

## **The Safety Profession The Challenge for The Future**

*(Or the more that things change – the more that they same the same)*

**Richard T. Cooper, MSc  
Lapsap Chong  
Trowbridge, Wiltshire, England**

*It is not the strongest of the species that survives nor the most intelligent...but the one most responsive to change.*

**—Charles Darwin**

Are we the strongest profession? Are we going to survive in this ever changing world of business? Is our message confused or can we seek to find some way of moving the our aims and objectives forward? All relevant questions that I will seek to answer within this paper, I would however contend that we must be responsive that change or as a profession we shall become irrelevant. Change however does not mean abandoning our core values or beliefs, once those are truly identified and understood. It does mean however being adaptable, forward thinking and willing to take on new and exciting challenges.

It is useful to ensure that a working definition is made of the term 'safety.' Frank Bird and George Germain, (Practical Loss Control Management 1985), defined safety as being; The Control of Accidental Loss. Such a definition allows for a premise that a safety professional is therefore an individual that is working to control or reduce accident (or unplanned) loss to his employers business. This definition now some twenty plus years old still struggles to be embraced by many safety professionals. Many still believe that we have some altruistic higher calling, to save the employees engaged in the world of work from pain and suffering. As laudable as that may be, in our current and future working environments this is not a justification for undertaking our specific function or even part thereof. As a profession we must embrace the concept of 'safety' being a function of controlling the loss to our employing businesses.

According to Stewart et al (Handbook of Management Skills 2<sup>nd</sup> Edition 1991), Management involves achieving results through people.

It would therefore be correct to use as a working definition for the Safety professional that we are employed to reduce unplanned loss to the business by utilising the skills of other people. This is again a concept that many not only in our profession find difficult but also in the wider business community find hard to understand. During a recent unscientific survey conducted at a United Kingdom Safety professional branch meeting, the question was posed in respect of performance

appraisals and objectives. 26% of those questioned had a business objective to reduce the accident rate in their respective businesses. Another 14% had objectives relating to reduction of loss time and a further 6% had some objective relating to reduction of loss in general.

The challenge must for our profession must therefore be to change the perception of what we do and how we do. We as a professional can not 'do safety' we can not be held accountable for loss to the business, that must be integral to the way in which the company does business. We can help, advise and assist in the identification of methods designed to meet the aim and end of the process.

Related to this therefore must be the challenge must therefore be to recognise that fact. We have for so long relied on safety as being that dark and necessary art form that we as professionals undertake and not appreciated that our results come via the utilisation of other people. Safety does not, must not start when the safety professionals walk onto the shop floor. If it does then you truly have safety culture. Real organisational culture which can be defined as 'the way we do things around here' should have safety, loss control embedded into it as part of its very fabric. It may be an interesting debate and perhaps not one for this paper as to if safety culture truly exists? Can we separate out, measure and manage that part of the way that a company goes about its business objectives, or is it more of a holistic approach that is needed?

Before we continue in moving forward and embrace that challenges of the future, and in some respects seek clarity to the mist that is so difficult to clear in the crystal ball. It may be of assistance to seek for a moment to clarify our history, to learn from it and to examine where we are now and perhaps how we got here. Hind sight however it must be warned is not a precise science, it is not the 20/20 vision that most people believe is the fact.

During the Victorian age in Britain, (only just a hundred years ago), it was considered perfectly correct to employ children as young as five years old, to climb up and clean chimneys. From today's perspective that is not a strategy that we could endorse. Again, it is not the subject of this paper to speak to the changes in culture prevalent in various parts of the world but it is important in our global village to be aware in order that offence is not caused. Therefore to understand the challenges that our various industries face, which no matter the sector are basically the same a lesson from history will enable some clarity.

It would perhaps be fair to say that Occupational Safety and Health are not an innovation of the last half century. There are contemporary reports for documents found referring to the 'safety' of slaves employed to build the ancient pyramids. These mainly concern the lack of production related to the heat of the day and the need therefore to provide 'water carriers' in or that stones could be placed at the required times. Interesting for the premise of this paper that the concern was not for the real welfare or safety of the slaves but for the lack of production in placing of the stones. The 'Code of Hammurabi' King of Babylon, dating from 2200BC details that overseers shall have punishment inflicted on them if a worker is injured due to their negligence. Modern safety perhaps effectively came however into being some 200 years old when the first safety legislation; The Health Welfare and Morals of Apprentices Act was passed by the UK Parliament in 1802.

