

From: Les Vozzo [REDACTED]
Sent: Thursday, 10 December 2015 7:39 PM
To: SI Feedback
Subject: Feedback regarding the review of the self-insurer licensing framework

Dear SIRA,

I would like to submit feedback regarding the review of the self-insurer licensing framework.

I have been working in the safety field for over 30 years, I have worked in organisations that are self insured and as a safety professional, I have been contracting to self insured organisations for around twenty years. I began work in safety after leaving the army , where I was a trained Medic. I started as a First Aid officer and had to treat the results of poor safety. I decided that it would be smarter to prevent injuries than try and fix those that were injured.

I support the current self-insurer licensing framework. regulatory monitoring of Self-Insurers, in particular NAT auditing by the Regulator. The authority of the regulator when conducting audits increases the response by organisations

The current 3 year NAT audit frequencies for Self-Insurers that meet the benchmarks and annual audits for Self-Insurers that don't meet the benchmarks, I believe is at the correct frequency.

The Nat Auditing by the regulator is the driving force for many organisations to maintain a NAT Audit Tool compliant Safety Management System. Many safety professionals at the organisations I attend also support the Audit by the regulator. Many of the Safety professionals believe without the need for regulator safety audits, the self insured organisations would barely maintain a safety management system. Spending on safety prevention would plummet and all savings would be added to organisational profits, with any payments to injured workers or spend on safety being scrutinised by management as a cost and treated as such, to be minimised or eliminated.

Some safety professionals have stated that would like to fail a Self Insurance audit so that management would take safety more seriously and allocated resources to minimise incidents in the workplace. This is under the current system, the actions of self insured organisations in an unchecked environment will lead to a decrease in safety and potentially death.

Self insured organisations believe that they have a right to manage their organisation as they see fit and manage costs as they see fit, without intervention by any regulator. Unrestrained profits at the cost of workers paid for by injury.

I live in the Liverpool Local Government Area, Liverpool Council is self Insured and as such has a safer workplace than other non self insured organisations or Councils. Self insured organisations use other likeminded safety aware organisations and as such that standard becomes the expected standard for work with Council. This safety culture is then adopted by other organisations and flows through to general society so that safety in the home is also now becoming as safe as the workplace. Society benefits.

The best outcome to reduce injury in the workplace would be for the Regulator (formerly WorkCover NSW) to visit all organisations not just the ones that have reportable injuries, I know this is impractical, however it should be strived for, by representative sample or other means. The proposed retrograde step of increasing audit frequencies will result in more injuries and greater profits for the self insured organisations.

If you wish to discuss this further or have any questions, [please let me know and I will be happy to discuss the issues.

Yours Faithfully,
Les Vozzo

A large black rectangular redaction box covering the signature of Les Vozzo.