TNO innovation for life

Healthy Living
Polarisavenue 151
2132 JJ Hoofddorp
P.O. Box 718
2130 AS Hoofddorp
The Netherlands

www.tno.nl

T +31 88 866 61 00
F +31 88 866 87 95
infodesk@tno.nl

TNO report

Design, implementation and maintenance of OIRA; some suggestions and recommendations

Date	3 May 2011
Author(s)	Jan Michiel Meeuwsen, Fenny Michel
Copy no.	1
No. of copies	1
Number of pages	16
Number of appendices	0
Customer	European Agency for Safety and Health at Work, Bilbao, Spain
Project name	OIRA pilots Bilbao
Project number	031.14989.01.02

All rights reserved.
No part of this publication may be reproduced and/or published by print, photoprint,
microfilm or any other means without the previous written consent of TNO.

In case this report was drafted on instructions, the rights and obligations of contracting
parties are subject to either the General Terms and Conditions for commissions to TNO, or
the relevant agreement concluded between the contracting parties. Submitting the report for
inspection to parties who have a direct interest is permitted.

© 2011 TNO

Contents

Introduction

In this report TNO describes ideas and suggestions to assist EUOSHA in further rolling out the OiRA project in the European Union.

We base our ideas on the experiences we have with design and implementation of digital risk assessments in The Netherlands.

We trust that our ideas will be constructive and we are open for any further discussion on this.

1   Design

In this chapter we will describe a few ideas as discussed within TNO regarding the OiRA project. Our suggestions regarding design are based on the experiences we have with the Dutch digital risk assessment tools and what we have so far seen and witnessed within the OiRA project during the design phase and the set up of the pilot projects in 2010.

1.1   From generic to specific OiRA

The development of digital risk assessment tools in The Netherlands really boosted after the development in 2003 of a so called generic tool for MKB Nederland (the Dutch employers' organisation for MSE's). The modules of this tool dealt with generic topics in health and safety such as lifting, office work, handling of dangerous substances, etc. Based on the success of this approach a demand grew for more specific tools in specific sectors. Hence, this resulted in the development of specific tools in many Dutch sectors.

We would rather advocate the further development of such a generic tool as soon as possible on the EU level with the OiRA tools generator. Already earlier the Dutch tool was translated for OiRA. The Dutch tool is called 'Algemene MKB RI&E' (General MSE Risk Assessment) (cf: http://www.rie.nl/rie-instrumenten/ri-e-algemene-mkb) This tool is now in revision and will be updated. It could be translated and offered free of charge to all Focal Points for further adaptation and implementation in their respective countries. Of course approval is needed on this from Dutch social partners.

The advantage of this approach is
- design and development efforts are limited
- a modular set up of this generic risk assessment allows for cutting and pasting in other tools EU wide
- EUOSHA can offer a filled tool to all Focal Points at the official launch of OiRA during the Istanbul World Congress in September 2011

1.2   Regular and simplified OiRA

Despite all efforts made in The Netherlands to simplify risk assessment procedures for MSE's, still the micro enterprises (less than 10 employees according to Dutch definitions in Employers' survey (WEA 2009)) underperform when it comes to the risk assessment obligation. We expect the same dilemma will occur on the EU level.

Therefore, we suggest developing a *simplified* OiRA tool for these micro enterprises in contrast to a more *regular* OiRA tool. There is a huge difference between an enterprise of 200 workers and a micro enterprise of 1 or 2 workers; the latter in many cases could have a sufficient risk assessment with a much more simplified tool.

One simplified generic tool in The Netherlands already exists for these micro enterprises and is called 'Checklist gezondheidsrisico's' Checklist Health Risks (cf. http://www.rie.nl/rie-instrumenten/checklist-gezondheidsrisicos-max.-40-uur-personeel-in-dienst-2000) This Checklist Health Risks is designed for micro enterprises who have staff working less than 40 hours a week in total. It covers risk modules on dangerous substances, noise, temperature, machine safety, well being, etc. Per module a maximum of 10 questions is offered. The checklist also gives relevant tips to improve a dangerous situation immediately.

