

Senior Labour Inspectors Committee (SLIC) Campaign 2022 on the prevention of musculoskeletal disorders (MSD)

“Healthy Workplaces Lighten the Load”

In case you need support to understand a question better, please get in touch with minke.wersall@av.se with a copy to EMPL-C2-SLIC@ec.europa.eu

1. General description

Country [Sweden](#).

2. National campaign goals or indicators (*example: Increased number of enterprises who do have a RA including MSD*)

- We took the overall goals from Slic-campaign in Sweden with a big focus on one of the main goals for the activity that was to increase the knowledge for MSD of the inspectors and specially about the MSD risk-assessment methods. To reach the goal of increased knowledge we also produced a support for describing the shortcomings.

3. Inspection methods and tools used from the current SLIC MSD campaign or national (already existing or specifically created for this campaign) in order to implement the national legislation.

[Additional methods and material in Sweden:](#)

We want to be sure of that the demands in the inspection notice has been taken care of or put in an action plan in all of the companies. Because of that we plan for follow up-inspections during the autumn for each company who gets an inspection notice.

- We produced two different checklists for each sector to make it easier for the inspectors to ask the specific and proper questions.
- We also changed the colours of the Slic-produced mind maps for better ability to read.

4. Training

a) Has specific training for preparation of the campaign taken place? What kind?

We produced instructions for inspectors for individual preparation as a “smorgasbord”. They were instructed to take part of the material, different websites, webinars, and to update the knowledge on our own national website to be able to show the employers. The inspectors were also recommended to update their knowledge about inspection tools according to gender and an accessible work environment.

We had a train-the-inspector event for discussion about the material and different risk assessment methods. We had very good use of the material from the train-the-trainer-event and we also produced some extra slides that we joined together.

b) Have training materials been developed? Describe please.

We produced a power point presentation for the train-the-inspector event. See above.

c) How many inspectors have been trained? [15 inspectors joined the train-the-inspector event.](#)

d) What was the number of training days per inspector?

[Half a day for preparation and one day together on the train-the-inspector event.](#)

5. How was the interaction with the EU OSHA National Focal Point? Did you organise joint activities (please describe kind of activities and effects of these).

We did a short presentation of the Slic-campaign on two different NFP-meetings but no other interaction with our projectgroup. But, there is overall a lot of interaction with the National Focal Point in Sweden throughout the whole EU-campaign for three years. There are for example different webinars and workshops to support the campaign and an annually specific message.

6. Workers participation

a) Were there any workers' representatives at the workplace?

b) Did they participate in the inspection visit?

c) Did workers participate in the risk assessment?

d) If yes, how was workers participation organised in practice in your country (give the general approach regarding MSD prevention)?

a) and b) In the questionnaire the focus was if the representatives did participate in the MSD RA and not if there were **any worker' representatives at the workplace (a) or if they were joining the inspection (b)**. So we have no answer according to the result of the questionnaire, but we have been talking to the inspectors who say that the workers or the safety representatives participated in some of the inspections. There are some differences between the sectors and it is more common with safety representatives in the food and drink industry compared to the hairdressers. It is overall common in all sectors that the workers or safety representatives participate on the inspections according to the Swedish model. The Swedish model is built on cooperation between the unions and the employers in specific collective agreements.

c) In the hairdresser sector only in 29 % of the inspected workplaces workers representatives participated in the risk assessment and in the food and drink industry there were workers representatives participating in the MSD risk-assessment in 50% of the supervised work places .

d) If there are more than 5 employees at a workplace they can choose a safety representative to participate in the OSH. If there is no safety rep. at the site they can be in contact with a regional representative if there are members of the unions among the workers and the company has a collective agreement. There is no safety representative special for MSD, they are supposed to regard all the risks at the workplace and not just according to risks for MSD.

General evaluation of the campaign

7. Was the EU-Survey tool easy to use? Did it add value?

Yes it was ok but we have comments about that the questionnaire in paper and the survey should have had the same layout and that the paper was too small and too detailed.

8. Which background materials were useful (tools, methods, Campaign guide, mindmaps etc...) and how did you use them? Exemplify

We used all the materials and added some national material to. We have some comments that the material worked just fine.

We produced two different checklists for each sector to make it easier for the inspectors to ask the specific and proper questions. The checklists were synchronized with the questionnaires.

One of the main goals for the activity was to increase the knowledge for MSD of the inspectors, and because of that, we also produced a support for describing of the shortcomings.

We also changed the colours of the mind maps to increase the ability to read.

9. Description of learning examples and good practises (in attachment if needed)

One example of good practices is one inspectors visit on Oatly that is a Swedish international company with headquarters in Malmö, Sweden. Some of the production is situated in Germany.

They were very well prepared and they had many safety representatives. They had documented RA, that is not always in place everywhere. They had taken a bigger grip on the task that also has a positive impact on the worksite I Germany.

10. What were the inspectors' overall experiences from the campaign?

We felt that we did a good job and that the inspections were needed and we visited the right places/sectors. In addition to that, the inspections were interesting and fun to do.

Effects of the Campaign (short answers on national level)

11. How did the campaign influence the national priorities?

One of our goals in Sweden is to support a healthy work environment. This campaign supports that goal.

12. Please comment on the demands written in inspection notices regarding risk assessments.

For example: in Cyprus an Inspection Notice regarding absence of RA concerning MSDs can be issued, with the employer being given at least 14 days to fix the RA. In case a risk assessment is not carried out within the prescribed time frame by the inspector, the employer is not entitled to continue to work with these tasks.

In case a demand is not carried out within the prescribed time frame, the employer in Sweden may have to pay a fine after communication.

13. Please, comment on demands regarding OSH Management system / Measures / Arrangements in workplaces.

If no appropriate OSH management procedures are in place the inspector demands these procedures to be implemented. The lead time are often discussed and agreed about with the employer.

14. Did the campaign stimulate preventive measures regarding MSDs in the chosen Campaign sectors at a national level? If yes, how?

For example: the use of an evidence based method for assessment of risks for MSDs, it could be the KIM or the Tilthermometer depending on the sector of activity.

We have had some examples that the inspections led to RA on other parts of the companies that we didn't visit.

15. Did the exchange of information with other Member States stimulate national development? If yes, how?

No, we did not and one reason could be that this is a well-known way of inspection-method in Sweden. There was also a bit tight timetable for the project-group and focus of getting everything in place before the train-the-trainer-event. Perhaps a physical train-the-trainer-event could have given a better outcome of interaction over the borders.

Sector	No. of inspection visits	Inspected establishments	Inspections (establishments with 1-9 employees)	Inspections (establishments with 10-49 employees)	Inspections (establishments with 50-249 employees)	Inspections (establishments with 250 or more employees)	Main risks were identified and assessed to some extent	* RA fit for purpose (with or without uses of evidence based methods regarding RA MSD)
Healthcare & social care	X	X	X	X	X	X	X	X
Food & drink industry	137	106	15	70	17	4	Yes 20 To some extent 32 ⇒ 49 %	Yes 23 To some extent 29 ⇒ 49 %
3 Courier activities	X	X	X	X	X	X	X	X
Hairdressers & barber shops	105	79	47	30	1	1	Yes 3 To some extent 19 ⇒ 28 %	Yes 4 To some extent 18 ⇒ 28 %
Construction sector	X	X	X	X	X	X	X	X
Total	242	185	62	100	18	5	Yes 23 To some extent 51 ⇒ 40 %	Yes 27 To some extent 46 ⇒ 40 %

*RA = Risk Assessment