

### Industry self-assessment of safety culture

The 2014 survey responses indicate that little change in MHF stakeholders' assessment of where facilities sit in terms of having a proactive, consultative safety culture.

### 8 Regulator's observations and response

According to feedback from a variety of sources over the past 18 months, industry has observed improvements in the way Resources Safety conducts many of its regulatory activities. This observation is supported by some results from the 2014 perceptions survey.

It is recognised that attitudes change slowly and tend to endure, so there is likely to be a lag in changing perceptions — even when improvements have been made. In any case, the survey results allow the regulator to identify opportunities for improving interaction with industry to achieve the common goal of improving safety and health outcomes for the Western Australian resources industry.

### Mines safety

When RADARS was implemented in 2010, the highest priorities were the regulatory activities undertaken to administer the *Mines Safety and Inspection Act 1994*. The initial focus was to address issues of capacity and competency, and continue to promote a risk-based approach to occupational safety and health. Extensive recruitment campaigns and a competency-based training and development program led to an increase in the number of inspectors and a broader mix of skills and experience.

The team-based structure and focus groups now in place are supporting more consistent approaches to raising awareness, seeking compliance and enforcing the legislation. When fully developed, the online Safety Regulation System (SRS) will provide enhanced data management and analysis.

The Department believes that, under RADARS, there have been significant improvements in the delivery of mines safety regulatory services. Using a variety of data sources, including the results of this survey, the inspectorate is targeting areas where improvements can be made to address areas of continuing concern.

In 2010, for example, it was accepted that mines safety and health representatives required more support and recognition of the importance of their role so a specific focus group was established. A range of strategies and resources were developed and these are reflected in the 2014 survey results for regulatory performance.

### Petroleum safety

No specific programs were put in place over the last two years for petroleum safety other than to recruit and train new staff. The regulator has mostly focussed on handling incoming safety case and safety management system assessment work and doing safety systems inspections.

Given this background and the increased number of respondents, it is perhaps not surprising that the ratings for most of the questions have fluctuated over the survey periods.

Although most performance ratings have improved, activities awarded an excellent rating by fewer than half the respondents could be considered as those where industry believes there is a need to improve. They are:

- conducting audits and inspections
- · investigating incidents
- resolving safety disputes in the workplace and responding to safety complaints
- providing advice and information about safety
- monitoring safety performance data and health surveillance programs
- supporting health and safety representatives.

### Major hazard facilities

As for petroleum safety, the MHF group had not put in place any specific programs to address issues raised by the previous perceptions survey.

In the past two years, the MHF group completed all of its brownfield safety report approvals and implemented an auditing program. The latter was viewed by industry with some trepidation at first but is now clearly acknowledged as being a highly professional and productive activity. This is reflected in industry's assessment of the MHF group's overall performance as a regulator, which significantly improved in every area in 2014 although responding to safety complaints was the only activity receiving excellent ratings from more than half the respondents.

The assessments also show that there is still room for improvement in:

consistency of approach and response

- being adaptable to industry conditions
- efficiency of audits
- usefulness of guidance material.

### Appendix 1: Comparison of survey responses from mining professionals

**MINING PROFESSIONALS** 

### STAKEHOLDER GROUP PROFILE

In 2014, there were 293 responses from mining and exploration professionals. This represents an increase of 48% from 2012 when there were 141 responses. In 2010, responses were received from only 65 professionals.

The mining professionals participating in the survey can be described as follows:

- Half come from organisations with more than 500 employees
- Mainly operation managers, OHS professionals, general managers or senior executive, and supervisors
- Being well experienced in the resources sector, with 60% having more than 10 years

The professionals also have a reasonable amount of contact with Resources Safety:

- 70% had contact with Resources Safety in the previous 12 months
- Of those who had contact with Resources Safety, more than 80% had several or many instances of contact
- · Contact was initiated for a wide variety of reasons but almost 70% involved audits or inspections

	2010	2012	2014
RESPONDENT PROFILE	%	%	%
Size of organisation			
Less than 10 employees	28	7	7
10-100 employees	37	18	11
101-500 employees	24	33	32
TOTAL - Less than 500 employees	89	58	50
More than 500 employees	11	42	50
Inspectorate Boundary			
North (Pilbara)	n/a	n/a	40
North (Kimberley)	n/a	n/a	6
West	n/a	n/a	27
East	n/a	n/a	22
Not specified – exploration or other	n/a	n/a	5
Respondent's current role			
General manager or senior executive	40	14	11
Operations manager	31	9	29
Supervisor	1	15	16
Safety and health representative	5	0	0
Contractor	1	0	0
Occupational health and safety professional	14	41	23
Other - professional	5	17	18
Other - administration / office	3	4	3
Length of time respondent has been working in the resources industry			
Less than 3 years	3	10	11
3-10 years	18	31	29
More than 10 years	79	59	60

	2010	2012	2014
CONTACT PROFILE	%	%	%
Contact with Resources Safety in the past year			
Only initiated by our organisation	11	21	8
Only initiated by Resources Safety	17	10	10
Initiated by our organisation and by Resources Safety	50	43	52
TOTAL initiated by Resources Safety (solely or also initiated by organisation)	67	53	62
TOTAL initiated by our organisation (solely or also initiated by Resources Safety)	61	64	60
TOTAL had contact with Resources Safety	78	74	70
No contact with Resources Safety	22	26	30
Where applicable, how often was contact with Resources Safety during 2013-14?			
Once	14	22	14
Several times	74	64	65
Many times	12	14	21
Nature of these contacts (multiple responses allowed)			
Response to an enquiry by you	45	40	34
Audit or inspection	43	49	69
A request for information from Resources Safety	41	48	38
Investigation of an incident	33	29	41
Consultation regarding a safety matter	33	43	40
Information session (e.g. safety roadshow, industry briefing)	28	70	37
Investigation of a complaint	12	9	8
Other	8	2	11

### **ROLES AND PERFORMANCE OF SAFETY REGULATOR**

\_\_\_\_\_\_

### PERFORMANCE OF REGULATOR IN TERMS OF

29.1% say outstanding well (8-10/10), which is an increase from both 2010 (26.2%) and 2012 (16.7%)

Being a proactive safety

regulator

The average rating increased slightly to 6.2 in 2014 from 2012 (6.0) but remains lower than that in 2010, when it was 6.4  $\bigcirc$ 

er than that in 2010, when it was 6.4

23.8% say an exceptional amount, a slight increase from 2012 (23.0%) and 2010 (20.0%)

Adding value to your organisation

The average rating increased to 6.0 from that in 2012 (5.8) and 2010 (5.3)



RATING THE IMPORTANCE OF REGULATORY ROLES (excludes "Don't knows")  Essential (8-10/10)  Average rating								
Compliance activities	2010	2012	2014	2010	2012	2014		
Set appropriate safety standards	86.2%	77.5%	77.4%	8.8	8.4	8.5		
Conduct independent audits of safety systems	44.6%	61.2%	73.6%	7.1	7.5	8.2	Ŏ	
Undertake safety inspections	50.8%	62.5%	72.3%	7.6	7.8	8.2	$\tilde{\bigcirc}$	
Carry out independent investigations of incidents	50.0%	73.8%	68.1%	7.6	8.1	8.2	Ŏ	
Respond to complaints about safety	67.2%	76.2%	71.5%	8.2	8.4	8.3		
Raise awareness and promote safety outcom	nes							
Provide advice and information about safety	82.8%	81.2%	80.1%	8.8	8.7	8.6		
Monitor safety performance data	50.0%	63.8%	64.2%	7.3	7.8	8.0		
Monitor health surveillance programmes	51.6%	61.2%	56.8%	7.1	7.8	7.6		
Support safety and health representatives	60.9%	76.2%	66.8%	7.8	8.3	8.2	Ŏ	
Resolve disputes about safety in the workplace	35.9%	56.2%	60.1%	6.8	7.5	7.7		
RATING RESOURCES SAFETY'S PERFORMANCE IN REGULATORY ROLES (excludes "Don't knows")								
RATING RESOURCES SAFETT S PERFORM				•		•		
RATING RESOURCES SAFETT S PERFORMA	Ver	well (8-16)	0/10)	Ave	rage rati	ng		
Compliance activities				•		•		
	Ver	well (8-16)	0/10)	Ave	rage rati	ng		
Compliance activities	Ver 2010	y well (8-1) 2012	0/10) 2014	Ave 2010	rage rati 2012	ng 2014		
Compliance activities Set appropriate safety standards	Very 2010 48.4%	y well (8-10 2012 48.8%	<b>0/10) 2014</b> 58.0%	Ave 2010	7.2	ng 2014 7.4		
Compliance activities Set appropriate safety standards Conduct independent audits of safety systems	Very 2010 48.4% 16.7%	y well (8-10 2012 48.8% 27.5%	0/10) 2014 58.0% 46.4%	Ave 2010 7.1 5.7	7.2 6.0	7.4 6.9		
Compliance activities Set appropriate safety standards Conduct independent audits of safety systems Undertake safety inspections Carry out independent investigations of	Very 2010 48.4% 16.7% 33.3%	y well (8-1) 2012 48.8% 27.5% 31.2%	0/10) 2014 58.0% 46.4% 44.7%	7.1 5.7 6.6	7.2 6.0 6.4	7.4 6.9 6.9		
Compliance activities Set appropriate safety standards Conduct independent audits of safety systems Undertake safety inspections Carry out independent investigations of incidents	Very 2010  48.4%  16.7%  33.3%  29.3%  42.1%	y well (8-1) 2012 48.8% 27.5% 31.2% 42.5%	58.0% 46.4% 44.7% 42.8%	7.1 5.7 6.6 6.8	7.2 6.0 6.4 7.0	7.4 6.9 6.9		
Compliance activities Set appropriate safety standards Conduct independent audits of safety systems Undertake safety inspections Carry out independent investigations of incidents Respond to complaints about safety	Very 2010  48.4%  16.7%  33.3%  29.3%  42.1%	y well (8-1) 2012 48.8% 27.5% 31.2% 42.5%	58.0% 46.4% 44.7% 42.8%	7.1 5.7 6.6 6.8	7.2 6.0 6.4 7.0	7.4 6.9 6.9		
Compliance activities Set appropriate safety standards Conduct independent audits of safety systems Undertake safety inspections Carry out independent investigations of incidents Respond to complaints about safety Raise awareness and promote safety outcom	Very 2010  48.4%  16.7%  33.3%  29.3%  42.1%	y well (8-1) 2012 48.8% 27.5% 31.2% 42.5% 41.2%	0/10) 2014 58.0% 46.4% 44.7% 42.8% 44.8%	7.1 5.7 6.6 6.8 7.1	7.2 6.0 6.4 7.0 7.0	7.4 6.9 6.9 6.9 6.9		
Compliance activities Set appropriate safety standards Conduct independent audits of safety systems Undertake safety inspections Carry out independent investigations of incidents Respond to complaints about safety Raise awareness and promote safety outcomprovide advice and information about safety	Very 2010  48.4%  16.7%  33.3%  29.3%  42.1%  nes  52.4%	48.8% 27.5% 31.2% 42.5% 41.2%	58.0% 46.4% 44.7% 42.8% 44.8%	7.1 5.7 6.6 6.8 7.1	7.2 6.0 6.4 7.0 7.0	7.4 6.9 6.9 6.9 6.9		
Compliance activities Set appropriate safety standards Conduct independent audits of safety systems Undertake safety inspections Carry out independent investigations of incidents Respond to complaints about safety Raise awareness and promote safety outcom Provide advice and information about safety Monitor safety performance data	Very 2010  48.4%  16.7%  33.3%  29.3%  42.1%  nes  52.4%  39.6%	48.8% 27.5% 31.2% 42.5% 41.2% 53.8% 38.8%	58.0% 46.4% 44.7% 42.8% 44.8% 53.9% 47.1%	Ave 2010  7.1  5.7  6.6  6.8  7.1  7.4  7.2	7.2 6.0 6.4 7.0 7.0 7.0 6.6	7.4 6.9 6.9 6.9 7.3 7.1		

