



**THE INSTITUTE OF EMPLOYMENT RIGHTS**

**19<sup>th</sup> October 2011**

**The Lofstedt Review**

Appointed by the Department for Work and Pensions as “part of the Government’s plan to reform Britain’s health and safety system”.

The review is directed to “consider the opportunities for reducing the burden of health and safety legislation on UK businesses whilst maintaining the progress made in improving health and safety”.

### Membership

Professor Ragnar Lofstedt – chair

Advisory panel:-

Andrew Bridgen – Conservative MP

Andrew Miller – Labour MP

LibDem MP to be confirmed

John Armit – Olympic Delivery Authority (employer representative)

Sarah Veale – TUC (employee representative)

Adam Marshall – British Chamber of Commerce (small business representative)

Expected to report by end of October 2011.

## The call for evidence

At its preliminary meeting the group called for submissions by no later than 29<sup>th</sup> July 2011, specifically in relation to 10 questions:-

1. Are there any particular health and safety regulations (or ACoPs) that have significantly improved health and safety and should not be changed?
2. Are there any particular health and safety regulations (or ACoPs) which need to be simplified?
3. Are there any particular health and safety regulations (or ACoPs) which it would be helpful to merge together and why?
4. Are there any particular health and safety regulations (or ACoPs) that could be abolished without any negative effect on the health and safety of individuals?
5. Are there any particular health and safety regulations that have created significant additional burdens on business but that have limited impact on health and safety?
6. To what extent does the concept of 'reasonable practicability' help to manage the burden of health and safety regulation?
7. Are there any examples where health and safety regulations have led to unreasonable outcomes, or to inappropriate litigation and compensation?
8. Are there any lessons that can be learned from the way other EU countries have approached the regulation of health and safety, in terms of (a) their overall approach and (b) regulating for particular risks or hazards?
9. Can you provide evidence that the requirements of EU Directives have or have not been unnecessarily enhanced ('gold-plated') when incorporated into UK health and safety regulation?
10. Does health and safety law suitably place responsibility in an appropriate way on those that create risk? If not, what changes are required?