


NEBOSH

**KNOW - WORKPLACE HEALTH AND SAFETY
PRINCIPLES (INTERNATIONAL)**

UNIT ID1:

For: NEBOSH International Diploma for Occupational Health and Safety
Management Professionals



nebosh



General note about this sample assessment

Please note that this is a *sample* assessment, designed to be illustrative of the different types of tasks/activities learners will face. It is therefore **not** a full sample; it does **not** contain as many tasks/activities as a live paper will have. This sample has only around 370 marks available, whereas a full paper will have 550 marks available (Parts 1, 2 and 4 - 150 marks each and Part 3 – 100 marks).

Guidance to learners

The assessment is split into four parts.

All the tasks and activities in all parts of the assessment are mandatory.

- Part 1 contains questions based on a fictitious, but realistic scenario.
- Part 2 contains tasks that you will need to complete in a suitable workplace.
- Part 3 contains reflective tasks.
- Part 4 is a short research project.

You will have 6 weeks (30 working days) to complete all four parts of the assessment.

Please refer to your registration confirmation email for the upload deadline.

Please note that NEBOSH will be unable to accept your assessment once the deadline has passed.

This assessment is not invigilated, and you are free to use any learning resources to which you have access, eg your course notes, or the HSE website, etc.

By submitting this completed assessment for marking, you are declaring it is entirely your own work. Knowingly claiming work to be your own when it is someone else's work is malpractice, which carries severe penalties. This means that you must **not** collaborate with or copy work from others. Neither should you 'cut and paste' blocks of text from the Internet or other sources.

Part 1: Scenario-based questions



The first part of the assessment requires learners to answer questions that are based on a scenario. The number of tasks and questions per paper may vary but will not cover the whole of the ND1 syllabus on a single paper. The scenario, tasks and questions will change in each paper.

The assessment begins with a realistic scenario to set the scene. You will then need to complete a series of tasks based on this scenario. Each task will consist of one or more questions. Your responses to **most** of these tasks should wholly, or partly, draw on relevant information from the scenario. The task will clearly state the extent to which this is required.

The marks available are shown in brackets to the right of each question, or part of each question. This will help guide you to the amount of information required in your response. In general, one mark is given for each correct technical point that is clearly demonstrated. Avoid writing too little as this will make it difficult for the Examiner to award marks. Single word answers or lists are unlikely to gain marks as this would not normally be enough to show understanding or a connection with the scenario.

Please attempt **ALL** tasks.

SCENARIO

A haulage company owns and operates one site from which it runs a fleet of 40 trucks, many of which are over 10 years old. The organisation has been operating for nearly 60 years and has grown from an initial workforce of 5, to 150 workers (a mixture of drivers, vehicle maintenance and office workers). The haulage company is still operating on the same site and using the same buildings as they did 60 years ago. The current managing director (MD) took over the role when their father retired 25 years ago.

The haulage company's main contract is to deliver car parts across Europe for a major car manufacturer. This contract was put in place nearly 20 years ago, at a time when the car manufacturer only made and sold cars in their country (they did not export). The contract was negotiated between the MD's of the two organisations, who are old school friends. There has been no significant review of the contract terms since it was signed, other than an annual financial review.

Over the past few years there have been numerous health and safety breaches at the haulage company's site. For example, six months ago a family member of one of the maintenance workers entered the site and was run over by a forklift truck which broke their foot. The worker took their family member to hospital. After leaving the hospital, they rang a lawyer for an initial consultation about bringing a compensation claim against the haulage company. Following the consultation, the lawyer also advised the worker to check that the organisation had reported the issue to the enforcement authority. When the worker approached the MD, they were told that it would not be reported as the family member should not have been on site, so it was their own fault. Nevertheless, the worker contacted the enforcement authority and explained the circumstances. The worker subsequently resigned as they did not want to work for an organisation whose MD had such a bad attitude.