### WORKING WITH INDUSTRY TO REDUCE LIKELIHOOD AND CONSEQUENCES OF SERIOUS INCIDENTS

\_\_\_\_\_\_

REGULATORY PERFORMANCE (excludes "Don't knows")							
	Very v 2010	well (8-1 2012	0/10) 2014	Ave 2010	rage rat	ting 2014	
Regulator overall							
Supports a risk management approach	30.9%	46.2%	51.7%	6.7	6.8	7.3	
Publishes appropriate industry safety performance indices	37.9%	46.2%	52.7%	7.0	7.1	7.4	
Encourages consistent application of safety standards across all operations	37.3%	27.5%	46.7%	6.8	6.1	6.9	
Prosecutes if necessary	34.2%	23.8%	43.8%	6.4	6.1	6.6	
Provides guidance on development of documentation to meet legislative requirements	28.8%	37.5%	42.6%	6.3	6.1	6.7	
Clarifies where legal responsibilities lie	23.1%	40.0%	45.3%	6.3	6.1	6.8	
Adds value to site safety procedures	22.8%	28.8%	38.4%	6.0	5.6	6.4	
Responds in a timely manner	40.0%	42.5%	52.7%	6.9	7.0	7.0	
Reviews submitted documents in a timely manner	30.4%	33.8%	42.2%	6.3	6.4	6.7	
Mines inspectors							
Are knowledgeable about the legislation	68.0%	65.0%	74.0%	7.9	7.7	8.1	
Are consistent in their interpretation of the legislation	35.6%		48.2%	6.6	6.7	6.9	
Interpret the legislation in a practical way	25.5%	40.0%	42.2%	6.4	6.5	6.7	
Are consistent in the application of the legislation	36.2%	38.8%	45.1%	6.7	6.7	6.8	
Are willing to consult our organisation	44.0%	46.2%	52.1%	6.9	6.8	7.2	
Are willing to consider and adapt to industry safety inovations	28.9%	48.8%	49.0%	6.3	6.7	7.1	
Approach their task professionally	62.0%	67.5%	71.4%	7.8	7.7	8.0	
Are knowledgeable about the industry that they are auditing or investigating	58.0%	52.5%	60.1%	7.5	7.2	7.7	
Are knowledgeable about the type of operation that they are auditing or investigating	45.8%	43.8%	57.3%	7.1	6.9	7.5	
Are well prepared before they go on site	42.5%	46.2%	61.2%	7.1	7.2	7.6	
Are available to visit sites when needed	37.8%	37.5%	53.2%	6.9	6.8	7.2	
Coordinate inspections and audits so that, where possible, the aims are achieved in one visit	41.7%	45.0%	54.6%	7.2	6.9	7.5	
Carry out audits and inspections in a timely manner	48.7%	47.5%	55.7%	7.3	7.0	7.4	
Are available to answer queries over the telephone or online	70.0%	61.2%	65.1%	7.9	7.4	7.8	
Have a consistent approach to audits and inspections, both individually and between inspectors	30.8%	27.5%	47.1%	6.5	6.3	6.8	
Provide useful, actionable information to make operations safer	42.9%	41.2%	51.6%	7.1	6.5	7.2	
Provide information in a friendly and cooperative way	62.7%	51.2%	59.6%	7.7	7.2	7.6	
Guidance material							
Addresses operational needs	28.8%	38.8%	41.0%	6.6	6.9	7.0	
Uses plain English to clarify legislative requirements	45.0%	50.0%	52.5%	6.9	7.1	7.4	
Is in a form appropriate for operational use on site	36.2%	43.8%	50.2%	6.7	6.9	7.2	
Is concise	36.7%	42.5%	48.6%	6.7	6.9	7.2	
Is clear and definitive on what is required	38.3%	43.8%	46.9%	6.7	6.8	7.1	
Is accurate and consistent in what it says	48.3%	50.0%	49.1%	7.1	7.2	7.3	

### **ADDING VALUE**

\_\_\_\_\_\_

Note: adds value refers to the ratings from	"Would add a lot of value" and	"Would add some value"
---	--------------------------------	------------------------

Note. and value refers to the ratings from Would add a lot of value and	vvoulu au	u some v	aiue	
	Adds value			
	2010	2012	2014	
Provide pro forma documents, information packs for contractors and preformatted risk assessments to assist small companies in writing their safety plans	79.4%	81.2%	80.9%	0
Provide positive feedback on what has been done well	77.8%	88.8%	86.5%	
Provide practical advice and examples of how things can be done better	84.4%	95.0%	90.4%	
Be willing to provide guidance and act as mentors	67.2%	83.8%	78.9%	
Ensure mandatory training for safety and health representatives	60.3%	81.2%	67.4%	
Undertake roadshows and formal presentations to companies and industry groups	54.0%	81.2%	72.9%	
Facilitate the development of industry networks to enable specific groups, such as managers or safety and health representatives, to get together	57.8%	81.2%	64.9%	
Ensure greater consultation and feedback to industry	81.3%	90.0%	87.0%	$\bigcirc$
Be available to answer queries when needed	87.5%	93.8%	88.4%	

### MINING PROFESSIONALS

### INDUSTRY'S ASSESSMENT OF SAFETY CULTURE PROGRESS FOR MINING & EXPLORATION

### Meeting goal of proactive, consultative safety culture

27.8% say outstandingly well (8-10/10), a slight decrease from 32.9% and remains lower than 33.8% in 2010

Average rating is 6.5 very comparable to 6.6 in 2012 but remains slightly lower than in 2010 with 7.0

	High rating (8-10/10)			Average rating		
	2010	2012	2014	2010	2012	2014
Culture of reform rather than repair	13.8%	18.4%	19.5%	6.3	6.0	6.0
Shared responsibility for safety across the organisation	27.7%	22.4%	30.8%	6.5	6.2	6.4
New ideas about safety actively sought	21.5%	34.2%	33.9%	6.4	6.6	6.5
Messenger rewarded not shot	29.7%	32.9%	25.9%	6.3	6.2	6.1
A proactive as well as reactive culture	28.6%	35.5%	28.7%	6.6	6.3	6.3

### Appendix 2: Comparison of survey responses from mines safety and health representatives

**MINES SHReps** 

#### STAKEHOLDER GROUP PROFILE

\_\_\_\_\_\_

255 elected mines safety and health representatives responded to the 2014 survey. In 2012, 134 elected safety and health representatives participated in the survey and in 2010 there were 237

The demographic of safety representative respondents was very similar to 2012 and 2010. Those who participated in the 2014 survey can be described as:

- Mainly coming from large organisations, with 65% from organisations of more than 500 employees
- Having some experience in the resources sector, with half having worked in mining for three to ten years and a further 30% for ten or more years

The safety representatives have a lower level of contact with Resources Safety than other stakeholder groups:

- About 40% have had contact with Resources Safety in the past year, with contact being just as likely to have been initiated by Resources Safety as by the client organisation
- Some 47% reported several instances of contact but none reported contact "many times"
- Most contact initiated by the safety representatives was through participation in an audit or inspection (40%), attendance at an information session (32%), or a request for information (23%)

	2212	22.42	2211
	2010	2012	2014
RESPONDENT PROFILE	%	%	%
Size of organisation			
Less than 10 employees	0	1	0
10-100 employees	9	7	9
101-500 employees	21	20	26
TOTAL - Less than 500 employees	30	28	35
More than 500 employees	70	72	65
Inspectorate Boundary			
North (Pilbara)	n/a	n/a	49
North (Kimberley)	n/a	n/a	3
West	n/a	n/a	25
East	n/a	n/a	19
Not specified (exploration or other)	n/a	n/a	4
Length of time respondent has been working in the resources industry			
Less than 3 years	14	16	18
3-10 years	50	53	51
More than 10 years	36	31	31

	2010	2012	2014
CONTACT PROFILE	%	%	%
Contact with Resources Safety in the past year			
Only initiated by our organisation	7	10	9
Only initiated by Resources Safety	12	12	12
Initiated by our organisation and by Resources Safety	20	13	19
TOTAL initiated by Resources Safety (solely or also initiated by organisation)	32	25	31
TOTAL initiated by our organisation (solely or also initiated by Resources Safety)	27	23	28
TOTAL had contact with Resources Safety	39	35	40
No contact with Resources Safety	61	65	60
Where applicable, how often was contact with Resources Safety during 2013-	14?		
At most once	48	42	53
Several times	47	53	47
Many times	5	5	0
Nature of these contacts (multiple responses allowed)			
Audit or inspection	30	43	40
Investigation of a complaint	2	4	3
Investigation of an incident	13	9	11
Consultation regarding a safety matter	10	7	8
Response to an enquiry by you	8	16	13
A request for information from Resources Safety	16	25	23
Information session (e.g. safety roadshow, industry briefing)	44	52	32
Other	23	18	19

### **ROLES AND PERFORMANCE OF SAFETY REGULATOR**

### PERFORMANCE OF REGULATOR IN TERMS OF

Being a proactive safety regulator

32.2% say outstandingly well (8-10/10), an increase from 20.3% in 2012 and 27.2% in 2010

The average rating of 6.5 represents a small increase from 6.0 in 2012 and 6.4 in 2010

Adding value to your organisation

35.9% say an exceptional amount (8-10/10) an increase from 18.6% in 2012 and 28.8% in 2010

The average rating increased to 6.5 from 5.9 in 2012 and 6.2 in 2010



RATING THE IMPORTANCE OF REGULATORY ROLES (excludes "Don't knows")							
	Esse	ntial (8-10	/10)	Average rating			
	2010	2012	2014	2010	2012	2014	
Compliance activities							
Set appropriate safety standards	85.1%	74.3%	77.4%	9.1	8.4	8.8	
Conduct independent audits of safety systems	76.3%	65.7%	76.3%	8.6	8.0	8.5	
Undertake safety inspections	78.7%	68.6%	75.6%	8.6	8.1	8.5	
Carry out independent investigations of incidents	80.4%	70.0%	76.6%	8.7	8.2	8.6	
Respond to complaints about safety	89.5%	75.7%	79.5%	9.0	8.5	8.8	
Raise awareness and promote safety outcom	es						
Provide advice and information about safety	86.5%	78.6%	76.2%	8.9	8.3	8.7	
Monitor safety performance data	72.1%	67.1%	73.1%	8.3	7.9	8.4	
Monitor health surveillance programmes	70.8%	62.9%	69.5%	8.2	7.9	8.3	
Support safety and health representatives	85.1%	81.4%	82.0%	8.9	8.7	8.8	
Resolve disputes about safety in the workplace	80.6%	77.1%	77.9%	8.6	8.5	8.6	
RATING RESOURCES SAFETY'S PERFORMA			•				")
	_	well (8-10/	•		rage ra		
	2010	2012	2014	2010	2012	2014	

