

## LATVIA. INSPECTION ACTIVITIES

Title of the inspection activities: **The thematic inspection in companies whose employees were diagnosed with an occupational disease for the first time in 2019.**

Duration of the inspection activities: **One month in November 2020**

Aim of the inspection activities: **Check what measures the employer had taken at the workplace after receiving information from State Labour Inspectorate (SLI) about the employee's confirmed occupational disease**

Scope of the inspection activities: **check the labour protection documentation –it was prepared according to the legislation**

Sector covered by inspections: **various industries**

The number of establishments inspected in the framework of the activities: **161 company**

The number of labour inspectors involved in implementing the inspection activities: **60**

The number of persons involved in supervising the implementation of the inspection activities (including development of inspection documents and summarizing results of inspections): **2**

Short summary of the outcome of the inspection activities: **Results: 81% of the inspected companies had taken technical measures to improve the working conditions of occupational patients; 72% of companies had a reduced workload for occupational patients; The workers of 37% of the companies were transferred to perform other jobs, in which the exposure to harmful factors of the working environment is excluded. In total, 71% of inspections were carried out in companies with more than 50 employees.**

No.	question	yes/no	comment
<b>Inspection activity</b>			
<b>A. Selecting priority areas for inspection</b>			
1.	What sources of information did you use in selecting the priority area for inspection?		<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> inspectorate's own database of occupational diseases
2.	What was the main reason for selecting the inspection priority area?		<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> high morbidity rates of occupational diseases
3.	What was defined as priority area?		<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> a particular hazard(s)
4.	What was the predominant aim of workplace inspections?		<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> to enforce compliance with the law in the inspected entities
5.	How did you determine the number of entities to be inspected?		<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> other criteria (please specify) <b>For each national thematic inspection campaign SLI planned 150 inspections to cover larger number of companies</b>
6.	What was taken into consideration when determining the number of inspections to be carried out by individual field offices (regions):		<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> others (please specify) <b>There are 5 regional SLI units in Latvia and usually the number of inspected companies is distributed equally to all regions for campaigns, except in specific cases, for example, there are practically no agricultural companies in the territory of Riga SLI, then this region would conduct more inspections in another campaign (such as construction) in order to achieve the common set goals</b>
7.	Were IT tools used to identify the priority area in the described inspection campaign?	NO	
8.	Were IT tools used to identify the target group of inspected entities in the described inspection campaign?	NO	
<b>B. Determining the time span of inspection activities</b>			
9.	How was the breakdown of inspections planned? Were the inspections carried out:		

a)	evenly throughout the whole period of the planned activities	YES	
10.	What was the average duration of a workplace visit conducted in the framework of the programme implementation (the time it took to complete inspection activities at an individual establishment)?		<b>Since the Covid pandemic started, the inspections were carried out remotely. It is hard to set the average time.</b>
11.	What was the average duration of the activities carried out in the office of the labour inspectorate (excluding the penal and administrative sanctions)?		<b>Since the Covid pandemic started, the inspections were carried out remotely. It is hard to set the average time</b>
<b>C. Selecting establishments for inspection.</b>			
12.	What criteria were used when selecting establishments for inspection?		<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> others (please specify) <b>The number of confirmed occupational diseases in the previous year</b>
13.	What sources of information were used when selecting establishments for inspection?		<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> inspectorate's own database
<b>D. Provision of staff for carrying out inspections</b>			
15.	What group of inspectors was involved in the inspection activities?		<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> all inspectors were involved in the inspection activities;
16.	How were inspectors prepared for the inspection activities (additional training)?		<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> no additional training was provided;
17.	Were IT tools used to prepare labour inspectors to carry out activities within the described inspection campaign?	NO	
18.	What materials were at the inspectors' disposal during the activities?		<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> checklists; <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> description of the reporting requirements;