In The Netherlands a pilot was started during the second half of 2010 to investigate the potential of a simplified digital risk assessment tool for micro enterprises. The tool concentrates on the specific risks in a sector and addresses the level of control ('How is the risk controlled?' instead of 'Is the risk present?'). The new tool was received very well by the pilot sector as a lean and mean risk assessment tool which forces enterprises to make up their minds about these sector specific risks and boosts compliance. The pilot will be scaled up to other sectors during 2011. We invite EUOSHA to take notice of this and we are willing to share our experiences.

1.3   OiRA modules

All OiRA products will come in modules somehow. Either arranged by topic or risk (e.g. noise, dangerous substances, stress, etc.), or by an important step in the primary process in enterprises (procurement, production, packaging, etc.). We believe it is best to build a database within the OiRA tools generator filled with all these modules for retrieval to all future OiRA users.

At the moment the four pilots, apart from the Cyprus one, have not developed any substantial modules yet. Therefore, we recommend making a selected choice of the digital risk assessments produced in The Netherlands, UK and perhaps some other EU countries to be used as a first fill of this database.

The pilot project in Cyprus is on hairdressers and the one in France (INRS) on the transport sector. In The Netherlands two full fledged digital tools exist for these sectors and have been widely used. Instead of rather cumbersome development processes, the Dutch tools could be translated and offered directly to Cyprus and France for adaptation and implementation.

In order to avoid this in future, we suggest selecting well designed and ready to use tools in The Netherlands and possibly elsewhere in the EU and use these to fill the OiRA tools generator. Hence, avoiding that some OiRA developers in member states will start from scratch and invent the wheel again.

1.4   Qualified OiRA developers and stakeholders

In order to promote the further development of OiRA within the EU, developers and stakeholders on several levels should be aware of their respective roles/tasks and responsibilities. EUOSHA could promote these respective roles and raise the

awareness on this. In this table we have described some crucial tasks and responsibilities we feel are key to the success of the mixed top down and bottom up approach EUOSHA presently has chosen to roll out OiRA within the EU. Of course the descriptions below are not carved in stone and would need considerable rethinking of EUOSHA and the Steering Committee.

Developers	Tasks	Responsibilities
EU community level: social partners, EUOSHA, Commission, SLIC	• Develop and offer OiRA tools generator • Promote the building of OiRA tools • Develop platform of OiRA community for developers and users • Assure most efficient use of earlier developed OiRA tools EU wide • Make a connection between the new Commission Strategy on Health & Safety and the OiRA project • Assure resources for further implementation and maintenance	Decide on resources and actions
Member state level: Focal Points, social partners, national governments (ministries and enforcement authorities)	• Put the OiRA project on the agenda of the national social dialogue • Promote the use of ready made OiRA tools in the national context • Adapt OiRA modules and tools to the national situation • Avoid, by all means, cumbersome development of OiRA tools that might exist already elsewhere in the EU • Raise awareness amongst national users • Introduce incentives (cf. par. 2.3) in legislation and enforcement for OiRA end users (employers and employees) • Assure resources for further implementation and maintenance	Decide on resources and actions
Sector level: social partners, OSH professionals	• put the OiRA initiative on the agenda of the sectoral social dialogue and decide to develop an OiRA tool or not • nominate a work group of responsible persons for the OiRA project • include OSH professionals who are familiar with the sector into the working group • include labour inspectors who are familiar with the sector into the working group • make an inventory of ready made tools/materials elsewhere within the EU • share the developed tools and modules with the OiRA community • assure resources for further implementation and maintenance	Decide on resources and actions

On the highest level we mention the Commission, more in particular DG Employment, Social Affairs and Inclusion, and SLIC, the Senior Labour Inspectors Committee. One represents the policy side, the other the enforcement side. Both are needed for further successful roll out of OiRA. We know that SLIC has started its own project on digital risk assessment a while ago, but we do not know the exact status of it. We feel that it is vital for EUOSHA to connect the OiRA project with this SLIC initiative. The Commission is strongly focused on the Better Regulation agenda. Obviously, the OiRA project and its outcomes would greatly add to the success of this Better Regulation agenda.