	V C i y	WC11 (0-10)	10,	710	iage ia	ung	
	2010	2012	2014	2010	2012	2014	
Compliance activities							
Set appropriate safety standards	60.9%	48.6%	66.3%	7.6	7.2	7.8	
Conduct independent audits of safety systems	45.2%	37.1%	54.9%	6.9	6.5	7.3	
Undertake safety inspections	49.1%	37.1%	55.8%	7.0	6.4	7.3	
Carry out independent investigations of incidents	51.0%	34.3%	61.2%	7.1	6.4	7.6	
Respond to complaints about safety	49.7%	42.9%	61.0%	7.0	6.9	7.5	
Raise awareness and promote safety outcom	es						
Provide advice and information about safety	58.2%	47.1%	62.0%	7.4	7.0	7.8	
Monitor safety performance data	50.7%	40.0%	62.2%	7.2	6.6	7.7	
Monitor health surveillance programmes	48.3%	31.4%	53.3%	6.9	6.4	7.4	
Support safety and health representatives	54.9%	45.7%	58.6%	7.2	6.8	7.3	
Resolve disputes about safety in the workplace	47.1%	32.9%	56.5%	6.9	6.4	7.3	

WORKING WITH INDUSTRY TO REDUCE LIKELIHOOD A						CIDENTS
REGULATORY PERFORMANCE (excludes "Don't knows	s")	well (8-1 2012		Aver	age rat 2012	
Regulator overall			,			
Supports a risk management approach	52.2%	38.6%	64.4%	7.4	6.8	7.8
Publishes appropriate industry safety performance indices	59.9%	47.1%	65.8%	7.7	6.9	8.0
Encourages consistent application of safety standards across all operations	53.2%	38.6%	63.4%	7.3	6.6	7.6
Prosecutes if necessary	47.9%	30.0%	55.5%	6.6	6.3	7.2
Provides guidance on development of documentation to neet legislative requirements	51.0%	38.6%	66.9%	7.1	6.6	7.8
Clarifies where legal responsibilities lie	51.2%	40.0%	61.5%	7.0	6.5	7.6
Adds value to site safety procedures	49.4%	41.4%	57.2%	7.0	6.6	7.4
Responds in a timely manner	47.9%	37.1%	59.5%	7.0	6.6	7.5
Reviews submitted documents in a timely manner  Mines inspectors	42.5%	30.0%	55.2%	6.8	6.4	7.4
Are knowledgeable about the legislation	67.3%	64.3%	74.7%	7.9	7.8	8.4
Are consistent in their interpretation of the legislation	57.2%	55.7%	69.3%	7.6	7.6	8.1
nterpret the legislation in a practical way	61.5%	55.7%	69.5%	7.6	7.5	8.0
Are consistent in the application of the legislation	52.9%		68.6%	7.4	7.3	8.0
Are willing to consult our organisation	61.0%		70.1%	7.7	7.3	8.1
Are willing to consider and adapt to industry safety nnovations	54.9%		69.6%	7.5	7.1	8.2
Approach their task professionally	69.3%	64.3%	73.5%	8.0	7.8	8.3
Are knowledgeable about the industry that they are auditing or investigating	66.2%	65.7%	72.1%	7.8	7.7	8.3
Are knowledgeable about the type of operation that they are auditing or investigating	61.0%	58.6%	72.3%	7.7	7.5	8.3
Are well prepared before they go on site	60.9%	52.9%	73.9%	7.6	7.3	8.1
Are available to visit sites when needed	54.2%	44.3%	63.4%	7.1	7.0	7.6
Coordinate inspections and audits so that, where possible, he aims are achieved in one visit	55.3%	44.3%	63.0%	7.2	6.8	7.8
Carry out audits and inspections in a timely manner	57.2%	47.1%	67.4%	7.3	7.1	7.8
Are available to answer queries over the telephone or online	55.8%	48.6%	74.6%	7.4	7.3	8.2
Have a consistent approach to audits and inspections, both individually and between inspectors	56.8%	51.4%	69.0%	7.3	7.3	8.0
Provide useful, actionable information to make operations safer	62.6%	55.7%	70.4%	7.5	7.4	7.9
Provide information in a friendly and cooperative way	64.0%	62.9%	74.3%	7.7	7.8	8.2
Guidance material						
Addresses operational needs	51.4%	37.1%	57.3%	7.3	6.7	7.5
Jses plain English to clarify legislative requirements	53.8%	44.3%	66.3%	7.5	7.2	7.7
s in a form appropriate for operational use on site	55.2%	44.3%	64.4%	7.4	7.0	7.8
s concise	55.7%	42.9%	66.7%	7.4	7.0	7.8
s clear and definitive on what is required	53.1%	48.6%	69.1%	7.4	7.1	7.8
s accurate and consistent in what it says	60.6%	51.4%	70.7%	7.6	7.2	7.9

### **ADDING VALUE**

\_\_\_\_\_

Note: adds value refers to the ratings from "Would add a lot of value" and "Would add some value"

	2010	Adds v 2012	alue 2014
Provide pro forma documents, information packs for contractors and preformatted risk assessments to assist small companies in writing their safety plans	78.9%	81.4%	80.4%
Provide positive feedback on what has been done well	82.9%	88.6%	88.1%
Provide practical advice and examples of how things can be done better	83.8%	85.7%	92.0%
Be willing to provide guidance and act as mentors	79.1%	88.6%	87.9%
Ensure mandatory training for safety and health representatives	85.1%	85.7%	89.1%
Undertake roadshows and formal presentations to companies and industry groups	75.2%	80.0%	85.1%
Facilitate the development of industry networks to enable specific groups, such as managers or safety and health representatives, to get together	77.1%	88.6%	86.3%
Ensure greater consultation and feedback to industry	80.6%	87.1%	87.9%
Be available to answer queries when needed	84.3%	91.4%	91.5%

### MINES SHReps

### INDUSTRY'S ASSESSMENT OF SAFETY CULTURE PROGRESS FOR MINING AND EXPLORATION

Meeting goal of proactive, consultat	ive
safety culture	

35.2% say outstandingly well (8-10/10), a decrease compared to both 2012 (40.0%) and 2010 (36.6%)

The average rating is 6.5, a slight increase from 6.3 in 2012 but despite more high ratings it still lower than 2010 (6.7)

	High	High rating (8-10/10)			Average rating			
	2010	2012	2014	2010	2012	2014		
Culture of reform rather than repair	34.7%	31.4%	31.3%	6.5	6.1	6.2		
Shared responsibility for safety across the organisation	38.4%	42.9%	40.7%	6.7	6.6	6.4		
New ideas about safety actively sought	38.0%	37.1%	44.4%	6.7	6.3	6.6		
Messenger rewarded not shot	24.2%	27.1%	27.9%	5.8	5.6	5.6		
A proactive as well as reactive culture	34.5%	38.6%	37.4%	6.4	6.1	6.2		

### Appendix 3: Comparison of survey responses from petroleum stakeholders

### PETROLEUM STAKEHOLDERS

#### STAKEHOLDER GROUP PROFILE

\_\_\_\_\_\_

38 site managers and safety representatives from onshore petroleum operations took part in the survey, similar to the number of respondents in 2012 (37), and still higher than in 2010 (20).

The petroleum clients participating in the survey can be described as:

- · Mostly occupational health and safety and other professionals followed by other senior management
- Representing a range of organisation sizes, with 42% from organisations of more than 500 employees
- Having considerable experience in the resources sector, with 65% having worked in the industry for more than ten years

The petroleum clients have a reasonable level of contact with Resources Safety Division:

- Three-quarters had contact with Resources Safety in the past year but this was less than in 2012 and 2010
- · Contact was slightly more likely to have been initiated by the client organisation than Resources Safety
- In most instances, contact was made several or many times over the year
- Contact was initiated for a wide variety of reasons

### NOTE: THE SAMPLE SIZE OF PETROLEUM STAKEHOLDERS IS SMALL AND RESULTS SHOULD BE INTERPRETED WITH CAUTION

\* fewer than 20 respondents \*\* fewer than 10 respondents

	2010*	2012	2014
RESPONDENT PROFILE	%	%	%
Size of organisation			
Less than 10 employees	15	16	3
10-100 employees	25	27	21
101-500 employees	10	24	34
TOTAL – Less than 500 employees	50	67	58
More than 500 employees	50	33	42
Respondent's current role			
General manager or senior executive	20	46	19
Operations manager	25	13	11
Supervisor	0	3	3
Safety and health representative	5	8	11
Contractor	5	0	0
Occupational health and safety professional	20	30	32
Other – professional	15	0	24
Other – administrative	10	0	0
Length of time respondent has been working in the resources industry			
Less than 3 years	10	3	5
3-10 years	25	27	30
More than 10 years	65	70	65

	2010*	2012	2014
CONTACT PROFILE	%	%	%
Contact with Resources Safety in the past year			
Only initiated by our organisation	10	13	6
Only initiated by Resources Safety	5	0	0
Initiated by our organisation and by Resources Safety	75	73	70
TOTAL initiated by Resources Safety (solely or also initiated by organisation)	80	73	70
TOTAL initiated by our organisation (solely or also initiated by Resources Safety)	85	86	76
TOTAL had contact with Resources Safety	90	86	76
No contact with Resources Safety	10	14	24
Where applicable, how often was contact with Resources Safety during 2013-	14?		
Once	17	7	4
Several times	61	51	57
Many times	22	42	39
Nature of these contacts (multiple responses allowed)			
Audit or inspection	50	56	68
Investigation of a complaint	0	3	7
Investigation of an incident	17	16	36
Consultation regarding a safety matter	39	44	57
Response to an enquiry by you	61	47	50
A request for information from Resources Safety	56	47	68
Information session (e.g. safety roadshow, industry briefing)	39	34	36
Other	33	31	36

### **ROLES AND PERFORMANCE OF SAFETY REGULATOR**

### PERFORMANCE OF REGULATOR IN TERMS OF

Being a proactive safety regulator

28.1% say outstandingly well (8-10/10), a decrease from 44.1% in 2012 but still slightly higher than in 2010 (25.0%)

The average rating is 6.5, a slight decrease from 7.0 in 2012, but still higher than in 2010 (6.1)

Adding value to your organisation

28.1% say an exceptional amount (8-10/10), a decrease from 41.2% in 2012 but still higher than in 2010 (5.0%)

The average rating is 5.8, a decrease from 6.6 in 2012 but still higher than in 2010 (4.9)