It would however be fair to say that since the 1970's the two subjects have been linked both in the mind of legislators, employers, unions and the public. Certainly in the United Kingdom, 1974

Health and Safety at Work Act was passed into law. In the United States the Occupational Safety and Health Act 1970 reinforced that link.

Occupational Health issues have been recognised for centuries, indeed there are records in existence from the second century A.D. which detail miners using bladders of sheep and goats to protect themselves against dust inhalation.

Ramazzini and Italian physician published a treaty on the diseases of occupation in the 17<sup>th</sup> Century. **Bernardino Ramazzini** (1633-1714) is considered a founder of occupational/industrial medicine. His studies of occupational diseases and advocacy of protective measures for workers encouraged eventual passage of factory safety and workmen's compensation laws. In 1700 he wrote the first important book on occupational diseases and industrial hygiene.

It can therefore be argued that we have come a long way, many of the principles have remained and some new ideas or models established for achieving the aim or goal. 1974 was a watershed for the United Kingdom moving from a prescriptive 'An employer will do' approach to that of a goal setting agenda in respect of the working environment. The 1974 Act in essence said to employers. 'You know the best way to manage your business as a going concern, here is another business objective for you – provide a safety place of work.' We the Authorities are not going to prescribe the method by which you do that, we may offer some guidance but you have the knowledge and skill so meet that objective.'

It is perhaps the contention of this paper that we, as a professional have not fully responded to that change in methodology, if we have the transition has not been communicated positively to either our employers, our customers or the general public as a whole. We are still mistrusted as a profession and still subject to a great deal of ridicule in the media. How often do we hear in response to a request to undertake a course of action in the workplace....'Show me the regulation that requires me to do that'

The evidence in respect of the reaction to H&S issues in the media, reflecting the way the subject is perceived by Mr and Mrs. Joe Average.

A recent news report from the British Broadcasting Corporation;

**A traditional pancake race has fallen flat after it was cancelled due to health and safety regulations.** Every year, children and choristers take part in the Shrove Tuesday race in Ripon, North Yorkshire. The event was revived 10 years ago and is usually started by the ringing of Ripon Cathedral's ancient Pancake Bell. But this year's event has been shelved, with organisers blaming the mountain of risk assessments that must be carried out before children can take part.

Bernard Bateman, one of the organisers, said they were told they would have to pay £250 to Harrogate Borough Council to close Kirkgate Road, where the race takes place. They would also have to hold insurance risk assessments and pay to have medical staff on hand in case of any injuries or accidents. Mr. Bateman, who is also a councillor for Ripon North, said it was difficult to find volunteers to carry out the procedures.

He said: "The main problem is the health and safety aspects and issues such as that. "There is bureaucracy that goes into holding any event these days, the policing, the risk assessments, and it has a cost factor and takes a lot of time. "I'm always disappointed when we've held something for some years now and it can't take place."

Here we have our profession being brought into disrepute by a member of the public and broadcast throughout the United Kingdom. To have this perception of 'safety' being utilised to stop people from enjoying themselves is only compounded by in our celebrity obsessive world, when one of the celebrities jumps on the bandwagon;

The broadcaster and journalist Jeremy Clarkson stated in the Sunday Times on 11<sup>th</sup> April 2004:

‘Health and safety is now so out of control that I find it nearly impossible to do my job’.

And again just recently in the same publication.

‘Everything was fine until the Health and Safety nutters got involved’

Is it the fact that we are out of touch with our client group or is it the fact we are not communicating our message correctly?

It must be contended that, this is certainly another of the challenges that we have for the future, communicating our message in a relevant way. But just what is our message? Have we got the context correct or are we uncertain of the aim and objective?

Traditional Safety Management usually falls into either one of or is a mix of ‘Compliance based, Behaviour based or Engineering based safety’

Various authors such as Sanders and Wheeler, (handbook of Safety Management 1991) have expanded on this and defined a coordinated strategy or ‘safety mix’ to include Engineering strategies, Environmental strategies, Education strategies and Enforcement strategies. However such strategies while including business elements are not inclusive nor do they define the business imperatives.

Sir John Harvey Jones, the plain speaking Chairman of ICI stated in his book, (Managing to Survive, 1993) ‘The first obligation of a business is to remain in business. From that the duties to shareholders and other stake holders such as employees can be fulfilled.’

If this contention is held to be correct, two elements must come together, which are very much one in the same thing. Business elements of maximising profits and the reduction of loss to the business.

