

**(Only Part Submitted)**

**Do you have any other comments?**

Yes.

There is a need to establish a requirement for employers (or the responsible person defined by the Act) to engage suitably qualified personnel for assessment and advise on OH&S issues for the Model Act to ensure that business complies with the intention of the Act (to reduce death and injuries arising from work).

Cost is frequently used as an excuse by company managers and supervisors when engaging professional OH&S or indeed any management services. However, OH&S services that are engaged are most often based on the cheapest quote or lowest immediate cost. These are often not professional, not competent and most importantly not in compliance with the requirements under the OH&S Act/ Regulation, improvement or PI notice. Cost is incurred by a business in attempting to comply with requirements of the Act or Regulation, improvement or PI notice but often fails to address the issue or to meet even basic requirements of providing the required OH&S advice.

This appears to be an aspect of a “tick-the-box” mentality which currently permeates business. When an OH&S issue arises a Manager or Supervisor views the issue as the same as any other management issue. There is often significant time pressure to have the task completed immediately rather than research the matter, seek internal advice or determine a level of professional or other appropriate competency. (eg 7 days action timeframe often issued in improvement notices by inspectors, 5 yearly risk review required when 5 years and 1 month has expired).

It would therefore be prudent to place in the model Act a requirement for competency in those offering advice on OH&S issues. This would aid business in reducing inappropriate expenditure on the wrong advice and it would reduce the timeframe for compliance by business in averting false starts, more appropriately meeting the requirements of the model Act.