RATING THE IMPORTANCE OF REGULATORY ROLES (excludes "Don't knows")								
	Esse	Essential (8-10/10)			Average rating			
Compliance activities	2010	2012	2014	2010	2012	2014		
Set appropriate safety standards	65.0%	79.3%	67.7%	7.9	8.5	7.8		
Conduct independent audits of safety systems	63.2%*	79.3%	45.2%	7.5	8.4	7.1	O	
Undertake safety inspections	52.6%*	69.0%	61.3%	7.1	8.0	7.9		
Carry out independent investigations of incidents	55.0%	55.2%	50.0%	7.2	7.9	7.2		
Respond to complaints about safety	63.2%*	72.4%	83.3%	7.7	8.2	8.4		
Raise awareness and promote safety outcome	omes							
Provide advice and information about safety	68.8%*	69.0%	59.4%	7.9	8.1	7.7		
Monitor safety performance data	73.3%*	55.2%	53.1%	7.5	7.6	7.0		
Monitor health surveillance programmes	40.0%*	44.8%	40.6%	6.5	6.8	6.4		
Support safety and health representatives	71.4%*	58.6%	54.8%	7.4	7.6	7.0		
Resolve disputes about safety in the workplace	53.3%*	48.3%	40.6%	6.6	6.9	6.3		
RATING RESOURCES SAFETY'S PERFORMANCE IN REGULATORY ROLES (excludes "Don't knows")								
RATING RESOURCES SAFETY'S PERFOR				•			)	
RATING RESOURCES SAFETY'S PERFOR	Very	well (8-10	0/10)	Ave	erage rat	ting	)	
RATING RESOURCES SAFETY'S PERFOR  Compliance activities				•		ting	)	
	Very	well (8-10	0/10)	Ave	erage rat	ting	)	
Compliance activities	Very 2010 25.0% * 33.3%	well (8-10 2012	0/10) 2014	Ave 2010	erage rat 2012	ting 2 201		
Compliance activities Set appropriate safety standards Conduct independent audits of safety	Very 2010 25.0%	well (8-10 2012 51.7%	<b>2014</b> 55.6%	<b>Ave 2010</b> 5.5	2012 7.3	ting 201		
Compliance activities Set appropriate safety standards Conduct independent audits of safety systems	Very 2010 25.0% * 33.3%	well (8-10 2012 51.7% 44.8%	0/10) 2014 55.6% 42.3%	2010 5.5 5.2	7.3	7.2		
Compliance activities  Set appropriate safety standards  Conduct independent audits of safety systems  Undertake safety inspections  Carry out independent investigations of	Very 2010  25.0%  *  33.3%  *  25.0%  *  11.1%	well (8-10 2012 51.7% 44.8% 55.2%	55.6% 42.3% 42.9%	5.5 5.2 4.8	7.3 6.8	7.2 7.0 6.8		
Compliance activities Set appropriate safety standards Conduct independent audits of safety systems Undertake safety inspections Carry out independent investigations of incidents	Very 2010  25.0%  * 33.3%  25.0%  * 11.1%  ** 0.0%**	51.7% 44.8% 55.2% 24.1%	0/10) 2014 55.6% 42.3% 42.9% 44.0%	5.5 5.2 4.8 4.7	7.3 6.8 6.8 6.7	7.2 7.0 6.8 7.6		
Compliance activities  Set appropriate safety standards  Conduct independent audits of safety systems  Undertake safety inspections  Carry out independent investigations of incidents  Respond to complaints about safety	Very 2010  25.0%  * 33.3%  25.0%  * 11.1%  ** 0.0%**	51.7% 44.8% 55.2% 24.1%	0/10) 2014 55.6% 42.3% 42.9% 44.0%	5.5 5.2 4.8 4.7	7.3 6.8 6.8 6.7	7.2 7.0 6.8 7.6		
Compliance activities  Set appropriate safety standards  Conduct independent audits of safety systems  Undertake safety inspections  Carry out independent investigations of incidents  Respond to complaints about safety  Raise awareness and promote safety outcome.	Very 2010  25.0%  33.3%  25.0%  *  11.1%  **  0.0%**	51.7% 44.8% 55.2% 24.1% 34.5%	55.6% 42.3% 42.9% 44.0% 43.8%	5.5 5.2 4.8 4.7 4.2	7.3 6.8 6.8 6.7 7.0	7.2 7.0 6.8 7.6 6.9		
Compliance activities  Set appropriate safety standards  Conduct independent audits of safety systems  Undertake safety inspections  Carry out independent investigations of incidents  Respond to complaints about safety  Raise awareness and promote safety outcome of the safety outcome o	Very 2010  25.0%  33.3%  25.0%  11.1%  **  0.0%**  omes  46.2%  28.6%	51.7% 44.8% 55.2% 24.1% 34.5%	55.6% 42.3% 42.9% 44.0% 43.8%	5.5 5.2 4.8 4.7 4.2	7.3 6.8 6.8 6.7 7.0	7.2 7.0 6.8 7.6 6.9		
Compliance activities  Set appropriate safety standards  Conduct independent audits of safety systems  Undertake safety inspections  Carry out independent investigations of incidents  Respond to complaints about safety  Raise awareness and promote safety outcome advice and information about safety  Monitor safety performance data	Very 2010  25.0%  33.3%  25.0%  *  11.1%  **  0.0%**  omes  46.2%  28.6%  **	51.7% 44.8% 55.2% 24.1% 34.5% 41.4% 24.1%	55.6% 42.3% 42.9% 44.0% 43.8% 37.0% 29.2%	5.5 5.2 4.8 4.7 4.2 6.3 4.7	7.3 6.8 6.7 7.0 7.2 6.7	7.2 7.0 6.8 7.6 6.9 6.2 6.3		

-----

### WORKING WITH INDUSTRY TO REDUCE LIKELIHOOD AND CONSEQUENCE OF SERIOUS INCIDENTS

### REGULATORY PERFORMANCE (excludes "Don't knows")

	Very well (8-10/10)		Average rati				
Regulator overall	2010	2012	2014	2010	2012	2014	
Supports a risk management approach	47.4%	65.5%	57.1%	6.3	7.7	7.4	
Publishes appropriate industry safety performance indices	43.8%	34.5%	21.4%	5.8	6.7	6.3	Ŏ
Encourages consistent application of safety standards across all operations	26.3%	51.7%	44.4%	5.5	7.4	6.9	
Prosecutes if necessary	16.7%	27.6%	23.8%	5.3	6.6	5.7	
Provides guidance on development of documentation to meet legislative requirements	38.9%	37.9%	39.3%	5.8	6.6	6.6	Ö
Clarifies where legal responsibilities lie	12.5%	31.0%	42.3%	5.7	6.5	6.7	
Adds value to site safety procedures	31.6%	31.0%	12.0%	5.1	6.3	5.0	Ŏ
Responds in a timely manner	44.4%	41.4%	48.2%	6.5	7.0	7.6	
Reviews submitted documents in a timely manner	38.9%	41.4%	50.0%	6.0	7.1	7.5	
Petroleum safety assessors							
Are knowledgeable about the legislation	52.6%	58.6%	59.3%	6.9	7.6	7.3	
Are consistent in their interpretation of the legislation	35.3%	41.4%	37.0%	4.9	6.8	6.3	
Interpret the legislation in a practical way	33.3%	41.4%	48.2%	5.1	7.0	6.5	
Are consistent in the application of the legislation	25.0%	41.4%	46.2%	4.6	6.8	6.3	
Are willing to consult our organisation	58.8%	65.5%	59.3%	6.8	7.6	7.3	
Are willing to consider and adapt to industry safety	20.0%	48.3%	42.9%	5.2	7.1	6.8	Ŏ
Approach their task professionally	55.6%	62.1%	42.3%	6.7	7.7	7.3	
Are knowledgeable about the industry that they are	50.0%	31.0%	29.6%	6.1	6.8	6.2	
auditing or investigating Are knowledgeable about the type of operation that they are auditing or investigating	50.0%	31.0%	30.8%	6.0	6.7	6.2	ŏ
Are well prepared before they go on site	38.5%	51.7%	39.1%	6.2	7.2	6.8	
Are available to visit sites when needed	38.5%	44.8%	47.4%	6.5	6.7	7.2	Ĭ
Coordinate inspections and audits so that, where possible, the aims are achieved in one visit	61.5%	48.3%	59.1%	6.7	7.1	7.3	ŏ
Carry out audits and inspections in a timely manner	35.7%	48.3%	56.5%	6.6	7.2	7.4	
Are available to answer queries over the telephone or online	64.3%	72.4%	64.0%	6.9	7.8	7.7	Ŏ
Have a consistent approach to audits and inspections, both individually and between inspectors	35.7%	37.9%	47.6%	5.1	6.7	6.8	Ŏ
Provide useful, actionable information to make operations safer	23.1%	31.0%	26.9%	5.2	6.8	6.2	
Provide information in a friendly and cooperative way	58.8%	58.6%	55.6%	7.1	7.7	7.3	
Guidance material							_
Addresses operational needs	12.5%	34.5%	25.9%	5.1	6.7	6.3	
Uses plain English to clarify legislative requirements	31.3%	48.3%	40.7%	5.9	7.1	6.7	
Is in a form appropriate for operational use on site	13.3%	37.9%	28.0%	4.9	6.6	6.0	
Is concise	12.5%	41.4%	33.3%	5.1	6.8	6.2	
Is clear and definitive on what is required	53.1%	34.5%	29.6%	4.8	6.7	6.1	
Is accurate and consistent in what it says	26.7%	41.4%	29.6%	5.7	6.9	6.2	
D " 10044 " 10 0 11							0.5

### **ADDING VALUE**

\_\_\_\_\_

Note: adds value refers to the ratings from "Would add a lot of value" and "Would add some value"

		Adds valu	ue
	2010	2012	2014
Provide pro forma documents, information packs for contractors and preformatted risk assessments to assist small companies in writing their safety plans	83.3%	82.8%	74.1%
Provide positive feedback on what has been done well	89.5%	96.6%	96.6%
Provide practical advice and examples of how things can be done better	73.7%	96.6%	89.3%
Be willing to provide guidance and act as mentors	57.9%	65.5%	59.3%
Ensure mandatory training for safety and health representatives	50.0%	58.6%	55.6%
Undertake roadshows and formal presentations to companies and industry groups	28.6%	51.7%	60.7%
Facilitate the development of industry networks to enable specific groups, such as managers or safety and health representatives, to get together	53.3%	58.6%	71.4%
Ensure greater consultation and feedback to industry	68.4%	96.6%	89.7%
Be available to answer queries when needed	78.9%	93.1%	89.7%

### PETROLEUM STAKEHOLDERS

### INDUSTRY'S ASSESSMENT OF SAFETY CULTURE PROGRESS FOR MINING AND EXPLORATION

46.7% say outstandingly well (8-10/10), lower than the 58.6% in 2012

Meeting goal of proactive, consultative safety culture

46.7% say outstandingly well (8-10/10), lower than the 58.6% in 2012 and 50.0% in 2010

The average rating increased from 7.2 in 2010 to 7.7 in 2012 but was lower in 2014 (7.4)

	10WC1 111 20	14 (7.4)					
	High	rating (8-10	/10)	Average rating			
	2010	2012	2014	2010	2012	2014	
Culture of reform rather than repair	35.0%	44.8%	46.7%	6.6	7.0	7.3	
Shared responsibility for safety across the organisation	50.0%	55.2%	60.0%	7.1	7.3	7.5	O
New ideas about safety actively sought	35.0%	55.2%	53.3%	6.9	7.2	7.3	
Messenger rewarded not shot	25.0%	44.8%	43.3%	6.4	7.2	6.8	
A proactive as well as reactive culture	31.6%*	41.4%	53.3%	6.8	7.1	7.0	

### Appendix 4: Comparison of survey responses from MHF stakeholders

MHF STAKEHOLDERS

#### STAKEHOLDER GROUP PROFILE

\_\_\_\_\_\_

38 MHF stakeholder representatives took part in the 2014 survey. This is more than in 2012, when there were 22 respondents, and 2010, when there were 15.