At a recent British Standards Institute business seminar, in response to questions from the floor the Managing Director of BSI stated; it would be really nice to know why we do not have in our employing organisations a Department; ‘For Profit’ After all we have departments that deal with Real Estates and Facilities. There are departments devoted to Human Resources and even Production and Sales.

We have team of people that deal with Risk Management and then of course that team that in the entire organisation knows understands and is capable of doing without – The Safety Team.

Internal perception is that 'profit' is a generation a result of sales. However if we consider that profit is the excess of cost of sale to the expenditure of production, it will soon be appreciated that to reduce the cost of production while holding sale price increases the margin of profit. It therefore necessarily follows that reduction of waste or reduction of loss impacts on cost of production and therefore the maximisation of profit. This all well appreciated theory and has been proven by many authors over the passage of time. Perhaps we should consider that while we as safety professionals have sought to understand such a theory we have not necessarily adapted or changed to this type of management process.

Have we sought comfort in the traditional thinking of 'safety' be one of regulations and restrictions, which is in concert with the perception still of the majority of the public and media or have we resisted the challenge of education and changing that perception?

Stewart et al (Handbook of Management Skills 2<sup>nd</sup> Edition 1991) states; Although it is often said that the manager is a generalist, in almost every case managers begin as specialists in one of the functions of the business. This can lead to a server case of 'blinkerdom', with managers of specialist functions having little knowledge and even less understanding of what goes on in the other functions of the business. What a shock to the system to be promoted to run one of these.

Not understanding, having little knowledge of other functions of the business. What a statement, perhaps in any business there are two teams that understand what happens on the shop floor across the functions more than any, in order to be able to perform their tasks. Those must be the Quality Assurance and the Safety teams,, without that knowledge and understanding of the interrelationships, the interfaces then anything that is recommended will be in isolation.

Interesting however the concept managers of specialist departments being promoted to run another department. Are we here talking about the art of management? Can we imagine for one moment a safety professional manager being promoted to run another department in a business? It can happen but I think only rarely, is this because of the lack of management skills of safety professionals or because we are happy within our comfort zone? Surely our abilities of being able to plan, organise train, motivate, monitor and control are the same as any other manager in the business, so why are opportunities for advancement not often seen?

Is it as alluded to previously that we are often seen as such a specialist, restrictive occupation. Moreover that we are not applying the art of management to our specialised function.

As I continued to research Stewart and her co-authors I could not help but be struck the lack of overt and only covert references to control of loss. 'What makes running a production department difficult is the requirement for excellent quality and competitive prices, (John Mapes 1991), Good utilisation of the physical resources ...and to ensure that the unit price costs are kept as low as possible.

Alan Cowling(1991), People are a vital resource. After paying lip service to this principle, many organisations are now beginning to take it seriously. That again is open to some debate as with the changing economic and political climates this principle is often considered a luxury.

Keith Newton was however overt...Such workplaces often have unnecessarily high accident rates....Lost time is expensive and a small investment in training in basic safe handling techniques and housekeeping is well worthwhile for both the employee and the employer.

We have seen a lot of evidence that managing a function in our case the safety function is the critical element. I would believe it to be an interesting area of research to look at the education that is available to us as a profession in management techniques rather than the functional or technical elements of the specialised subject. We talk about the elements of a safety Management System which can exercise power.

Power isn't a dirty word – A manager can not manage effectively without using power. Managerial authority and organisational politics are not black arts...(Lee Bryce, The Influential Manager 1991). This quote from Bryce generates a whole series of questions in respect of the role that we as safety professionals fulfil. It also perhaps is a partial answer to that of our not evolving into business efficiency managers. Our role of function is that of reducing losses to the business, (according to our working definition) but many professionals while understanding the 'functional' aspects of safety attempt to stay out of the organisational politics, to have a foot in the camp of management and the employees believing that in order to function correctly we must transition between the two sectors of the business. Many are reluctant to use the power that they are entrusted with as managers or worse the power is misused as a 'stop the process' rather than one that seeks to empower to a local level and find solutions to the challenges that present.

This was summarised by Bird and Germain (1981) as 'The challenge to management is clear. Safety through leadership is more fulfilling, more rewarding, more economical and more successful than safety by work group imposition or government intervention.

A Safety Manager has therefore to understand the needs of the business and lead a loss reduction process. One of the challenges has to be that of utilising the power and authority as a pragmatic tool rather than the restrictive one so often wheeled.