In the past, the enforcement authority has tried to work with the management at the haulage company's site and had, on several occasions, provided advice on how safety could be improved. Following the report about the broken foot, an inspector visited the site again. The MD was not available to speak to the inspector at this visit so the inspector spoke to the site manager. The inspector found evidence of at least six different health and safety breaches across the site. They also noticed a child disappearing through a hole that was in the perimeter fence; on closer inspection they also noticed that there was no signage on the perimeter fence to communicate the dangers of

entering the site. The inspector advised that this was a significant risk of serious injury or death to unauthorised visitors. The inspector issued enforcement notices for the health and safety breaches that were found across the site.

The inspector visited the site again 21 days after the notice date and then again, a further three weeks later. During this visit the MD told the inspector that the notices would not be actioned as it was the MD, not the inspector, who was in charge. The inspector reiterated the risk of serious injury or death to unauthorised visitors and said that they had no alternative but to issue another enforcement notice that would shut down the site until the hole was repaired. The MD tore up the notice in front of the inspector, saying that it would cost too much to put things right and that bonuses would be at risk if the improvements were made. The HSE subsequently prosecuted both the haulage company and the MD, and both received fines. So far the MD has not paid their fine and is refusing to speak to the court's officials about the issue.

Since then, there has recently been a fatality at the site. A 10-year-old child had entered the site with some friends through the hole in the perimeter fencing. The child was knocked over and killed by one of the lorries reversing into a parking bay.

There have been a lot of reports in the press and on social media about the child's death, which have included information on the haulage company's poor health and safety performance record. The car manufacturer's procurement director has seen these reports and visits the site to discuss the ongoing relationship between the two organisations. The procurement director tells the MD that they are very concerned about the relationship and that the car manufacturer is now a supply chain focal company. The procurement director explains that Corporate Social Responsibility (CSR) is also a top priority and that they have signed up to one of the codes on CSR which has health and safety requirements within it. The car manufacturer takes both their focal company and CSR responsibilities very seriously.

Following the fatality, the haulage company's insurers visited the premises to carry out an investigation as the MD had submitted a claim relating to the case. The insurance company sent a follow up report to the MD and board with several recommendations; one of these recommendations was to appoint at least one competent health and safety adviser.

After reading the report, the board of directors voted to recruit a health and safety manager as they agreed with the report's findings and recognised that something had to change. The MD did not agree with this decision, but was outvoted by the rest of the board. You were successful in obtaining the role. You have been doing similar roles for the last 10 years after passing the NEBOSH International Diploma and becoming a professional member of the country's premier health and safety professional body.

Your first job is to review the health and safety policy and any procedures currently in place. You are concerned to find out that there is no health and safety policy or written procedures. Procedures are passed by word-of-mouth from worker-to-worker. The drivers have told you that "this is just the way things are done around here". You check to see what driver training there is, but can find no training records. You also check that you have up-to-date drivers' paperwork and find that many of the driving licences on record have either expired or do not exist; in some cases, drivers are driving categories of vehicles for which they do not hold a licence.

You also discover that many of the drivers are not taking sufficient driving breaks during the working week. This is due to pressure from management to get the job done quickly, at all costs. You also find that the only contact between the driver and the haulage company is when the drivers are emailed their next pick up or delivery details. Drivers accept this as the 'norm' and have the attitude that if that is the way management want it done then that is what will be done, even if it means that they are working under excessive pressure.

You then carry out an investigation into the fatality and find out that unauthorised visitors including children, are a regular occurrence and that various workers have chased children off the site on

many occasions. You hear reports from most of the drivers that this was “an accident waiting to happen” as there have been a lot of near misses in the past involving children and site vehicles. The drivers tell you that most of the fleet go out on Monday mornings and return Friday afternoons or early evenings; at both of these busy times there are always children inside the perimeter fencing watching the lorries manoeuvring.