The MHF clients participating in the survey can be described as:

- Mostly operations managers (48%). There were no safety and health representatives
- Over half were working for organisations with more than 500 employees (20/38) and only one respondent was from an organisation with less than ten employees
- Generally having extensive experience in the resources sector, with 33 out of 37 having worked there for more than ten years

The MHF clients have a reasonable level of contact with Resources Safety Division:

- All MHF clients had contact with Resources Safety in the past year
- Contact was initiated by Resources Safety and the organisation and most had contact several or many times
- Contact was initiated for a wide variety of reasons but in particular audit or inspection

\_\_\_\_\_\_\_

### NOTE: THE SAMPLE SIZE OF PETROLEUM STAKEHOLDERS IS SMALL AND RESULTS SHOULD BE INTERPRETED WITH CAUTION

\* fewer than 15 respondents \*\* fewer than 10 respondents

	2010*	2012	2014			
RESPONDENT PROFILE	%	%	%			
Size of organisation						
Less than 10 employees	0	0	3			
10-100 employees	33	4	13			
101-500 employees	20	32	32			
TOTAL - Less than 500 employees	53	36	48			
More than 500 employees	40	64	52			
Respondent's current role						
General manager or senior executive	14	14	22			
Operations manager	36	14	48			
Supervisor	7	4	3			
Safety and health representative	7	32	0			
Occupational health and safety professional	22	14	11			
Other	14	22	16			
Length of time respondent has been working in the resources industry						
Less than 3 years	0	14	3			
3-10 years	29	41	8			
More than 10 years	71	45	89			

	2010*	2012	2014
CONTACT PROFILE	%	%	%
Contact with Resources Safety in the past year			
Only initiated by our organisation	0	4	8
Only initiated by Resources Safety	0	5	0
Initiated by our organisation and by Resources Safety	93	50	92
TOTAL initiated by Resources Safety (solely or also initiated by organisation)	93	55	92
TOTAL initiated by our organisation (solely or also initiated by Resources Safety)	93	54	100
TOTAL had contact with Resources Safety	93	59	100
No contact with Resources Safety	7	41	0
Where applicable, how often was contact with Resources Safety during 2013	-14?		
Once	0	8	3
Several times	29	58	70
Many times	71	34	27
Nature of these contacts (multiple responses allowed)			
Audit or inspection	64	54	76
Investigation of a complaint	0	8	16
Investigation of an incident	21	38	51
Consultation regarding a safety matter	14	38	49
Response to an enquiry by you	50	46	49
A request for information from Resources Safety	43	31	60
Information session (e.g. safety roadshow, industry briefing)	50	62	35
Other	57	23	24

### **ROLES AND PERFORMANCE OF SAFETY REGULATOR**

### PERFORMANCE OF REGULATOR IN TERMS OF

Being a proactive safety regulator

21.6% [8/37 respondents] say outstandingly well (8-10/10), which is a slight increased compared to 2012 (20%) [4/20 respondents] and 2010 (13.3%) [2/15 respondents]

The average rating is 5.6, the same as in 2012 and 2010



21.6% respondents [7/37 respondents] said an exceptional amount (8-10/10), a large increase compared to 0% in 2012 and 13.3% [2/15] in 2010

Adding value to your organisation

The average rating in 2014 increased slightly to 5.6 compared to 4.5 in 2012 and 4.9 in 2010

### RATING THE IMPORTANCE OF REGULATORY ROLES (excludes "Don't knows")

	Essential (8-10/10)			Average ratin			ing	
	2010	2012	2014	2010	2012	2014		
Compliance activities								
Set appropriate safety standards	93.3%	55.6%**	80.6%	8.8	7.8	8.3		
Conduct independent audits of safety systems	66.7%	44.4%**	72.2%	7.0	7.6	7.8		
Undertake safety inspections	73.3%	55.6%**	66.7%	7.7	7.8	7.5		
Carry out independent investigations of incidents	73.3%	55.6%**	65.7%	7.9	7.7	7.8	Ŏ	
Respond to complaints about safety	73.3%	66.7%**	60.0%	8.3	8.0	7.9		

### RATING RESOURCES SAFETY'S PERFORMANCE IN REGULATORY ROLES (excludes "Don't knows")

	Very well (8-10/10)		Av	ing		
	2010	2012	2014	2010	2012	2014
Compliance activities						
Set appropriate safety standards	14.3%*	33.3%**	41.7%	5.0	5.6	6.4
Conduct independent audits of safety systems	9.1%*	22.2%**	42.9%	4.1	4.8	6.4
Undertake safety inspections	25.0%*	22.2%**	45.5%	5.6	5.6	6.4
Carry out independent investigations of incidents	33.3%**	22.2%**	30.0%	4.7	5.2	6.0
Respond to complaints about safety	28.6%**	33.3%**	57.7%	5.4	6.1	7.2

### WORKING WITH INDUSTRY TO REDUCE LIKELIHOOD AND CONSEQUENCES OF SERIOUS INCIDENTS

REGULATORY PERFORMANCE (excludes "Don't know	•	well (8-10	/10)	Ave	erage r	ating
Regulator overall	2010	2012	2014	2010	2012	2014
Supports a risk management approach	35.7%*	33.3%**	48.6%	6.7	6.0	6.8
Publishes appropriate industry safety performance indices	23.1%*	11.1%**	46.9%	4.8	4.6	6.2
Encourages consistent application of safety standards across all operations	27.3%*	22.2%**	31.3%	5.2	4.3	5.9
Prosecutes if necessary	20.0%*	22.2%**	54.6%	4.0	5.4	6.2
Provides guidance on development of documentation to meet legislative requirements	26.7%	22.2%**	41.2%	5.3	4.1	6.2
Clarifies where legal responsibilities lie	30.8%*	11.1%**	40.6%	5.5	4.7	7.0
Adds value to site safety procedures	14.3*%	22.2%**	43.8%	4.7	4.4	5.9
Responds in a timely manner	46.7%	33.3%**	62.9%	6.8	5.6	6.9
Reviews submitted documents in a timely manner	42.9%*	22.2%**	41.2%	5.6	4.9	6.2
MHF dangerous goods officers						
Are knowledgeable about the legislation	53.3%	33.3%**	63.6%	6.9	6.3	7.2
Are consistent in their interpretation of the legislation	33.3%	33.3%**	30.3%	4.3	4.7	5.5
Interpret the legislation in a practical way	26.7%	33.3%**	33.3%	4.9	4.8	5.8
Are consistent in the application of the legislation	21.4%*	22.2%**	39.4%	4.5	4.9	5.7
Are willing to consult our organisation	46.7%	44.4%**	59.4%	6.9	6.6	7.0
Are willing to consider and adapt to industry safety innovations	45.5%*	33.3%**	41.9%	6.2	6.2	6.7
Approach their task professionally	66.7%	55.6%**	66.7%	7.3	7.8	7.5
Are knowledgeable about the industry that they are auditing or investigating	40.0%	33.3%**	43.8%	6.1	5.3	6.5
Are well prepared before they go on site	33.3%	44.4%**	39.4%	5.6	6.4	6.3
Are available to visit sites when needed	46.7%	33.3%**	37.5%	6.2	6.2	6.5
Coordinate inspections and audits so that, where possible, the aims are achieved in one visit	76.9%*	44.4%**	62.1%	7.8	7.0	7.3
Carry out inspections and audits so that, where possible, the aims are achieved in one visit	46.2%*	33.3%**	40.0%	6.2	6.8	7.3
Carry out inspections and audits in a timely manner	50.0%*	44.4%**	46.9%	7.3	7.0	7.1
Are available to answer queries over the telephone or online	69.2%*	55.6%**	64.5%	7.5	7.8	7.8
Have a consistent response or approach to inspections	27.3%*	22.2%**	31.3%	4.7	4.6	5.6
Provide useful, actionable information to make operations safer	30.8%*	22.2%**	45.5%	5.7	5.4	6.3
Provide information in a friendly and cooperative way	66.7%	44.4%**	56.3%	7.5	6.9	7.5
Guidance material						
Addresses operational needs	28.6%*	11.1%**	21.2%	6.4	5.3	5.8
Uses plain English to clarify legislative requirements	26.7%	11.1%**	37.5%	6.5	6.0	6.2
Is in a form appropriate for operational use on site	21.4%*	22.2%**	36.4%	5.9	5.7	6.4
Is concise	26.7%	22.2%**	30.3%	5.9	5.4	6.2
Is clear and definitive on what is required	26.7%	22.2%**	18.2%	5.1	5.2	5.7
Is accurate and consistent in what it says	20.0%	33.3%**	25.0%	5.4	5.9	5.6

### **ADDING VALUE**

Note: adds value refers to the ratings from "Would add a lot of value" and "Would add some value"

<u> </u>		Adds val	lue	
	2010	2012	2014	
Provide pro forma documents, information packs for contractors and preformatted risk assessments to assist small companies in writing their safety plans	64.3%	66.7%**	89.3%	
Provide positive feedback on what has been done well	100.0%	88.9%**	93.8%	
Provide practical advice and examples of how things can be done better	93.3%	88.9%**	84.9%	
Be willing to provide guidance and act as mentors	60.0%	66.7%**	69.7%	
Ensure greater consultation and feedback to industry	93.3%	77.8%**	90.6%	
Be available to answer queries when needed	93.3%	66.7%**	87.9%	

### MHF STAKEHOLDERS

### INDUSTRY'S ASSESSMENT OF SAFETY CULTURE PROGRESS FOR MAJOR HAZARD FACILITIES

\_\_\_\_\_

Meeting goal of proactive, consultative safety culture

33.3% [11/33 respondents] say outstandingly well (8-10/10) compared to 37.5% [3/8 respondents] in 2012 and 60.0% [9/15 respondents] in 2010

The average rating in 2014 was 7.0, the same as in 2012 (7.0) and 2010 (7.1)

	High 2010	n rating (8-1 2012	0/10) 2014	Av 2010	verage ra 2012	ating 2014	
Culture of reform rather than repair	46.7%	37.5%**	24.2%	6.9	6.5	6.6	
Shared responsibility for safety across the organisation	46.7%	50.0%**	39.4%	7.0	6.9	6.9	Ŏ
New ideas about safety actively sought	46.7%	62.5%**	51.5%	7.1	6.4	7.2	
Messenger rewarded not shot	73.3%	50.0%**	48.5%	7.9	6.5	7.2	
A proactive as well as reactive culture	60.0%	50.0%**	33.3%	7.3	6.6	6.9	