Perhaps this paper is controversial in so far as I am perhaps suggesting that we are perhaps our own worse enemies in the promotion of 'safe working.' Even more so we are holding back acceptance of the concept of integration of safety into the workplace. Is it also one of the major challenges for the future; ensuring that in these ever increasing financially demanding times, our message of loss control of the reduction of unplanned loss to the business is reduced to a minimal level.

The will require in us a change of attitude to embrace other disciplines that have hitherto be considered as peripheral to our core activities.

As we have seen, too often, are 'safety professionals' seen as the 'kill joys' of society. Too often are safety professionals seen as not being pragmatic as wanting to stop the job, calling a halt production at any cost holding court on the shop floor quoting rules and regulations that prohibit an activity. Too often is 'safety' only undertaken when the safety manager arrives on site and normal working resumes when he leaves.



There exists an apocryphal story of an enforcement inspector from a Local Authority in the West of England undertaking an inspection of a Circus tent to ensure compliance with Fire risks before allowing the public to enter.

On seeing the trapeze artist at practice, he commented that there was not a safety net in place and a fall of 45 feet could take place. The inspector was assured that the risk had been assessed and in fact 'airbags' were in place on the ring floor. This satisfied the inspector but he issued an 'Improvement Notice' none the less for the artists to wear 'Hard Hats' as the trapeze was very close to the roof of the tent.

In our list of challenges for the future, should we also add to this list that of image?  
As a safety professional we are taught that there are three basic reasons as to why we should practice our profession;

- Moral – to save human suffering
- Legal – to prevent the prosecution of individuals and businesses
- Social – To save the state or society in general health care and long term care costs.

These are certainly valid reasons and can not be disputed, however I would argue while they are relevant in this modern age there are other imperatives that we should be driven by. We are facing a global crisis in respect of financial stability following the sub-prime credit lending spree. That being the case, companies will be examining the balance sheets even closure to identify cost savings, can we as a profession respond with traditional arguments of moral, legal and social or are we going to be responsive to change and utilise business justifications to embed further our objectives into the business environment?

In other words, I am suggesting that these fundamental principles on which we have built our profession, which are still valid do not encompass or justify the employment of an individual for the specific function of 'safety manager' or engineer' (this function could be undertaken for a legislative compliance basis by a consultant on a far more cost effective regime but moreover will suggest that the idea of a specific safety function could be viewed as counter productive. Perhaps even by resting on these fundamental principles we are not addressing the working definition of safety that of the control of loss.

In light of the current global economic situation, the possibility exists that businesses could return to the classic 'Friedmanist' economic view; that of a reactive 'do-the-minimum-to-comply' approach.

This type of thinking was most prevalent during the latter half of the last century. We are now in more inclusive times, that of stakeholder involvement. Perhaps this has been due to the rise of such elements in business as Quality Assurance.

Let me just dwell on Quality Assurance for a moment and perhaps look at the rise of this business system.

Quality Assurance is perhaps a relatively new phenomenon, rising as Quality Control during the 1950's and changing into its current form in the 1960's. Perhaps its greatest victory took place as

far as Europe was concerned during 1993 when European Council Decision 93/465/EEC stated; 'the manufacture must operate an approved quality system'

Why a 'Quality system' and not a health and safety system or a Loss Control system?

Not an easy question to answer but perhaps it is because the 'Quality Chaps' had made the economic leap, the leap to 'this is relevant to your business model', this will save you money on rework and increase the Customer Satisfaction rating so they will come back. All we as 'Safety' professionals did during that time was to public reinforce the Moral, Legal and Social justification. We did of course debate internally if we should adopt models of Safety Behaviour or 'Tayloristic' styles of management as being the panacea for everything.

The year 2000 was one or could have been one of great change for the profession, not only in terms of the UK but also on a Global scale. The 'Turnbull working party report – Internal Control for directors on the Combined Code' (ICAEW 1999), was a landmark opportunity which we as a profession still need to get to grips with. Principle D2 requires that the Board 'to maintain a sound system of internal control to safeguard shareholders investment and the company's assets.'

I would seek to clarify in so far as the Turnbull guidelines tell the Board to ensure that it doesn't just deal with what it likes, or those who within the business shout the loudest, but that it establishes a way of dealing with all significant risks to the business through its system of internal control. It does not tell the board to deal specifically with H&S risks but significant risks. We as business managers need to ensure that the value of our profession and the risk to the business in respect of the control of loss which is our primary function is understood. It can not be a great leap from 'safeguarding shareholders investment' to that of maximisation of profit by reduction of loss making opportunities.