If we think of training and further awareness raising, one could think of roughly three target groups as connected to the three levels described above in the table; the community, member state and sector level. Within these levels several target groups can be approached and these would have their own interests (e.g. social partners). However, on all three levels the OiRA intervention logic needs these stakeholders to convince them to further participation.

On the community level EUOSHA could expand the present Steering Committee of OiRA with SLIC representatives. Training is not really needed, although demos of intermediate results of OiRA would be instrumental.

Awareness raising

On the member state level EUOSHA could think of awareness raising workshops to be held in Brussels or Bilbao. The content of such a one day workshop could be:
- The OiRA intervention logic
- Example of best practice from The Netherlands or another member state
- A discussion on roles and expectations from the national developers/stakeholders
- Operational issues on how to access and make use of the OiRA tools generator and community
- Rules for participation; public domain, non exclusivity, willingness to share products, social dialogue
- Hand outs: implementation guide, funding guide (to be produced in 2011)

On the sector level of course a vast amount of participants will occur in several member states. Therefore, we would suggest introducing a train-the-trainer approach. Even the workshops described on member state level could function as an example of how Focal Points in EU member states can organise similar workshops in their respective countries in order to raise support amongst sector organisations.

Technical training

However, still the OiRA project would need some technical training for the hard core developers of digital risk assessment tools everywhere in the EU. Here we would suggest some form of ODL (Open and Distance Learning) offered by EUOSHA to all persons who are interested to participate in the development of OiRA tools. ODL seems to be the most efficient form to cover many participants and to efficiently update the actual content of such a training program. A web based ODL program

can be accessed 24 hours a day and is not dependent on place. Even one might think of such ODL training as a prerequisite before entering the OiRA community.

Possible content of this technical ODL training could be:
- Full explanation of the OiRA tools generator
- Reference to a database with ready made modules
- Explanation of the basic principles of a digital risk assessment tool: introducing filter questions, statements and not questions, introduce references to legislation, good practices, how one has to work with CMS in Zope Plone etc.

1.5 Development and authorisation

A real danger for the OiRA project is that developed risk assessment tools do not comply with the requirements on risk assessment as made in EU Directives and member state legislation. There should be some sort of quality check before a tool or modules are available for use and could be disseminated EU wide through the earlier described OiRA database and the OiRA community.

In The Netherlands the quality check is mostly guaranteed through a multi disciplinary development work group consisting of social partner representatives, but also OSH professionals and sometimes labour inspectors. On the EU level there is a risk in future that labour inspectors in member states will simply refer risk assessments produced with OiRA developed tools to the waste bin, because they can not stand a quality check.

Some basic quality and legislative requirements for a risk assessment tool are:
- The tool should cover all relevant risks for the sector it is supposed to cover
- It should be wide and deep enough
- State of the art technical measures should be considered

Therefore, a system of approval and authorisation is needed and at the same time one should avoid an overly bureaucratic and time consuming procedure. This report is too limited in its nature to dwell extensively on this issue. However, we believe one can think of the following measures:
- EUOSHA could produce an overview of quality and legislative requirements to be taken into account when it comes to developing a digital risk assessment tool
- Establish on the national level (as compared to the RIE Steunpunt (RIE support desk) in The Netherlands) a mechanism for approval and authorisation (Some commission which approves newly developed tools)
- Establish on the EU community level a similar approval mechanism before OiRA outcomes are shared with the OiRA community

2 Implementation

In this chapter we will describe strategies and alternative ideas to foster successful implementation of the OiRA project. We will also reflect upon the transferability of the Dutch experiences to other EU member states. We would rather like to warn for too optimistic expectations regarding the transferability of the Dutch approach to other member states. The Dutch situation is different in many respects from other national contexts, policies and cultures. Therefore, to think that the lessons learned in The Netherlands can guarantee a faster roll out elsewhere in the EU it a bit too optimistic.