### Appendix 5: Survey questions for mining and petroleum stakeholders

AB	O	UT	Υ	O	U
----	---	----	---	---	---

1.	Which industry sector do you mainly work in?						
	Mining Petroleum Geothermal energy Other (please specify)	□ <sub>1</sub> □ <sub>2</sub> □ <sub>3</sub>					
2.	Which mines inspectorate do you currently work in a boundaries (http://www.dmp.wa.gov.au/documents/Misc/MSH_Misc						
	North (Pilbara) North (Kimberley) West East Not specified – exploration		$ \Box_1 $ $ \Box_2 $ $ \Box_3 $ $ \Box_4 $ $ \Box_5 $				
3.	What is the size of your organisation?						
	Less than 10 employees 10-100 employees 101-500 employees More than 500 employees	$ \begin{array}{c} \square_1 \\ \square_2 \\ \square_3 \\ \square_4 \end{array} $					
4.	How long have you been working in the resources industry?						
	More than 10 years 3-10 years Less than 3 years	$ \Box_1 $ $ \Box_2 $ $ \Box_3 $					
5.	What is your current role?						
	General manager or senior executive Operations manager Supervisor Safety and health representative Contractor Occupational health and safety professional Other (please specify)	$ \begin{array}{c} \square_1 \\ \square_2 \\ \square_3 \\ \square_4 \\ \square_5 \\ \square_6 \\ \square_9 \end{array} $					
INTER	ACTION WITH RESOURCES SAFETY						
6.	Have you had contact with Resources Safety in the	oast year? Pleas	e tick one only.				
	Yes – only initiated by our organisation Yes – only initiated by Resources Safety Yes – initiated by our organisation and by Resources Sa No	•	to Question 8a				
7.	How often did you have contact with Resources Saf	ety during the 20	013-14 financial year?				
	Not at all Once Several times Many times	$ \Box_1 $ $ \Box_2 $ $ \Box_3 $ $ \Box_4 $					
8.	What was the nature of these contacts? Tick as many	/ as applicable					
	Audit or inspection Investigation of a complaint Investigation of an incident Consultation regarding a safety matter Response to an enquiry by you A request for information from Resources Safety Information session (e.g. safety roadshow, industry brief Other (please specify)		$ \Box_1 $ $ \Box_2 $ $ \Box_3 $ $ \Box_4 $ $ \Box_5 $ $ \Box_6 $ $ \Box_7 $				

	industry is operating as safely as possible? Please rate out of 10 where 0 is very poorly and 10 is outstandingly well. Tick the box closest to your view.																
		Very poor												Outst	tandir well	ngly	
	$\square_0$	$\square_1$	$\square_2$	$\square_3$	$\square_4$		5	$\square_6$	$\square_7$		<b>□</b> 8	□9		I <sub>10</sub>			
10	To what organis		Please i	rate out	of 10 v										ount.		
		Not at all											Ar	n extra	aordir mour		
	□₀	$\square_1$	$\square_2$	$\square_3$	$\square_4$		5	$\square_6$	$\square_7$	[	<b>□</b> 8	□9		I <sub>10</sub>			
RESO	URCES S	AFETY	'S ROL	ES AND	PERF	ORM	ANC	Ε									
11&12	<ul><li>11&amp;12 How important are the following roles of the safety regulator? Please rate out of 10 using 0 for not important and 10 for essential. If you do not know or have had no experience with this, tick the DK box.</li><li>Not important</li><li>Essential</li></ul>																
					Not im	porta	nt								E	ssent	ial
Con	npliance	activitie	es														
Set a	appropriate	e standar	ds of sat	fety		По	□1	$\square_2$	Пз	$\square_4$	$\square_5$	$\square_6$	$\square_7$	□8	□9	□10	$\square_{DK}$
	duct indep			safety sys	stems	□0	□1	$\square_2$	□3	$\square_4$	$\square_5$	□6	$\square_7$	□8	□9	□10	$\square_{DK}$
	ertake safe					□0	□1	$\square_2$	□3	□4	<b>□</b> <sub>5</sub>	□6	□7	□8	□9	□10	□ <sub>DK</sub>
incid	Carry out independent investigations of incidents						$\square_1$	$\square_2$	□3	$\square_4$	□5	□6	$\square_7$	□8	□9	□10	□ <sub>DK</sub>
	Respond to complaints about safety							$\square_2$	$\square_3$	$\square_4$	$\square_5$	$\square_6$	$\square_7$	□8	□9	□ <sub>10</sub>	$\square_{DK}$
	se aware								_								
	ide advice				ety	□ <sub>0</sub>	□ <sub>1</sub>		□ <sub>3</sub>	□ <sub>4</sub>	<b>□</b> <sub>5</sub>	<b>□</b> <sub>6</sub>	□ <sub>7</sub>	□8		□ <sub>10</sub>	□ <sub>DK</sub>
	itor safety	-						$\square_2$	□ <sub>3</sub>		□ <sub>5</sub>	$\square_6$	$\square_7$	□8		□ <sub>10</sub>	
	itor health				•				□ <sub>3</sub>								
	port safety		-			$\square_0$	$\square_1$	$\square_2$	$\square_3$	$\square_4$	$\square_5$	□6	$\square_7$	□8	□9	□ <sub>10</sub>	□ <sub>DK</sub>
place	olve disput e	es about	salety if	i the wor	K	□0	<b>□</b> <sub>1</sub>	$\square_2$	□3	□4	<b>□</b> <sub>5</sub>	□6	$\square_7$	□8	□9	□10	□ <sub>DK</sub>
out of	How we 10 using ( is, tick the	for very	y poorly														
					Very	poo	rly						Οι	ıtstan	ding	ly wel	I
Cor	mpliance	activiti	es														
Set	appropriat	e standa	rds of sa	fety		Пο	<b>□</b> 1	$\square_2$	Пз	$\square_4$	□5	□6	$\square_7$	□8	□9	□10	□ <sub>DK</sub>
Con	nduct indep	endent a	udits of	safety sy	stems	$\square_0$	□₁	$\square_2$	□3	$\square_4$	$\square_5$	□6	$\square_7$	□8	□9	□10	□ <sub>DK</sub>
Und	lertake saf	ety inspe	ctions			$\square_0$	$\square_1$	$\square_2$	$\square_3$	$\square_4$	$\square_5$	$\square_6$	$\square_7$	□8	□9	□10	□ <sub>DK</sub>
	ry out inde dents	pendent	investiga	ations of		По	$\square_1$	$\square_2$	Пз	$\square_4$	□5	□6	$\square_7$	□8	□9	□10	□ <sub>DK</sub>
Res	pond to co	mplaints	about sa	afety		$\square_0$	$\square_1$	$\square_2$	Пз	$\square_4$	$\square_5$	$\square_6$	$\square_7$	□8	□9	□10	□ <sub>DK</sub>
Rai	se aware	ness ar	nd pron	note saf	ety ou	ıtcom	es										
Prov	vide advice	and info	rmation	about sa	fety	По	□1	$\square_2$	□3	$\square_4$	$\square_5$	□6	$\square_7$	□8	□9	□10	□ <sub>DK</sub>
	nitor safety	•				$\square_0$	$\square_1$	$\square_2$	Пз	$\square_4$	$\square_5$	$\square_6$	$\square_7$	□8		□10	□ <sub>DK</sub>
	nitor health			•		<b>□</b> <sub>0</sub>	□ <sub>1</sub>	<b>□</b> <sub>2</sub>	<b>□</b> <sub>3</sub>	<b>□</b> <sub>4</sub>	<b>□</b> <sub>5</sub>	<b>□</b> <sub>6</sub>	□ <sub>7</sub>	□8	<b>□</b> 9		□ <sub>DK</sub>
•	port safety					$\square_0$	$\square_1$	$\square_2$	□3	$\square_4$	<b>□</b> <sub>5</sub>	□6	$\square_7$	□8	<b>□</b> 9	□10	□ <sub>DK</sub>
Res	olve dispu	tes abou	t safety i	n the wor	ĸ	$\square_0$	$\square_1$	$\square_2$	$\square_3$	$\square_4$	<b>□</b> <sub>5</sub>	$\square_6$	$\square_7$	□8	□9	□10	□ <sub>DK</sub>

Overall, how well do you feel that Resources Safety performs in terms of being a proactive safety regulator, working with industry to create an environment where

place

9

15,16 &17. Here are some things that industry people have said need to be done well by Resources Safety when working with industry to reduce the likelihood and consequences of serious incidences. How well do you think Resources Safety performs on these? Please rate out of 10 using 0 for very poorly and 10 for outstandingly well. If you do not know or have had no experience with this, tick the DK box.

Resources Safety	ery poo	orly							Ou	tstar	ndingly	well
Supports a risk management approach	По	<b>□</b> <sub>1</sub>	$\square_2$	□3	$\square_4$	<b>□</b> <sub>5</sub>	□6	$\square_7$	□8	□9	□10	□ <sub>DK</sub>
Publishes appropriate industry safety performance indices	По	□1	$\square_2$	□3	$\square_4$	□5	□6	$\square_7$	□8	□9	□10	□ <sub>DK</sub>
Encourages the consistent application of safety standards across all operations (e.g. small and large employers and contractors)	$\square_0$	□1	$\square_2$	□3	$\square_4$	$\square_5$	□6	$\square_7$	□8	□9	□10	□ <sub>DK</sub>
Prosecutes if necessary	□₀	$\square_1$	$\square_2$	$\square_3$	$\square_4$	$\square_5$	□6	$\square_7$	□8	□9	□10	□ <sub>DK</sub>
Provides guidance on the development of documentation to meet legislative requirements	Пο	□1	$\square_2$	Пз	□4	□5	□6	<b>□</b> <sub>7</sub>	□8	□9	<b>□</b> 10	□ <sub>DK</sub>
Clarifies where legal responsibilities lie	□₀	$\square_1$	$\square_2$	$\square_3$	$\square_4$	$\square_5$	□6	$\square_7$	□8	□9	□10	□ <sub>DK</sub>
Adds value to site safety procedures	$\square_0$	$\square_1$	$\square_2$	$\square_3$	$\square_4$	$\square_5$	$\square_6$	$\square_7$	□8	□9	□10	□ <sub>DK</sub>
Responds in a timely manner	$\square_0$	$\square_1$	$\square_2$	$\square_3$	$\square_4$	$\square_5$	□6	$\square_7$	□8	□9	□10	□ <sub>DK</sub>
Reviews submitted documents in a timely manner	По	□1	$\square_2$	Пз	$\square_4$	$\square_5$	□6	$\square_7$	□8	□9	□10	□ <sub>DK</sub>
Resources Safety authorised officers	s											
Are knowledgeable about the legislation	По	$\square_1$	$\square_2$	Пз	$\square_4$	$\square_5$	□6	$\square_7$	□8	□9	□10	□ <sub>DK</sub>
Are consistent in their interpretation of the legislation	По	□1	$\square_2$	□3	$\square_4$	□5	□6	$\square_7$	□8	□9	□10	□ <sub>DK</sub>
Interpret the legislation in a practical way	По	$\square_1$	$\square_2$	$\square_3$	$\square_4$	$\square_5$	$\square_6$	$\square_7$	□8	□9	□10	□ <sub>DK</sub>
Are consistent in their <u>application</u> of the legislation	По	□1	$\square_2$	□3	$\square_4$	□5	□6	$\square_7$	□8	□9	□10	□ <sub>DK</sub>
Are willing to consult our organisation	$\square_0$	$\square_1$	$\square_2$	$\square_3$	$\square_4$	$\square_5$	$\square_6$	$\square_7$	□8	□9	□10	□ <sub>DK</sub>
Are willing to consider and adapt to industry safety innovations	<b>′</b> □ <sub>0</sub>	□1	$\square_2$	□3	□4	□5	□6	□7	□8	□9	□10	□ <sub>DK</sub>
Approach their task professionally	$\square_0$	$\square_1$	$\square_2$	$\square_3$	$\square_4$	$\square_5$	$\square_6$	$\square_7$	□8	□9	□10	$\square_{DK}$
Are knowledgeable about the industry that they are auditing or investigating	□₀	□1	$\square_2$	□3	□4	□5	□6	<b>□</b> <sub>7</sub>	□8	□9	□10	□ <sub>DK</sub>
Are knowledgeable about the type of operation that they are auditing or investigating	$\square_0$	□1	$\square_2$	Пз	□4	<b>□</b> <sub>5</sub>	□6	$\square_7$	□8	□9	□10	□ <sub>DK</sub>
Are well prepared before they go on site	По	$\square_1$	$\square_2$	$\square_3$	$\square_4$	$\square_5$	$\square_6$	$\square_7$	□8	□9	□10	□ <sub>DK</sub>
Are available to visit sites when needed	□о	□1	$\square_2$	Пз	$\Box_4$	<b>□</b> <sub>5</sub>	□6	$\square_7$	□8		9 🗆 10	□ <sub>DK</sub>
Coordinate inspections and audits so that, where possible, the aims are achieved in one visit	□₀	□1	$\square_2$	□3	$\square_4$	<b>□</b> <sub>5</sub>	□6	$\square_7$	□8	□9	□10	□ <sub>DK</sub>
Carry out inspections and audits in a timely manner	По	□1	$\square_2$	$\square_3$	$\square_4$	□5	□6	$\square_7$	□8	□9	□10	□ <sub>DK</sub>
Are available to answer queries over the telephone or online	По	<b>□</b> <sub>1</sub>	$\square_2$	Пз	$\square_4$	$\square_5$	□6	$\square_7$	□8	□9	□10	□ <sub>DK</sub>
Have a consistent response or approach to inspections and audits, both individually and between officers	По	□1	$\square_2$	Пз	$\square_4$	□5	□6	$\square_7$	□8	□9	□10	□ <sub>DK</sub>
Provide useful, actionable information to make operations safer	По	□1	$\square_2$	Пз	□4	□5	□6	<b>□</b> <sub>7</sub>	□8	□9	□10	□ <sub>DK</sub>
Provide information in a friendly and cooperative way	По	□1	$\square_2$	□3	$\square_4$	□5	□6	$\square_7$	□8	□9	□10	□ <sub>DK</sub>