It is often stated that 'safety' must be integral to the task and therefore it is logical to assume that the identification of an individual or team that looks at the specific issue of safety sends a covert message to employees that safety is an add on and the responsibility of others.

The question must therefore be posed; why do we have 'safety professionals' who make much of 'Safety Culture' as an individual element of organisational culture?

Culture is defined as being 'the way we do things around here.' Accepting that definitions therefore must mean that elements of Loss control or accident prevention are embedded in the work ethic of the company an isolated micro measurement can not therefore be made of those elements without examination of 'the organisational culture.'

To paraphrase Sir John Harvey Jones, 'The first duty or obligation for every business is to be in business tomorrow'. Increasingly Cost Control is an important key stone of business ethics. Reduction of waste by means of quality control and quality assurance. Focus of reduction of attrition of customers, focus on multi-skilled employees with the aim of continuing business as usual are the keystones of modern business philosophy. Perhaps here is one of the real challenges, a safety professionals we need to become multi skilled managers to seek to embrace all elements of loss control in a unified system or departmental structure which can add value to the business.



Let's expand our horizon and seek to understand the challenges that are faced by our employing organisations;

- Environment – the increased concerns of Climate Change
- Energy security and the rising cost of energy.
- Pandemic – Still the threat of avian Flu and other Pandemics
- Business Continuity – Arising from a Pandemic or Terrorism
- Corporate Social Responsibility
- The rising cost to the business of Insurance.

What do all the above elements have in common? Are they in effect areas that have a potential for loss to the business?

Certainly it can be argued that Environmental issues are not only loss making in terms of the Global ecological systems but reduction of waste, energy efficiency and the new phenomena of an International Standard (ISO 14000), are all elements that lead to greater efficiency and the reduction of loss to the business. The Environmental standard it can be contended is the new 'badge to have' the complementary system to Quality Assurance the must have for marketing. Many governmental departments within the United Kingdom and increasingly in the European Union are demanding as a prerequisite for tendering certification to ISO 14000 or equivalent. This of course spins of into savings in respect of energy utilisation.

Pandemic planning and business continuity are in essence about keeping the company in survival mode when external forces conspire to disrupt the normal working of the business. An even greater time to address the issues connected with the control of accidental loss. The last thing that an organisation need when it is struggling to continue is another employee absent or another machine out of production. Along with many other companies my employer is tending to regard this element now as 'Business as usual' how do we continue to service our customers in times of increased difficulties, which are not of our making.

Many of you will remember the events of 7<sup>th</sup> July 2005, when terrorist attacks brought Greater London to a standstill and killed in the process 52 innocent people. Here is a challenge for the safety professional to take on board. However do we continue 'Business as usual' how do we minimise the losses that this can generate to our employing organisations?

Insurance is the last element of a Risk Management strategy. The three fold strategy can be defined as: Risk Reduction, Risk Avoidance and Risk Transference.

It has to be stated that Risk is defined in this context as 'the probability and a hazard will be realised'.

The risk can be business risk or a more general risk even that of our subject matter that of health and safety.

- Risk Reduction – Undertaking and activity in house and instituting measures to reduce the occurrence or consequence.
- Risk Avoidance – Passing the task or activity that is likely to cause loss onto another party, i.e. Contracting the activity out to a third party who then assumes the risk

- Risk transference – Insurance, undertaking the task or activity but laying the financial burden of loss off to a third party.

With these definitions it can be seen that ‘safety’ or loss control is the first step in a Risk Management process. The safety management system interacting with other business process systems to reduce the likelihood that a loss will occur. I would offer you this thought as a practical example, over the past two years as a result of the declining accident frequency rate and the positive results obtained by independent safety audit, my employer has been able to see a reduction in casualty premiums of first 22% then 10%.

Corporate Social Responsibility, or CSR, is becoming a key component of business strategy. In an increasingly global society, political, social and corporate pressure has led to companies taking more serious consideration over their impact on, and responsibilities towards the environment and their various stakeholders. Our relationship with all our stakeholders, whether they be investor, customer, supplier, employee or community at large, is essential to the sustainable success of our business.

I would offer here that in this particular venture ‘traditional’ safety is a vital component that must be addressed. Employees out of their normal working environment, undertaking tasks that they are not used to doing. The potential for injury is high and therefore loss in terms of the individual being away for positive employment for a long time. It is not just about company image in the social aspect here the safety professional has to be more of a facilitator, to make it happen in a safe way.