You also discover that the hole in the perimeter fence has been reported to the MD on several occasions by different workers and that, despite numerous requests from drivers, the lorries have no reversing cameras or audible alarms. The drivers also tell you that they have stopped reporting issues and asking for safety-related equipment/clothing/PPE as these requests are always ignored. They also say that they think, with hindsight, that this equipment/clothing/PPE is not required because they have not been involved in any incidents. You find that even if the MD authorises the purchase of these items, they will very often change their mind and tell the drivers to buy it for themselves. You ask the drivers why they stay with the haulage company, and they all reply because they can turn up, get the job done but not care if they do a good job or not. Their attitude is, that if management do not care how the job is done, neither should they. The drivers also tell you that the pay is exceptional, much higher than the industry average.

You ask the MD for the site’s risk assessments. The MD tells you that there is “no such thing as risk”! The MD goes on to say that it is up to the individual to make sure that they act responsibly so that they do not cause themselves or anyone else an injury; so there is no need for the MD to bother doing risk assessments. You raise the issue of the reversing devices for the lorries and say that the workforce must be consulted on such issues, rather than the MD making a unilateral decision. The MD’s response is to laugh at you before walking away.

The Police and the enforcement authority carried out a joint investigation into the accident where the child died. The MD initially co-operated with the enforcement authority. However, when they asked to see the site’s risk assessments, the MD’s attitude changed. After this, the MD refused to co-operate with the investigators, insisting that it was the child’s fault as they were not authorised to be on the site and that it was nothing to do with the haulage company.

You later found out that the MD had destroyed a lot of evidence directly after the fatality. The MD’s personal assistant told you this in confidence, but would not go ‘on the record’ as they were afraid of repercussions. After the investigation, you find out that another driver voluntarily told the labour inspector that near miss incidents between reversing vehicles and pedestrians were common on the site. They said they were concerned about the number of incidents that were happening even after they had reported the issue to the MD. This driver also resigned as they did not want to work for an organisation that had so little regard for safety.

Task 1: Insurance

- 1 Outline how the insurance company can positively influence the haulage company’s health and safety standards. (10)
Note: You should support your answer, where applicable, using relevant information from the scenario.

Task 2: Role of the enterprise

- 2 The International Labour Organisation Recommendation R164 requires ‘*action at the level of the undertaking*’ and places obligations upon employers.

Explain how the haulage company may have contravened its obligations under recommendation 10(a) to 10(g) of R164. (15)

Note: You should support your answer, where applicable, using relevant information from the scenario.

Task 3: Organisational and individual factors

- 3 (a) Comment on the *organisational* factors that could have contributed to the poor health and safety culture at the haulage company. (15)

Note: You should support your answer, where applicable, using relevant information from the scenario.

- (b) Comment on the *individual* human factors that could have contributed to the poor health and safety culture at the haulage company. (10)

Note: You should support your answer for parts (a) and (b), where applicable, using relevant information from the scenario.

Task 4: Supply chain and corporate social responsibility obligations

- 4 (a) The haulage company’s main client is a car manufacturer that is a supply chain focal company.

(i) Outline the role of a supply chain focal company. (5)

(ii) Based on the scenario, what are the implications for the haulage company of the car manufacturer’s focal company role? (5)

- (b) Comment on what the car manufacturer’s corporate social responsibilities (CSR) responsibilities are likely to be. (10)

Note: You should support your answer, where applicable, using relevant information from the scenario.

Part 2: Workplace-based activities



The following activities must be carried out on your chosen workplace. Typically this is the workplace in which you normally work. But if your workplace is not suitable (for example it does not provide sufficient scope), you can choose any suitable workplace, provided you can access the information you need to complete the activities in this part.

Each paper will have 150 marks available for this section. The activities will be different for each each paper.

Activity 1: Description of your chosen organisation

This section is very important. It describes the context of your organisation. The answers you give to the remaining activities in Part 2 must be consistent with the information you provide here. This information ‘paints a picture’ that helps the examiner award you marks for relevance and suitability in those later activities. For example, if you work in the service sector, such as banking or insurance, it would be unusual to later describe a situation where welding contractors are repairing a chemical storage tank in your own organisation. But that would not be unusual in a chemical factory.