### Resources Safety's guidance material

Addresses operational needs	По	□1	$\square_2$	□3	$\square_4$	<b>□</b> <sub>5</sub>	□6	$\square_7$	□8	□9	□10	□ <sub>DK</sub>
Uses plain English to clarify legislative requirements	$\square_0$	$\square_1$	$\square_2$	$\square_3$	$\square_4$	$\square_5$	$\square_6$	$\square_7$	□8	□9	□10	□ <sub>DK</sub>
Is in a form appropriate for operational use on site	По	□1	$\square_2$	Пз	$\square_4$	□5	□6	$\square_7$	□8	□9	□10	□ <sub>DK</sub>
Is concise	$\square_0$	$\square_1$	$\square_2$	$\square_3$	$\square_4$	$\square_5$	$\square_6$	$\square_7$	□8	□9	□10	$\square_{DK}$
Is clear and definitive on what is required	$\square_0$	$\square_1$	$\square_2$	$\square_3$	$\square_4$	$\square_5$	$\square_6$	$\square_7$	□8	□9	□10	□ <sub>DK</sub>
Is accurate and consistent in what it says	□₀	□1	$\square_2$	Пз	$\square_4$	$\square_5$	$\square_6$	$\square_7$	□8	□9	□10	□ <sub>DK</sub>

18. Here are some things that industry people have said are important for Resources Safety to do when working with industry to reduce the likelihood and consequences of serious incidents. How well do you think each of these would add value to your operation's safety outcomes?

		Would add a lot of value	Would add some value	May/may not add value	Probably wouldn't add value	Definitely wouldn't add value	Don't know
1.	Provide pro forma documents, information packs for contractors and preformatted risk assessments to assist small companies in writing their safety plans	□5	$\square_4$	Пз	$\square_2$	□1	□9
2.	Provide positive feedback on what has been done well	$\square_5$	$\square_4$	□3	$\square_2$	□₁	□9
3.	Provide practical advice and examples of how things can be done better	□5	□4	□3	$\square_2$	□1	□9
4.	Be willing to provide guidance and act as mentors	□5	$\square_4$	□3	$\square_2$	□1	□9
5.	Ensure mandatory training for safety and health representatives	□5	□4	□3	$\square_2$	□1	□9
6.	Undertake roadshows and formal presentations to companies and industry groups	□5	□4	Пз	$\square_2$	□1	□9
7.	Facilitate the development of industry networks to enable specific groups, such as managers or safety and health representatives, to get together	□5	<b>□</b> <sub>4</sub>	□₃	$\square_2$	□1	□9
8.	Ensure greater consultation and feedback to industry	$\square_5$	$\square_4$	□3	$\square_2$	□1	□9
9.	Be available to answer queries when needed	□5	$\square_4$	□3	$\square_2$		□9

19.	What else might Resources Safety do that would support better safety outcomes at your operation?

INDU	STRY CU	LTURE													
20.	It is now accepted that a proactive, consultative safety culture achieves the best outcomes. How do you rate your industry overall in meeting this goal? Please rate your industry out of 10 where 0 is very poorly and 10 is outstandingly well. Tick the box closest to your view.  Very poorly  Outstandingly well														
	Very poo	orly										Ou	tstand	lingly v	vell
	$\square_0$	$\square_1$	$\square_2$	$\square_3$	$\square_4$		] <sub>5</sub>	$\square_6$	$\square_7$		8 [	<b>⊐</b> 9	□10		
	21. How advanced is your industry in having the attributes of a resilient safety culture?  Please rate your industry out of 10 where 0 is not established yet and 10 is achieved industry wide. Tick the box closest to your view.  Not established yet  Achieved i														
	A cultur than rep	J J	orm rather		o [	<b>]</b> 1	$\square_2$	Пз	$\square_4$	□5	□6	$\square_7$	□8	□9	□10
		across th	nsibility fo าe	r 🗆	o [	]₁	$\square_2$	Пз	$\square_4$	□5	$\square_6$	$\square_7$	□8	□9	□ <sub>10</sub>
		eas abou	ut safety		o [	]1	$\square_2$	$\square_3$	$\square_4$	$\square_5$	□6	$\square_7$	□8	□9	□10
	Messer not sho	•	arded and		o [	]1	$\square_2$	Пз	$\square_4$	$\square_5$	$\square_6$	$\square_7$	□8	□9	□10

Thank you for your time in completing this survey. Are there any other comments you like to make?

 $\square_2$ 

 $\square_3$ 

 $\square_5$ 

 $\square_6$ 

 $\square_7$ 

 $\square_8$   $\square_9$ 

 $\square_4$ 

 $\square_1$ 

 $\square_0$ 

A proactive as well as reactive safety culture

□10

### Appendix 6: Survey questions for MHF stakeholders

## ABOUT YOU The following information is required to ensure we have a representative cross section of industry.

11101	onowing information is required to chedic we have a re	presentative e	oroso scotion or indus	.ı y .
1.	Which industry sector do you mainly work in?			
	Mining Petroleum Geothermal energy Chemical industry Other (please specify)	□ <sub>1</sub> □ <sub>2</sub> □ <sub>3</sub> □ <sub>4</sub>		
2.	What is the size of your organisation?			
	Less than 10 employees 10-100 employees 101-500 employees More than 500 employees	□ <sub>1</sub> □ <sub>2</sub> □ <sub>3</sub> □ <sub>4</sub>		
3.	How long have you been working in the resource	es industry?		
	More than 10 years 3-10 years Less than 3 years	$\Box_1$ $\Box_2$ $\Box_3$		
4.	What is your current role?			
	General manager or senior executive Operations manager Supervisor Safety and health representative Contractor Occupational health and safety professional Other (please specify)	$ \begin{array}{c} \square_1 \\ \square_2 \\ \square_3 \\ \square_4 \\ \square_5 \\ \square_6 \\ \square_9 \end{array} $		
INTE	RACTION WITH RESOURCES SAFETY			
5.	Have you had contact with Resources Safety in	the past year	? Please tick one only	<b>y</b> .
	Yes – only initiated by our organisation Yes – only initiated by Resources Safety Yes – initiated by our organisation and by Resource No	$\Box_1$ $\Box_2$ es Safety $\Box_3$ $\Box_4$	→ Go to Question 8	a
6.	How often did you have contact with Resources	Safety during	g the 2013-14 financ	ial year?
	Not at all Once Several times Many times	$\Box_1$ $\Box_2$ $\Box_3$ $\Box_4$		
7.	What was the nature of these contacts? Tick as	many as applic	cable	
	Audit or inspection Investigation of a complaint Investigation of an incident Consultation regarding a safety matter Response to an enquiry by you A request for information from Resources Safety Information session (e.g. safety roadshow, industry Other (please specify)		$ \begin{array}{c} \square_1 \\ \square_2 \\ \square_3 \\ \square_4 \\ \square_5 \\ \square_6 \\ \square_7 \end{array} $	

	10 is out	tstandin	gly wel	I. Tick th	e box o	closes	it to y	our vi	ew.								
		Very poor												Outst	andir well	ngly	
	$\square_0$	$\square_1$	$\square_2$	$\square_3$	$\square_4$		5	$\square_6$	$\square_7$		<b>□</b> 8	$\square_9$		10			
8.b	To what organis Tick the	ation?	Please	rate out	of 10 v										ount.		
		Not at all											Ar	extra a	ordir mour	. •	
	$\square_0$	$\square_1$	$\square_2$	$\square_3$	$\square_4$		5	$\square_6$	$\square_7$		<b>□</b> <sub>8</sub>	□9		10			
RESOURCES SAFETY'S ROLES AND PERFORMANCE																	
9.a How important are the following roles of the safety regulator? Please rate out of 10 using 0 for not important and 10 for essential. If you do not know or have had no experience with this, tick the DK box.																	
	Not important Essential														ial		
Cor	npliance	activitie	s														
Set	appropriate	standar	ds of sa	fety		$\square_0$	$\square_1$	$\square_2$	Пз	$\square_4$	$\square_5$	$\square_6$	$\square_7$	□8	□9	□10	□ <sub>DK</sub>
Con	duct indepe	endent a	udits of	safety sy	stems	$\square_0$	□1	$\square_2$	□3	$\square_4$	$\square_5$	$\square_6$	$\square_7$	□8	□9	□10	□ <sub>DK</sub>
	ertake safe					□0	□1	$\square_2$	□3	$\square_4$	<b>□</b> <sub>5</sub>	□6	$\square_7$	□8	<b>D</b> 9	□10	□ <sub>DK</sub>
	y out indep lents	endent i	nvestiga	ations of		□0	□1	$\square_2$	Пз	$\square_4$	$\square_5$	□6	$\square_7$	□8	□9	□10	□ <sub>DK</sub>
Res	pond to cor	mplaints	about s	afety		$\square_0$	$\square_1$	$\square_2$	$\square_3$	$\square_4$	$\square_5$	$\square_6$	$\square_7$	□8	<b>□</b> <sub>9</sub>	<b>□</b> <sub>10</sub>	$\square_{DK}$
	How we 10 using 0 is, tick the	for very	/ poorly														
					Very	poo	rly						Ou	tstan	ding	ly wel	I
Co	mpliance	activitio	es														
Set	appropriate	e standaı	ds of sa	afety		$\square_0$	$\Box_1$	$\square_2$	$\square_3$	$\square_4$	$\square_5$	$\square_6$	$\square_7$	□8	□9	□10	□ <sub>DK</sub>
Cor	nduct indep	endent a	udits of	safety sy	stems	$\square_0$	□1	$\square_2$	$\square_3$	$\square_4$	$\square_5$	$\square_6$	$\square_7$	□8	□9	□10	□ <sub>DK</sub>
Und	lertake safe	ety inspe	ctions			$\square_0$	$\square_1$	$\square_2$	Пз	$\square_4$	$\square_5$	$\square_6$	$\square_7$	□8	□9	□10	□ <sub>DK</sub>
	ry out inde <sub>l</sub> dents	pendent i	investig	ations of		□0	□1	$\square_2$	Пз	□4	□5	□6	$\square_7$	□8	□9	□10	□ <sub>DK</sub>
Res	spond to co	mplaints	about s	afety		$\square_0$	$\square_1$	$\square_2$	$\square_3$	$\square_4$	$\square_5$	$\square_6$	$\square_7$	□8	$\square_9$	□10	□ <sub>DK</sub>

Overall, how well do you feel that Resources Safety performs in terms of being a proactive safety regulator, working with industry to create an environment where

industry is operating as safely as possible? Please rate out of 10 where 0 is very poorly and

8.a

10. Here are some things that industry people have said need to be done well by Resources Safety when working with industry to reduce the likelihood and consequences of serious incidences. How well do you think Resources Safety performs on these? Please rate out of 10 using 0 for very poorly and 10 for outstandingly well. If you do not know or have had no experience with this, tick the DK box.