In all of these elements therefore there is some form of loss control some form of activity that is required to contribute towards the success of the business. This therefore begs the question; ‘Do these elements fit together? Is there a case that in order to improve the status of the profession and the success of our Loss Control activities we must respond to change and treat these other business elements as the challenge for the future?’

In order therefore to survive within this increasingly global enterprise environment the safety professional must adapt, become multi skilled and responsive to change. Not necessarily to change the focus of attention but to encompass more areas of responsibility and speak the language of business rather than that of Moral, Legal or Social imperatives.

For a moment I would ask that we think about just what we are attempting to achieve as professionals and perhaps even the reasons that we entered the profession in the first instance?

Did we become safety professionals because we wanted to change the world? Did we enter the profession because we wanted to save our fellow man from pain and suffering? Did we enter the profession because we wanted to make lots of money? Did we enter the profession because we believed in the supremacy of the law? Did we enter the profession because we wanted to have lots of friends?

I would suggest that certainly in my own case, none of these was the case. I have certainly not made lots of money. I have however found that it is the most challenging and rewarding work that one can undertake.

In broad terms I believe that as a profession we are attempting to achieve is not a new answer. Frank Bird and George Germain summarised the goal during the 1980's 'The Conservation of People, Property, Process and Profits.'

I would therefore argue that the safety professional in order to be effective has to change into a 'business' manager, Not only understanding the business processes in respect of the organisational output or product but more importantly in respect of the approach and functional activities that he must undertake.

The body of research into the correlation between health and safety and economic returns is growing.

Two recent papers from a Trade Union in the United Kingdom (The Transport Salaried Staff Association, H&S Measures and Investing in H&S August 2005) discussed the issue in some detail. The UK regulatory the Health and Safety Executive has also undertaken and published numerous papers and even includes on its website and 'Business benefits' section.

To meet the challenges for the future, to evolve into a 'new' breed skill sets of business managers must be embraced those functional areas which in broad terms are concerned with Loss Control.

- Quality Assurance – that seeks to minimise waste of rework.
- Customer Complaints Forums seeking to reduce customer attrition rates.
- Risk Management – Seeking to transfer those risks which the organisation does not wish to financially retain.
- Legal Compliance – be it our traditional 'Safety' or the growing Environmental field.

The professional must reach out to other key stake holders such as H.R. Much of the work undertaken by 'safety professionals' is related to the 'soft systems' the influencing of employees and managers attitudes and behaviours. Taking the foregoing statement to be true it is argued therefore that much can be done to influence these soft systems by the incorporation of an accident prevent or loss control message into the H.R. systems also training, education or developmental programmes adopted by the corporation.

Managers and increasingly employees are subject to appraisal of the work undertaken during the preceding period, are attitudes or behaviour subject to appraisal or just outputs in terms of productivity. Most appraisal systems attempt to quantify attitudes in the box 'assist as required' which in essence addresses attitude to the working environment. The question has therefore to be asked 'are not attitudes and actions towards accident prevention, Loss Control subject to appraisal.'

In order that we as 'safety professionals' can meet the challenges for the future we must first abandon the often perceived stance of seeking to protect the employment prospects of persons engaged in the field by turning the subject matter into a 'dark art' a mixture of pseudo-legal, para-scientific and quasi-social engineering.

Nick Nichols et al, (Professional Safety July 2007) makes much of professional ethics; *that the safety professional must be not only true the employee...and s/he self*. Does this go far enough, what about those who provide the financial rewards? Our employers are entitled to ethical

behaviour, which in some respect brings us full circle. Trading that fine line between the employer, the employee and ourselves.

Evolution into a business efficiency manager, working with all the stake holders to protect the employees and assist our employers to stay in business tomorrow should be our new objective. A professional a Code of Conduct placing integrity and ethics to the fore is essential so that moral social and legal paradigms can be addressed. More importantly it will address item 1 of Michael Thompson's President's message (PS July 2007) in so far as working with business leaders. Working with our employers to meet their major objective of staying in business tomorrow.

Moreover we shall achieve integration of 'safety' of reduction of loss to people property and process by the education of other managers, we shall achieve results through others and enable a scope of opportunities that we have only before wondered upon. This then is our challenge for the future to use the language of business and the skills of business managers to meet our stated objectives.