2.1 Experts and lay men

Risk assessment is always a controversial topic amongst OSH experts and they can devote substantial time to it. Some would advocate a thorough analysis of all risks, even for the smallest enterprises, others are less fundamentalist and would accept lighter forms of risk assessment. Introduction of digital and more simplified risk assessment tools flares up this professional debate.

Some national OSH policies in member states sometimes are more expert based – relying strongly on the professionalism of OSH experts such as safety experts and occupational physicians – (e.g. France) others are more liberal and promote that the employer and workers together try to come to best solutions, by all means, with assistance of OSH professionals if necessary (e.g. The Netherlands and United Kingdom). Consequently, in the latter situation one can expect a more positive approach towards digital risk assessment than in the first.

The lay men or non experts in OSH such as employers and workers are in need of transparent and easy to understand information. Especially MSE's, as underlined by numerous studies, are in need of clear and concise information and want to know immediately what to do if there is a problem. They want solutions and not deep analyses on risk assessment.

These two interests of experts and non experts should be balanced somehow; reconciliation is needed on all the three levels we described in paragraph 1.4 The best is to put these two groups or their representatives together in a working group during the design phase of risk assessment tools and add a moderating stakeholder like the government or the enforcement authority or some other third party. The moderator should stress the final goal of any design phase, namely: the introduction of a tool which is reasonably well and complete and will be used by employers and employees.

2.2 Implementation partners

The current diffusion model that EUOSHA has in mind puts strong impetus on a top down approach in which national governments and social partners play a significant role. The philosophy is that through these 'intermediaries' OiRA can reach the end-

users: enterprises, employers and employees. To rely exclusively on this diffusion model, however, is delicate, because it does not always work in this way.

This diffusion model entails a well working social dialogue on all levels in a member state: the national, sector and company level. In The Netherlands, Germany and Nordic countries this is more or less the case, but in quite a few other EU member states the quality of social dialogue is relatively poor and improves slowly. This is especially the case in the new member states[1]. The social dialogue in the new Central and Eastern European member states generally does not measure up to the minimum criteria for social dialogue, and that dialogue has not been able to counteract serious reductions in real wages and employment opportunities. If any improvement does take place, it is in the sphere of collective agreements on better wages and <u>hardly</u> on working conditions topics. More recent findings from EUROFOUND demonstrate that social dialogue is in 'robust' shape, but large differences between member states exist[2]. More than 60% of employees in Europe are covered by some form of employee representation. However, these institutions are generally much more common in northern Member States than in southern ones. Especially in the field of psychosocial risks at work diverging stakeholder perspectives and structural weaknesses still pose serious challenges to effective social dialogue in this area[3].

Moreover, social partner organizations can sometimes – even in a well developed social dialogue setting - function as a layer of clay and make it hard for others, such as an OiRA initiative, to reach down to their members. In The Netherlands this was especially noticed in the horeca[4] and trade sector. These sectors consist of very small enterprises which easily rise and fall and their sector organizations lobby quite strongly to avoid extra regulation for its members. Presently, The Netherlands has started a communication campaign to raise the compliance level regarding risk assessment in these sectors. The project has just started and it is too early to mention any results. In a later stage, lessons learned from this project could be useful for EUOSHA.

Apart from this top down strategy, a bottom up and middle out strategy could be considered. The OiRA intervention logic should also tolerate bypasses in the implementation process. We give some examples of alternative strategies.

Bottom up strategy:
- Also allow for grassroots' initiatives in individual sectors in member states; if a specific sector is motivated to introduce a risk assessment tool, facilitate this, without the official approval of social partners or others on the higher levels

---

[1] Jesper Due & Mikkel Mailand, 'Social Dialogue in Central and Eastern Europe –present state and future development', Invited paper prepared for the IIRA-congress 2003, Berlin

[2] European Company Survey 2009– Flexibility practices and social dialogue, EUROFOUND, Dublin, Ireland

[3] 'European social dialogue on psychosocial risks at work: benefits and challenges', Michael Ertel et. al. in: <u>European Journal of Industrial Relations,</u> June 1, 2010 16: 169-183

[4] **Horeca** is a business term which refers to a sector of the food service industry, to establishments which prepare and serve food and beverages. The term is a syllabic abbreviation of the words Hotel/Restaurant/Catering.