Resources Safety	ery po	orly							Ou	ıtstaı	ndingly	well
Supports a risk management approach	$\square_0$	$\square_1$	$\square_2$	Пз	$\square_4$	$\square_5$	□6	$\square_7$	□8	□9	□10	□ <sub>DK</sub>
Publishes appropriate industry safety performance indices	$\square_0$	□1	$\square_2$	$\square_3$	$\square_4$	$\square_5$	□6	$\square_7$	□8	□9	□10	□ <sub>DK</sub>
Encourages the consistent application of safety standards across all operations (e.g. small and large employers and contractors)	□0	□1	$\square_2$	Пз	$\square_4$	$\square_5$	□6	$\square_7$	□8	□9	□10	□ <sub>DK</sub>
Prosecutes if necessary	$\square_0$	$\square_1$	$\square_2$	Пз	$\square_4$	$\square_5$	$\square_6$	$\square_7$	□8	□9	□10	□ <sub>DK</sub>
Provides guidance on the development of documentation to meet legislative requirements	□0	□₁	$\square_2$	Пз	$\square_4$	□5	□6	$\square_7$	□8	□9	□10	□ <sub>DK</sub>
Clarifies where legal responsibilities lie	$\square_0$	$\square_1$	$\square_2$	□3	$\square_4$	<b>□</b> <sub>5</sub>	□6	$\square_7$	□8	□9	□10	□ <sub>DK</sub>
Adds value to site safety procedures	$\square_0$	□₁	$\square_2$	Пз	$\square_4$	$\square_5$	$\square_6$	$\square_7$	□8	□9	□10	□ <sub>DK</sub>
Responds in a timely manner	$\square_0$	$\square_1$	$\square_2$	$\square_3$	$\square_4$	$\square_5$	$\square_6$	$\square_7$	□8	□9	□10	□ <sub>DK</sub>
Reviews submitted documents in a timely manner	$\square_0$	□1	$\square_2$	□3	$\square_4$	$\square_5$	□6	$\square_7$	□8	□9	□10	□ <sub>DK</sub>
Resources Safety authorised officers	6											
Are knowledgeable about the legislation	$\square_0$	□1	$\square_2$	Пз	$\square_4$	□5	□6	$\square_7$	□8	□9	□10	□ <sub>DK</sub>
Are consistent in their interpretation of the legislation	$\square_0$	□1	$\square_2$	Пз	$\square_4$	□5	□6	$\square_7$	□8	□9	□10	□ <sub>DK</sub>
Interpret the legislation in a practical way	$\square_0$	□₁	$\square_2$	Пз	$\square_4$	$\square_5$	$\square_6$	$\square_7$	□8	□9	□10	□ <sub>DK</sub>
Are consistent in their <u>application</u> of the legislation	□₀		$\square_2$	Пз	$\square_4$	□5	□6	$\square_7$	□8	□9	□10	□ <sub>DK</sub>
Are willing to consult our organisation	$\square_0$	$\square_1$	$\square_2$	Пз	$\square_4$	$\square_5$	□6	$\square_7$	□8	□9	□10	□ <sub>DK</sub>
Are willing to consider and adapt to industry safety innovations	0	□1	$\square_2$	□3	□4	□5	□6	$\square_7$	□8	□9	□10	□ <sub>DK</sub>
Approach their task professionally	$\square_0$	$\square_1$	$\square_2$	$\square_3$	$\square_4$	$\square_5$	$\square_6$	$\square_7$	□8	□9	□10	□ <sub>DK</sub>
Are knowledgeable about the <u>industry</u> that they are auditing or investigating	□₀	□1	$\square_2$	□3	□4	□5	□6	$\square_7$	□8	□9	□10	□ <sub>DK</sub>
Are knowledgeable about the type of operation that they are auditing or investigating	□0	□1	$\square_2$	Пз	□4	□5	□6	<b>□</b> <sub>7</sub>	□8	□9	□10	□ <sub>DK</sub>
Are well prepared before they go on site	$\square_0$	$\square_1$	$\square_2$	$\square_3$	$\square_4$	$\square_5$	$\square_6$	$\square_7$	□8	□9	□10	□ <sub>DK</sub>
Are available to visit sites when needed	$\square_0$	$\square_1$	$\square_2$	$\square_3$	$\square_4$	$\square_5$	$\square_6$	$\square_7$	□8	□9	□10	□ <sub>DK</sub>
Coordinate inspections and audits so that, where possible, the aims are achieved in one visit	□₀	□1	$\square_2$	Пз	$\square_4$	$\square_5$	□6	$\square_7$	□8	□9	□10	□ <sub>DK</sub>
Carry out inspections and audits in a timely manner	По	□1	$\square_2$	□3	$\square_4$	□5	□6	$\square_7$	□8	□9	□10	□ <sub>DK</sub>
Are available to answer queries over the telephone or online	$\square_0$	□1	$\square_2$	□3	$\square_4$	$\square_5$	□6	$\square_7$	□8	□9	□10	□ <sub>DK</sub>
Have a consistent response or approach to inspections and audits, both individually and between officers	d □o	□1	$\square_2$	Пз	□4	□5	□6	$\square_7$	□8	□9	□10	□ <sub>DK</sub>
Provide useful, actionable information to make operations safer	Пο	□1	$\square_2$	Пз	□4	□5	□6	$\square_7$	□8	□9	□10	□ <sub>DK</sub>
Provide information in a friendly and cooperative way	$\square_0$	□1	$\square_2$	□3	$\square_4$	$\square_5$	□6	$\square_7$	□8	□9	□10	□ <sub>DK</sub>

Resources	Safety's	guidance
material		

Addresses operational needs	По	<b>□</b> <sub>1</sub>	$\square_2$	Пз	$\square_4$	<b>□</b> <sub>5</sub>	□6	$\square_7$	□8	□9	□10	□ <sub>DK</sub>
Uses plain English to clarify legislative requirements	$\square_0$	$\square_1$	$\square_2$	$\square_3$	$\square_4$	$\square_5$	$\square_6$	$\square_7$	□8	□9	□10	□ <sub>DK</sub>
Is in a form appropriate for operational use on site	$\square_0$	□1	$\square_2$	Пз	$\square_4$	□5	□6	$\square_7$	□8	□9	□10	□ <sub>DK</sub>
Is concise	$\square_0$	$\square_1$	$\square_2$	$\square_3$	$\square_4$	$\square_5$	$\square_6$	$\square_7$	□8	□9	□10	□ <sub>DK</sub>
Is clear and definitive on what is required	$\square_0$	$\square_1$	$\square_2$	$\square_3$	$\square_4$	$\square_5$	$\square_6$	$\square_7$	□8	□9	□10	□ <sub>DK</sub>
Is accurate and consistent in what it says	По	$\square_1$	$\square_2$	Пз	$\square_4$	$\square_5$	□6	$\square_7$	□8	□9	□10	□ <sub>DK</sub>

11. Here are some things that industry people have said are important for Resources Safety to do when working with industry to reduce the likelihood and consequences of serious incidents. How well do you think each of these would add value to your operation's safety outcomes?

		Would add a lot of value	Would add some value	May/may not add value	Probably wouldn't add value	Definitely wouldn't add value	Don't know
1.	Provide pro forma documents, information packs for contractors and preformatted risk assessments to assist small companies in writing their safety plans	□5	$\square_4$	□₃	$\square_2$	□1	□9
2.	Provide positive feedback on what has been done well	□5	$\square_4$	□3	$\square_2$	□₁	□9
3.	Provide practical advice and examples of how things can be done better	□5	□4	Пз	$\square_2$	□1	□9
4.	Be willing to provide guidance and act as mentors	$\square_5$	$\square_4$	□3	$\square_2$	□1	□9
5.	Ensure greater consultation and feedback to industry	□5	□4	□3	$\square_2$	□1	□9
6.	Be available to answer queries when needed	□5	$\square_4$	□3	$\square_2$	□₁	□9

12.	What else might Resources Safety do that would support better safety outcomes at your operation?

### INTERACTION WITH THE DEPARTMENT AS A WHOLE

Questions 13 to 16 look at interaction with the Department of Mines and Petroleum as a whole, and are not included here.

### **INDUSTRY CULTURE**

It is now accepted that a proactive, consultative safety culture achieves the best							
outcomes. How do you rate your industry overall in meeting this goal? Please rate your							
industry out of 10 where 0 is very poorly and 10 is outstandingly well. Tick the box closest to vour view.							

Very poo	orly								Outstandingly wel		
$\square_0$	$\square_1$	$\square_2$	$\square_3$	$\square_4$	$\square_5$	$\square_6$	$\square_7$	$\square_8$	$\square_9$	$\square_{10}$	

18. How advanced is your industry in having the attributes of a resilient safety culture?

Please rate your industry out of 10 where 0 is not established yet and 10 is achieved industry wide. Tick the box closest to your view.

Achieved industry with the possible of the property with the possible of t

Not est	Achieved industry wide										
A culture of reform rather than repair	□о	□1	$\square_2$	□3	$\square_4$	□5	$\square_6$	$\square_7$	□8	□9	□10
A shared responsibility for safety across the organisation	□₀	□1	$\square_2$	$\square_3$	$\square_4$	$\square_5$	$\square_6$	$\square_7$	□8	□9	□ <sub>10</sub>
New ideas about safety actively sought	□о	□1	$\square_2$	Пз	$\square_4$	□5	□6	$\square_7$	□8	□9	□10
Messenger rewarded and not shot	□о	$\square_1$	$\square_2$	$\square_3$	$\square_4$	□5	$\square_6$	$\square_7$	□8	□9	□ <sub>10</sub>
A proactive as well as reactive safety culture	По	□1	$\square_2$	$\square_3$	$\square_4$	$\square_5$	$\square_6$	$\square_7$	□8	□9	□10

Thank you for your time in completing this survey. Are there any other comments you would like to make?