- 1 Provide a detailed description of your organisation. Representative examples should be included where relevant.

As a minimum, your description must include the following

- Industrial sector, eg agriculture, service industry, manufacturing, etc
- Physical features of the site (if your chosen organisation has multiple sites, describe only the site that you are basing your assessment on)
 - location
 - approximate site area
 - number and types (eg offices, warehouse, etc) of buildings
- Main activities carried out at the site
- Worker profile and work organisation at the site
 - the main roles and responsibilities within the organisation with examples
 - number of workers by employment status with examples, eg contract, full-time, etc
 - number and types of vulnerable groups
 - the typical work shift pattern(s)

(10)

Note: You are free to include any other information that you think is relevant, but no additional marks are available. You are therefore advised to include as much relevant detail as you can under the above categories.

If the location or activity of your business is sensitive (for whatever reason) you are permitted to create fictitious (but nonetheless representative) details. For example, the location may be changed if this would otherwise reveal sensitive detail.

Activity 2: Create an organisational risk profile

- 2 Produce a risk profile of your chosen organisation's *health and safety risks only*. The risk profile must include **4 risks**. (40)

Note: You **must** use the Activity 2(b) format table to record your answers.

Activity 2(b) format table.

Nature and level of threats faced by the organisation	Likelihood of adverse effects occurring	Likely level of disruption should adverse effects occur	Likely realistic costs associated with each type of risk	Effectiveness of the controls in place to manage the identified risks.

Activity 3: High reliability organisations

- 3 Analyse your chosen organisation against the five characteristics of high reliability organisations (HROs).

Your analysis must:

- a) evaluate (using relevant examples) how your chosen organisation performs against each of these HRO characteristics; and (15)
- b) make 5 realistic recommendations to improve the reliability of your chosen organisation (one taken from **EACH** of the characteristics). (25)

Note: You **must** use the Activity 3(b) format table to record your answers.

Activity 3(b) format table.

Activity/action	Justification for choice (including how effect the action will be in improving reliability)	Timescale for completion	Likely costs (include an estimation of worker time and costs required for purchases)	Who is responsible for carrying out the activity/action

Part 3: Reflection



The aim of this part of the assessment is for you to reflect on transferable leadership and professional skills that you may already have and/or need to develop. These skills could have been acquired either through your work life (whether this is in health and safety or some other work activities) or your personal life.

For instance, you may want to draw examples where you have been chairing a meeting or been required to make decisions under pressure. Alternatively, you may carry out voluntary work and want to draw on this for your examples. The examples can be from any element of your working or personal life.

Task 1: Transferable leadership skills

- 1 (a) Compare your own leadership experience against the characteristics of a *resonant* leader. You should aim to identify **at least 8** characteristics. (20)
Use relevant examples to support your answer.

Note: You **must** use the Task 1(a) format table to record your answers.

- (b) Produce an action plan to show how you will develop what you consider to be the **TWO** most important *resonant leader* characteristics for your own leadership style. (20)

Note: You **must** use the Task 1(b) format table to record your answers.

Task 1(a) format table.

Characteristic	How characteristic is reflected in your leadership style	Personal experience example(s)

Task 1(b) format table.

Characteristic to be worked on and detail on the change(s) required	What difference will the change(s) make to your leadership style	When will you do this by	How will you review the effectiveness of the changes

Task 2: Effective communication and financial justification

- 2 Explain how you have influenced or negotiated an issue/situation by using effective communication.

Your answer must include detail on:

1. Background to the issue/situation.
2. The role that you played.
3. The objective(s) of the communication.
4. The types of significant stakeholders and their influence. You should aim to include three different stakeholder groups.
5. The range of communication methods used and why you chose these.
6. The effectiveness of the communication methods.
7. What feedback did you receive and what did you do with this feedback.
8. Comparison of the actual outcome against the set objective(s).
9. The impact of your involvement.
10. The lessons that you learned from the process.