- Or … a bit stronger, identify a few of these grassroots' initiatives and offer them a status as an OiRA pilot
- Chose one or two high risk sectors in the EU (construction e.g.) and approach through their EU confederations well organized national sector organizations and invite them to prepare an OiRA tool (this is more a top down approach combined with bottom up initiatives)

Middle out strategy:
- Reach out with the OiRA activities to insurance companies, banks and accountants who have direct commercial connections with MSE's and are their ears and eyes in the market; EUOSHA could consider a specific brochure describing the advantages of digital risk assessment and the benefits for enterprises; dissemination can take place through the Focal Points network; a communication campaign could be considered with articles in specialist magazines reaching out to these alternative intermediaries
- Connect with associations of OSH professionals on EU and member state level (safety engineers, occupational physicians and others); inform them and include them because OiRA tools can and will be used by these professionals to improve their service provisions to MSE's; many of these professionals will work with the OiRA tool, preferably, in future. If you do not involve them now, you must be prepared for obstruction and non-cooperation later, because these professionals cling strongly to their own tools. Cf. para. 2.1.
- EUOSHA could set up a communication campaign or disseminate informative materials to these professional associations to inform them on the rules of the OiRA game (use of the tool is free of charge); especially in the UK, EUOSHA could contact IOSH (cf. www.iosh.co.uk) which is the world's largest chartered body of OSH professionals, as it seems that the Health & Safety Executive is confronted with severe budget cuts and not willing and able to support the OiRA initiative.

2.3 Incentives

Apart from the quality of the social dialogue in member states, as discussed in the last paragraph, also the legislative environment and national government policies could support the success of the OiRA initiative. Again, if national OSH policy is strongly expert driven, i.e. the notion that companies and their workers are mere novices in OSH and need special assistance preferably from highly qualified OSH professionals using advanced risk assessment methodologies, an OiRA intervention is doomed to fail. The main reason for this is because the OiRA intervention strives to empower employers and their workers to perform risk assessments themselves.

Factors that have been instrumental in this respect in The Netherlands include the adaptation of risk assessment legal requirements for companies with less than 25 employees. The use of a digital risk assessment tool officially approved by social partners in the sector, exempted these small enterprises from a full-scale authorisation procedure with an OSH service (which is an obligation for all other Dutch enterprises and requires some investment). This category of companies can

now use a less thorough authorisation procedure, which means mostly submitting the risk assessment and plan of measures on paper to the OSH service. This policy took effect in 2005 and has provided a relatively easy and inexpensive way for the smallest companies of fulfilling the legal risk assessment requirement. It was also a strong incentive to participate in the Dutch digital risk assessment initiative because sector organisations could clearly convince their members of the benefits.

We conclude that it is not enough to put a tool at the disposal of the end users for free; some other incentives or rewards are needed. If EUOSHA could raise this issue on community or member state level, we believe that the OiRA initiative could add to the success of the commission's better regulation agenda. Would it be possible in the new Community strategy on health and safety to relieve the administrative burden of MSE's in Europe regarding risk assessment on the condition that they make use of the OiRA tool?

Another strong incentive in The Netherlands was the funding made available by the Dutch authoritiesfor sector organisations to develop a first digital risk assessment tool. Approximately half of the costs for development were subsidised and the sector organisation had to fund the other half. This has clearly been vital in supporting the tool's development and roll out.

EUOSHA might consider a similar funding scheme on EU level and suggest this on member state level.

