SLOVENIA. INSPECTION ACTIVITIES

Title of the inspection activities: **Health and safety inspection on temporary and mobile construction sites 2023 (Slovenia)**

Duration of the inspection activities: **3. 1. 2023 – 1. 12. 2023**

Aim of the inspection activities: **Decrease the number of accidents at work and ensure a safe working environment on construction sites**

Scope of the inspection activities: **89/391 EU Directive, 92/57 EU Directive, PPE, working equipment;**

Sector covered by inspections: **Construction activity**

The number of establishments inspected in the framework of the activities: **461 construction sites; 925 enterprises; 1,512 inspections;**

The number of labour inspectors involved in implementing the inspection activities: **28**

The number of persons involved in supervising the implementation of the inspection activities (including development of inspection documents and summarizing results of inspections): **28**

Short summary of the outcome of the inspection activities: **In the field of occupational safety and health, inspectors carried out 1,512 inspections at 360 construction sites and 101 workplaces. In addition to traditional construction sites, inspectors also inspected the work sites of contractors such as roofers, carpenters, joiners, facers and window fitters. They found together 2,444 infringements and issued 1,030 measures. The most irregularities were found in relation to work at height (scaffolding, guardrails, work on roofs), ensuring the use and non-use of personal protective equipment, and failure to follow the instructions of occupational safety and health coordinators.**

The inspections found scaffolding irregularities in 292 cases, and in 24 cases, access to workplaces at height or depth was found to be unregulated. In 229 cases, inspectors found that contractors had not erected safety barriers at workplaces, or that the safety barriers were inadequate or insufficiently designed, which made falls from height or depth likely.

In 405 cases, irregularities were found in the provision and use of personal protective equipment and in the failure of individual workers to use it, and in 44 cases, irregularities were found in the protection of construction pits and excavations. 47 infringements were found in relation to electrical installations on construction sites and 36 infringements were found in relation to inadequate protection of construction sites against the surrounding area. In the field of OSH inspections, inspectors issued 225 regulatory decisions, 73 of which were issued orally because they were extremely urgent measures. In 67 cases, work was banned because of direct danger to workers' lives.

No.	question	yes/no	comment
Inspection activity			
A. Selecting priority areas for inspection			
1.	What sources of information did you use in selecting the priority area for inspection?		☒ inspectorate's own database of workplace accidents ☒ EU Strategic Framework on Health and Safety at Work 2021-2027 ☒ complaints;
2.	What was the main reason for selecting the inspection priority area?		☒ high rates of workplace accidents, including fatal and serious accidents ☒ high rates of inability to work
3.	What was defined as priority area?		☒ a particular sector(s) of economy ☒ incompliance with legal requirements concerning labour relations/working conditions
4.	What was the predominant aim of workplace inspections?		☒ to provide the inspected entities with information on legal requirements ☒ to enforce compliance with the law in the inspected entities ☒ to achieve a measurable effect, e.g. in the form of reduced accident rate, morbidity rate, etc.
5.	How did you determine the number of entities to be inspected?		☒ the percentage of the overall number of inspections planned in a given year – if so, what percentage? **Between 20% - 30% depending on other priorities**
6.	What was taken into consideration when determining the number of inspections to be carried out by individual field offices (regions):		☒ the number of inspectors carrying out inspection tasks in a given region;
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. Determining the time span of inspection activities			
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)?		☒ within one day, between 2 and 4 hours;
11.	What was the average duration of the activities carried out in the office of the labour inspectorate (excluding the penal and administrative sanctions)?		☒ within one day, no longer than 2 hours;
C. Selecting establishments for inspection.			
12.	What criteria were used when selecting establishments for inspection?		☒ personal knowledge of labour inspectors who supervise particular workplaces (groups of workplaces) ☒ sectoral criterion
13.	What sources of information were used when selecting establishments for inspection?		☒ inspectorate's own database ☒ databases of institutions registering economic activity ☒ labour inspectors' knowledge of workplaces ☒ internet search engines
14.	Were IT tools used to select specific inspected entities in the described inspection campaign?		- A brief description of IT tools **INSPIS - Inspectorate information system** - What data was analysed to select specific inspected entities? – please indicate the type of data:

			accidents at work, previous infringements, notice of starting work on construction site
D. Provision of staff for carrying out inspections			
15.	What group of inspectors was involved in the inspection activities?		☒ nearly all inspectors were involved (at least 80%);
16.	How were inspectors prepared for the inspection activities (additional training)?		☒ 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?		☒ the rationale of the inspection activities; ☒ description of the inspection activities' objectives; ☒ description of the ways in which to implement the activities (tasks to be completed); ☒ checklists; ☒ information about the rules of programme evaluation; ☒ description of the reporting requirements; ☒ specialist, issue-related materials (applied technologies, machinery, equipment and tools, existing hazards and legal provisions); ☒ examples of reactive actions to be taken by inspectors upon identification of typical cases of incompliance;
19.	Did labour inspectors use IT tools when carrying out activities within the described inspection campaign?		- A brief description of IT tools: **tablets, apps on mobile phones, accesses to other databases (work licence, insurances, data on accidents at work)** - IT tools were used :

			☒ for labour inspector's preparation for an inspection at a specific inspected entity ☒ when performing inspection activities during the inspection ☒ when summarizing and documenting the results of the inspection in a specific inspected entity - How did they support the labour inspector in (please provide a short description): - preparation for an inspection? **getting up-to-date information as quickly as possible** - performing inspection activities? **getting up-to-date information as quickly as possible** - summarizing and documenting the results of the inspection? **getting up-to-date information as quickly as possible**
E. Involvement of other regulators, institutions, authorities for labour protection and social partners in the implementation process.			
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?		**Ministries, inspectorates, social partners,**
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?		**Police, Financial administration, Building Inspectorate**