(20)

Note: *The issue/situation can be from an existing or a previous job role and does **not** have to be a health and safety issue/situation.*

You should aim to complete this part of the assessment in approximately 1500 words.

Part 4: Research project



There is no unique answer for this part of the assessment. The research project allows the learner to demonstrate and evidence informed arguments. The research topic will change with each paper.

Task: how health and safety has changed

Task brief

The Health and Safety at Work etc Act 1974 (HASAWA) is nearly 50 years old.

Prepare a brief report on **what you believe** are the three most important changes that have happened to health and safety since HASAWA came into force.

As a guide aim to make your report no more than 3500 words; approximately 500 words of the 3500 must be used for the executive summary.

The report must:

- include a justification for why you think **each** change is important;
- cite reliable evidence from a range of sources such as authoritative guidance, expert opinions and other evidence to support your justification; and
- include references for the evidence sources that you have consulted.

Your research report must be presented in the following format.

- Executive summary
- Introduction
- Justification for selection of three changes (including evidence of research and referencing)
- Conclusion
- Other references, if applicable (references used in addition to those used for each identified change)
- Appendices (if relevant).

(150)

Marks will be awarded as follows:

Criteria	Marks
Presentation, focus and executive summary *	10
Introduction	10
Justification for selection of three changes **	120
Conclusion	10

** Each change identified will be marked using the descriptors † for the following criteria	Marks		
	Change 1	Change 2	Change 3
Outline of change	5	5	5
Justification for choosing the change	25	25	25
Evidence of research and use of appropriate referencing	10	10	10
	Max 40	Max 40	Max 40

† Marks will be allocated using the descriptors on the following pages.

† Descriptors

Criteria	Level 1	Level 2	Level 3
Presentation, focus and executive summary [max 10]	7-10	4-6	0-3
Presentation and focus Coherent and logical structure.	Presentation and focus The report has a clear, logical structure.	Presentation and focus The report generally has a clear, logical structure but lacks structure or focus in some areas.	Presentation and focus The report is unclear and unfocused. The report is not logically structured.
Uses concise and clear language to convey the information.	Clear concise language has been used to convey the information.	The language used is generally concise but is slightly ambiguous or unclear in some areas.	The language is unclear and does not convey information in a concise way.
Appropriate technical language is used.	Technical language has been used appropriately.	Technical language has generally been used appropriately.	Technical language has not been used appropriately or no technical language has been used.
Presentational devices used where appropriate.	Appropriate presentational devices, eg tables and figures are used where relevant.	Presentational devices used, eg tables and figures are mostly appropriate for the information being conveyed.	Presentational devices (eg tables, figures) are limited, missing or not relevant.
Executive summary Coherent and logical format giving clear information.	Executive summary A clear, logical format giving clear information.	Executive summary Format is generally good but does not flow in some areas and some information appears to be missing.	Executive summary Format is poor and information is unclear or missing.
Outline of 3 changes.	3 changes outlined clearly/briefly.	2-3 changes outlined, but outline is unclear in some areas.	1 or no changes outlined. Where an outline is included it is unclear.
Outline of main findings / conclusions.	Brief but clear outline of findings / conclusions.	Outline of findings/conclusions which is unclear or missing key information in some areas.	Findings/conclusions are poor or are not included.
Approximately 500 words (one sheet of A4) used.	Approximately 500 words used.	Approximately 500 words used.	More or less than 500 words have been used (+-10%).
Introduction [max 10]	7-10	4-6	0-3
Clear and concise aims and objective of report. Relates to task brief.	The aims and objectives are clearly stated and relate to the task brief.	The aims and objectives are given but detail in some areas is brief or unclear; they generally relate to the task brief.	The aims and objectives have either not been given or are described poorly and/or do not relate to the task brief.
Overview/introduction of research topic.	The topic is clearly and succinctly introduced.	The topic is introduced but detail in some areas is brief or unclear.	The topic is either not introduced or the detail is very poor.
Description of methodology used.	Clear description of the methodology used to carry out the research.	A methodology has been outlined but this is brief or unclear in some areas.	A methodology has either not been given or is very poor/unclear.