2.4   Communication

Our impression is that so far communication on OiRA has been relatively low profiled. It was announced every now and then, e.g. in November 2009 in Bilbao during the conference on Healthy Workplaces, but then not much was heard of it again. Of course last year was the year of the pilots, but also the progress of the pilots is remarkably slow. During a project activity TNO had in Estonia, we introduced OiRA, but the response was rather disappointing. The representative from the ministry of Labour had heard of it, but mentioned it as 'something of a secret'. The Estonian ministry has developed its own digital tool, which is in competition with the OIRA initiative.

In quite a few member states digital risk assessment tools have been developed or are being developed. The danger is that the OiRA project will lose its momentum and is perceived as an initiative which comes too late for some member states.

Therefore, we suggest that EUOSHA communicates quite openly and strongly in 2011 on the status of the project and what stakeholders can expect. Moreover, the pilots should really be strengthened and come with results, because successful pilots can be used in a communication campaign. Pilots can also fail and perhaps they should to allow EUOSHA to invest its scarce resources in more promising pilots.

Perhaps, even, OiRA should be made available as soon as possible for all interested stake holders and offer them a development environment to produce tools and submit these to a system of approval and authorisation on EU level as we

discussed in paragraph 1.5. This might lead to a critical mass of users where EUOSHA only steps in in the last phase: approval to upload the developed tool in the OiRA community. In a way an element of competition could be introduced here; which member states have the most approved tools?

As regards a communication strategy in 2011, this means:
- Building up an expectation level of OiRA – what is is and how it can be used – to culminate in the launch during the World Congress in September 2011 in Istanbul
- Use the Focal Points network to assist in this
- Reach out to ministries of Economy to promote the benefits for companies, because the tool is apt for much more functionalities and relieves administrative burden for employers. It could stimulate higher productivity
- Reach out to ministries of Labour and invite them for a pilot project connected with the incentives as discussed in paragraph 2.3; perhaps even the Dutch government is willing to explain its approach in this respect in a workshop moderated by EUOSHA
- Avoid the perception of secretiveness and delay in the project and communicate clear steps in the roll out of OiRA

2.5 Intervention logic

Member states differ a lot in their national legislative and cultural environment in health and safety. We discussed earlier the importance and quality of social dialogue. One might think of the following preconditions for a strong social dialogue:
- the involved parties must be independent of each other to a certain extent
- all involved parties have sufficient organisational capacity and legitimacy to act on behalf of the people they represent
- it is important that the division of power between the participants is not too uneven
- the involved participants must show a willingness to cooperate and acknowledge the legitimate interests of the other participants

Another dimension we introduced was the legislative and OSH policy environment. The OiRA intervention, to our view, flourishes best in a supportive OSH policy environment – as opposed to a restrictive OSH policy environment - which is:
- Willing to change and adapt rules and obligations for specific target groups; not to offer them a free ride, but merely to stimulate these specific groups (e.g. MSE's) to comply more easily
- Willing to think of 'soft law' initiatives such as covenants or other agreements between social partners and the governments
- Trusting employers and employees to come with OSH solutions and measures that suit them best
- Willing to fund or subsidize good initiatives that will improve working conditions in the country

If we combine these dimensions, we can characterize four environments in which the OiRA intervention could take place. In the table below we give some rough descriptions and suggestions for all these environments.