23.	At which stage was the cooperation with another regulator, institution, authority for labour protection or social partner initiated?		☒ at the implementation stage of the activity;
24.	What did the cooperation with another regulator, institution, authority for labour protection or social partner involve?		☒ participation in inspection activities (e.g. as experts) – if so, in what role? **Security for inspectors (Police) and joint supervision of matters outside the Labour Inspectorate's competence (finances, construction documentation)**
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?		**Individual cases on the base of mutually agreed protocols (Financial administration, Employment service, Health insurance service)**

26.	Does the labour inspectorate have direct online access to information and data collected by other bodies, institutions and authorities?		**The protocol-based web service is in use with:**
			- Financial Administration (social security
			- Slovenian Business Register (information on
			  Employers and their status)
			- Health Insurance Institute (information on
			  workers' health insurance)
			- Employment Service (recruitment of workers)

27.	What information obtained in the above manner was used for implementing the inspection campaign?		**- Slovenian Business Register (information on** **registered employers and responsible persons)**
F. Supporting inspection activities with training provided for employers or workers (combining inspection and educational activities)			
28.	Were establishments covered by inspections provided with	NO	

	information or training **prior to the commencement of the inspection task**?		
30.	Once the **inspection activity is completed**, 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?		What form do they have? **Presentation of findings and debriefing after the inspection activity on the site (verbal discussion)**
G. Monitoring the implementation of inspection activities			
31.	Was the implementation of inspection activities in any way monitored and coordinated?		How many people were involved in monitoring and coordination of the inspection activity? **1 (one)** 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)? **OSH inspector and construction specialist**
32.	What was the scope of monitoring and coordinating actions regarding the inspection activity?		☒ assistance in solving problems: over the phone, via email, formally (official correspondence), other (what?) / ☒ monitoring the implementation level of the developed quantitative plan ☒ monitoring the implementation level of the developed qualitative plan (how?) checks that inspections are carried out in accordance with instructions and guidelines
33.	Were IT tools used to carry out monitoring and coordination		- A brief description of IT tools: **INSPIS Inspectorate information system**

	activities as part of the described inspection campaign?		**(up-to-date findings are checked from the system at any time)** - IT tools were used to: ☒ assist labour inspector in solving problems related to inspection carried out within the inspection campaign (how?) (e.g. finding out that an employer has already been subject to an enforcement campaign) ☒ monitoring the implementation level of the developed quantitative plan
H. Communicating the information about inspection campaign and its results.			
34.	Did you develop any plan to communicate the information about the inspection activities to:		
a)	stakeholders in the sector covered by the inspection activity ?		What information did the communication plan contain? **The same as 34.b.**
b)	the general public?		What information did the communication plan contain? **Information are published in the annual report and, whene appropriate, on the Inspectorate's website. We also send reports of our findings to various medias if they express an interest.** **Information shall be provided on the duration of the activity, the infringements detected and the measures taken. A commentary on the findings, the factual situation, good and bad practices, etc. shall also be provided.**
35.	What was the scope of information communicated to:		
a)	stakeholders in the sector covered by the inspection activity ?		/

b)	the general public?		**Purpose and reasons for the exercise, duration, scope, statistics (number of sites inspected and inspections carried out, number and type of infringements found and measures imposed), a description of all infringements with an emphasis on the most frequent and significant ones, conclusion;**
36.	How was the information about the inspection activities communicated to stakeholders and the general public?		**Via the Annual Report and publishing on the Inspectorate's website**

I. Evaluating the results of the inspection activities. Evaluation methods and tools.

37.	How were the **results** of inspection campaign evaluated?		
a)	based on a checklist		**How are the results of inspections evaluated by means of a checklist? The checklist is the basis for the inspection and is used to determine whether the inspectors have checked all the risk factors foreseen or whether they have also identified some other risk factors.**
b)	based on the number of legal measures issued	Yes	
c)	based on the type of legal measures issued	Yes	
e)	based on the type of implemented legal measures	Yes	
38.	How was the information about the **effects** of inspection campaign obtained (e.g. about the elimination of irregularities, introduction of higher standards)?		
a)	information provided by the employer		What form did the information provided by the employer have? **A formal written answer regarding the rectification of the founded irregularities.**

			Was the information provided by employers randomly verified by labour inspectors? **In individual cases.** What is the employer's liability for providing false information? **A fine may be imposed for an offence.** What is the ratio of information provided by the employer to the overall pool of information about the effects of inspections? **N/A**
b)	information provided by the labour inspector who conducted the next inspection at the workplace		What form did the information provided by the inspector have? **The situation on construction sites changes very quickly, so it doesn't make much sense.** What is the ratio of information provided by the labour inspector who conducted the next inspection at the workplace to the overall pool of information about the effects of inspections? **N/A**
39.	What performance indicators were used to evaluate the effectiveness of the inspection campaign?		Please list and briefly describe the indicators: **- number of inspections carried out compared to the planned number - trend of the most frequently detected infringements compared to regular checks - the responsiveness of employers to eliminate previously identified irregularities (many employers informed the inspectorate that they had removed the irregularities before the written decision was issued) - number of reported accidents before and after the campaign**

40.	Were IT tools used to assess the effectiveness of the inspection campaign?		- A brief description of IT tools: **INSPIS Inspectorate information system** - IT tools were used to: ☒ provide compilations of data on the basis of which the inspection campaign was assessed
41.	How were the project **effects** evaluated? **We are repeating the campaign in 2024 and will evaluate effects in 2025.**		