Criteria	Level 1	Level 2	Level 3
Justification for selection of three changes			
The following three descriptors must be used to mark EACH of the three changes identified.			
Outline of change [max 5]	4-5	2-3	0-1
Clear description of change. Change identified is in line with the task brief.	Description of the change is clear and is in line with the task brief.	Description of the change is generally clear, but more detail could have been provided. The change identified is in line with the task brief.	Description of the change is very unclear or missing. The change identified is outside of the task brief.
Justification for choosing the change [max 25]	15-25	6-14	0-5
Justification for selection of the change.	Clear justification given for selection of the change.	The justification given for selection of the change is generally good but further arguments could have been made or the arguments made are unclear in some areas.	The justification given for selection of the change is generally poor or has not been included.
Justification includes reasoned arguments.	Learner has included clear reasoned arguments.	Learner has included reasoned arguments in the justification but these are brief or unclear in some areas.	Reasoned arguments have not been included or are very poor and/or not always related to the change.
Arguments supported by research evidence and/or relevant literature.	Arguments are supported by evidence.	Arguments are generally supported by evidence.	There is no evidence to support the arguments or the evidence cited is poor and/or not relevant to the argument.
Evidence of research and use of appropriate referencing [max 10]	7-10	4-6	0-3
Evidence of a range of reliable evidence sources used in research.	Clear evidence that learner has researched a range of reference sources.	There is evidence that learner has researched a range of reference sources.	There is little or no evidence to suggest that the learner has researched a range of reference sources.
Research evidence (literature/reference material) is appropriate and clearly linked to the identified change.	The research evidence used is appropriate for and clearly linked to the identified change.	The research evidence used is generally appropriate for the identified change but in some areas the link is not clear.	The research evidence used does not link to the identified change.
Cited evidence is reliable, relevant and good quality.	The reference sources used are from reliable, relevant and good quality sources.	The reference sources used are generally from reliable, relevant and good quality sources.	The reference sources that have been used are generally from unreliable sources and/or do not relate to the identified change.

Criteria	Level 1	Level 2	Level 3
Correctly and consistently formatted references and citations, eg Harvard style.	Referencing is based on a known / recognised style. Reference technique is excellent and consistently formatted.	Referencing is generally based on a known/recognised style. Referencing technique is good and generally consistently formatted.	Referencing is not based on a known/recognised style or has not been included. A poor or no attempt has been made to reference the research.
Conclusion [max 10]	7-10	4-6	0-3
Conclusion references aims and objectives.	Good, clear conclusion that references the aims and objectives of the report.	The conclusion is generally clear but further clarity is required in some areas; generally clear referencing of the aims and objectives.	The conclusion has either not been included or is very poor; there is little or no reference to the aims and objectives of the report.
The aims and objectives are the same as those given in the introduction.	Aims and objectives given are the same as those given in the introduction.	Aims and objectives given are the same as those given in the introduction.	Aims and objectives given do not generally refer to those given in the introduction or have not been included.
Summary of main findings.	There is a concise summary of the main findings	There summary of the main findings is generally clear but further detail could have been given in some areas.	There is a poor or no summary of the main findings.
Credible conclusions that relate to the task brief.	The conclusions made are credible and relate to the task brief.	The conclusions made are generally credible and relate to the task brief.	The conclusions made are generally not credible and do not relate to the task brief.
New factors should not be introduced at the conclusion stage.	There is no introduction of any new factors.	There is some introduction of new factors.	There is introduction of new factors.