	Restrictive OSH policy environment	Supportive OSH policy environment
Well developed social dialogue	**I Help us to improve!** This environment offers opportunities for a successful OiRA intervention. Social partners can debate with the government to use digital risk assessment for better regulation and reduction of administrative burdens especially for MSE's. Reference can be made to Dutch or best EU examples and benefits shown. OiRA tool can be developed preferably while adapting the OSH policy environment to become more supportive and introduce exemptions for MSE sectors who work with the tool and show progress.	**II We can be the best!** Excellent environment for OiRA intervention logic. Best practices from The Netherlands or elsewhere can be shown and EUOSHA could suggest to introduce incentive mechanisms (cf. paragraph 2.3) to stimulate the further roll out of OiRA and reach a critical mass of users in the country. Also grassroots' initiatives can be allowed here given the well developed environment and strong social dialogue also on sector and company level. This environment can be used to roll out OiRA to more sectors and introduce special OiRA tools on psychosocial burdens, dangerous substances, etc. Digital tools already exist and the OiRA initiative should take account on this and connect with them and offer support.
Poor developed social dialogue	**III We do not need your help!** Social partners are at a loss and lack sufficient capacity. The government believes in ruthless rules and accuses employers of not obeying. The enforcement authorities are understaffed and a lot of 'illegal' practices take place, hardly noticed by the enforcers. This is an extremely bad environment for an OiRA intervention. First a strengthening of social dialogue is needed and this could raise a voice towards the government to think of more supportive policies to improve the working conditions in the country, such as OiRA. Additionally, fact and figures on the status quo of OSH in the country could raise urgency at government level to improve.	**IV Help us to improve!** In this environment the government lacks support and feed back from social partners. Perhaps there are confederations of employers and trade unions, but there is hardly a diversified sector based social dialogue, let alone on company level. Social partners also miss competent staff on OSH. In this environment the OiRA initiative could be an intervention to revive or strengthen the social dialogue. EUOSHA would need to communicate intensively with the government on ways to involve participation of social partners.

Presently, the Steering Committee of the OiRA project plays an important role in authorising the direction in which OiRA develops. However, given the intervention matrix above, one could argue that in I and especially II the Steering Committee should not 'control' to strong the 'correct' OiRA implementation, whereas in III and IV clearly on EU level social partners should represent and stimulate their counterparts in these respective countries and try to convince them of the benefits OiRA can offer.

3   Maintenance

In this chapter we will describe some ideas for a maintenance model. We will focus on the three earlier introduced levels the OiRA intervention makes use of: community, member state and sector level.

3.1   Help desk structures

The most ideal picture according to us would be inter connected maintenance help desks on EU (EUOSHA), member state and sector level. One can think of the following crucial tasks that need to be performed on these three levels.

Level	Maintenance tasks
EU community	Monitor changes/adaptations to EU directives and assess consequences for the approved OiRA tools
	Inform owners of OiRA tools if update is needed
Member state level	Monitor changes to national legislation and assess consequences for the approved national OiRA tools
	Inform owners of national OiRA tools if update is needed
Sector level	Monitor changes to national legislation and state of the art technology and assess consequences for their own tools
	Update tools

Clearly, thinking of such a maintenance model fits best environment **II We can be the best!** as discussed in paragraph 2.5. In the other environments either EUOSHA or national governments should invest more energy in maintenance.

Another measure one can think of is to agree on an approval period of maximum three years for an OiRA tool which is uploaded to the OiRA database as described in paragraph 1.3. Before the expiration date, a notice is send to the developers to update the tool or else it will be removed from the database.

Perhaps the best is that EUOSHA should not invest a lot of energy to stimulate all sorts of maintenance mechanisms in member states, but just approve OiRA tools for a limited period which makes it clear to the developers that after this period an update is needed.

To stimulate submission and maintenance of tools one might think of some ranking mechanism (a top 10) which illustrates how often modules from tools have been used in other tools. In other words which OiRA tool has been 'cannibalized' the most and thus demonstrates that is a good example for others to follow.

For maintenance one should not forget the PEROSH network that exists in the EU. PEROSH consists of national OSH institutes and perhaps these are most apt to check if OiRA tools still are up to standard when it comes to the latest technical developments. Many PEROSH institutes receive national funding and if the development and maintenance of national OiRA tools is found important in a

member state, funds could be allocated for this task specifically in future work plans of the PEROSH members.

3.2   **Users community**

What we would suggest to EUOSHA to start with <u>immediately</u> is the set up of a users community through LinkedIn or similar existing social media. This is up and running within 2 hours and relatively easy to moderate and one can start with the developers from the four pilots. This community should offer instant answers to questions the developers have and as such it can speed up the progress of the pilots. Also reminders could be sent to the developers, e.g. a deadline for a first draft of a tool, etc.

This user community can also serve as a pilot and could be launched officially during the World Congress in Istanbul end of this calendar year.