19.	Did labour inspectors use IT tools when carrying out activities within the described inspection campaign?	NO	
<b>E. Involvement of other regulators, institutions, authorities for labour protection and social partners in the implementation process.</b>			
20.	Can other regulators, institutions, authorities for labour protection and social partners submit their proposals of inspection topics to the inspectorate's plan of work?		<b>Sometimes social partners and authorities (for example, Free Trade Union Confederation of Latvia, The Ministry of Welfare, the Association of Competent Institutions for labour protection) mention problematic issues when meeting with SLI</b>
21.	Was the inspection activity the result of a proposal submitted by another regulator, institution, authority for labour protection or social partner?	NO	
22.	Was there any cooperation between the labour inspectorate and another regulator, institution, authority for labour protection or social partner?	NO	
23.	At which stage was the cooperation with another regulator, institution, authority for labour protection or social partner initiated?		<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> at the planning stage;
24.	What did the cooperation with another regulator, institution, authority for labour protection or social partner involve?		<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> others – please specify: <b>Giving an opinion on what inspections should be organized from their point of view</b>
25.	Are there any legal requirements obliging other regulators, institutions, authorities or social partners to make their data accessible to the labour inspectorate for inspection needs?	NO	
26.	Does the labour inspectorate have direct online access to information		<b>State Revenue Service (number of employees, wages) Business Register</b>



	and data collected by other bodies, institutions and authorities?		(address, owner), Land Registry (address), Road Safety Directorate (vehicles), Construction Information System (documentation about construction), Office of Citizenship and Migration Affairs (information about persons)
27.	What information obtained in the above manner was used for implementing the inspection campaign?		State Revenue Service (number of employees, wages), Business Register (address)
<b>F. Supporting inspection activities with training provided for employers or workers (combining inspection and educational activities)</b>			
28.	Were establishments covered by inspections provided with information or training <b>prior to the commencement of the inspection task</b> ?	NO	
29.	Is the effectiveness of prior information or training activities taken into account when evaluating the results of the inspections?	NO	
30.	Once the <b>inspection activity is completed</b> , are representatives of inspected establishments provided with recommendations and proposed corrective measures – in the form of guidance or training – regarding the identified compliance level in establishments operating in the field covered by inspection?	NO	
<b>G. Monitoring the implementation of inspection activities</b>			
31.	Was the implementation of inspection activities in any way monitored and coordinated?	YES	How many people were involved in monitoring and coordination of the inspection activity? <b>2 persons from the SLI Headquarters</b>

			<p>What was the function of those persons in relation to labour inspectors who implemented the activity (fellow labour inspectors, immediate supervisors, national coordinator at the labour inspectorate's headquarters)?</p> <p><b>To prepare checklist, prepare all necessary information how to conduct the inspection, prepared lists of the companies to be inspected, prepared the campaigns timetable, download the checklist in the SLI information system, prepare summary about the all inspected companies, support the inspectors if needed</b></p>
32.	What was the scope of monitoring and coordinating actions regarding the inspection activity?		<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> assistance in solving problems: over the phone, via email, formally (official correspondence), other (what?) <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> monitoring the implementation level of the developed quantitative plan
33.	Were IT tools used to carry out monitoring and coordination activities as part of the described inspection campaign?	NO	
<b>H. Communicating the information about inspection campaign and its results.</b>			
34.	Did you develop any plan to communicate the information about the inspection activities to:	NO	
35.	What was the scope of information communicated to:	NO	
36.	How was the information about the inspection activities communicated to stakeholders and the general public?		<b>The summary of the inspection campaign was included in the annual SLI report</b>
<b>I. Evaluating the results of the inspection activities. Evaluation methods and tools.</b>			

37.	How were the <b>results</b> of inspection campaign evaluated?		
a)	based on a checklist		How are the results of inspections evaluated by means of a checklist? <b>The answers to the checklist questions were analysed</b>
b)	based on the number of legal measures issued		<b>Report from the information system</b>
c)	based on the type of legal measures issued		<b>Report from the information system</b>
38.	How was the information about the <b>effects</b> of inspection campaign obtained (e.g. about the elimination of irregularities, introduction of higher standards)?		
a)	information provided by the employer	NO	
b)	information provided by the labour inspector who conducted the next inspection at the workplace	NO	
c)	other way		<b>The total number of detected violations decreased</b>
39.	What performance indicators were used to evaluate the effectiveness of the inspection campaign?		Please list and briefly describe the indicators: <b>The total number of detected violations decreased.</b>
40.	Were IT tools used to assess the effectiveness of the inspection campaign?	NO	
42.	How was the final document utilized in practice?		<b>Prepared summary for the SLI annual report; taking into account the results before planning next inspection campaigns; participating in seminars and giving information about the results of this campaign and other SLI activities</b>