



Ministry
of Defence

JSP 815

Element 9: Performance, Management Information and Reporting



Contents

Title	Page
Amendment record	1
Terms and definitions	1
Introduction	2
Purpose and expectations	2
Management information	2
Performance	3
Reporting	6
Element assurance framework	6
Expectations and performance statements	7

Amendment record

This element has been reviewed by the Directorate of Defence Safety (DDS) together with relevant subject matter experts and key safety stakeholders. Any suggestions for amendments **should** be sent to COO-DDS-GroupMailbox@mod.gov.uk.

Version No	Date published	Text Affected	Authority
1.0	Dec 22	BETA version for consultation	Dir HS&EP
1.1	7 Jun 23	Final version	DDS
1.2	10 Sep 24	Annual revision and combined element and assurance framework	DDS

Terms and definitions

General safety terms and definitions are provided in the [Master Glossary of Safety Terms and Definitions](#) which can also be accessed on [GOV.UK](#).

Must and should

Where this element says must, this means that the action is a compulsory requirement.

Where this element says should, this means that the action is not a compulsory requirement but is considered good practice.

Introduction

1. This element provides the direction that must be followed and the guidance and good practice that should be followed and will assist users to comply with the expectations for performance, management information (MI) and reporting that are set out in this Element 9.

Purpose and expectations

2. This element focuses on the mechanisms the Defence organisation has put in place to generate and communicate complete and accurate MI on a timely basis. There are methods in place to define data requirements, and then collect, record, manage and report on its safety performance, including incidents, accidents, and good practice.

Management information

3. Checking and reporting performance at different levels within a Defence organisation is an essential part of managing safety. For example:

- a. Commanding Officers, Heads of Establishment and Managers are to seek assurance that they are compliant with safety legislation, Defence policy and regulations;
- b. Chief Environment and Safety Officers (CESOs) or equivalents are to seek assurance and report compliance to their senior management that their organisations are compliant with safety legislation, Defence policy and regulation;
- c. Accountable Persons and / or Duty Holders are to check and report up through their chain of command, that Risk to Life activities (RtLs) are being managed to a level where the risk is both ALARP and tolerable;
- d. Defence organisations are to monitor, review, audit and inspect as part of their overall system of measuring, correcting, improving and providing evidence about safety performance; and
- e. Military Commands are to provide the Director DS with weekly performance reports, including information on safety occurrence investigations.

4. The processes and systems used for checking should be proportionate to the consequences of failure when conducting activities and can include:

- a. Use of proactive and reactive performance indicators, such as safety occurrence reporting trends, audit findings, enforcement actions, lessons learnt from near misses and actual safety occurrences and assessments of safety culture;
- b. Specific monitoring of safety effects where these might result from undertaking an activity, such as work-related stress or noise-induced hearing loss. The review or a specific investigation of the circumstances leading to such health effects is essential to understand the causes so as to prevent their reoccurrence;
- c. Processes for reviewing, auditing and inspecting both the safety management arrangements and the activities conducted, which will range from self-assurance to independent 3rd Line of Defence (3LOD) assurance. Refer to Element 12 of this JSP 815 for further guidance;

- d. Safety monitoring systems providing real time monitoring of key controls with clear escalation actions when the relevant measurements are out of range; and
- e. Health surveillance, near miss, occurrence reporting systems and action tracking databases gathering information to allow for trend analysis and early warning of emerging issues.

Performance

Establishing a baseline

5. Establishing a baseline is the starting point for effective performance management and will drive opportunities for the Defence organisation by preventing or reducing avoidable safety occurrences. It is important that once established, the baseline is captured as the original benchmark, from which to assess changes in performance. However, a major change may require a new baseline to be established. The safety baseline will comprise a variety of sources of information including but not exhaustively:

- a. Results of safety audits, particularly if these are provided independently by specifically commissioned external authorities such as regulators, both statutory and Defence;
- b. Peer reviews provided by other related organisations or comparative exercises;
- c. Data from accident and injury reporting, including trends;
- d. Description of the organisation and arrangements including responsibilities and posts specifically identified with safety responsibilities;
- e. Compliance performance verified by audit or from records of regular interventions;
- f. Measurement against other metrics; such as expenditure on safety training; and
- g. Assessments against safety culture models.

Performance measurement

6. The measuring and reporting of safety performance is a necessary part of a 'Plan, Do, Check, Act' approach. It allows Defence organisations to check how effectively legislation and Defence safety policy and regulations are being implemented, where the areas are that require improvement and where are the risks to performance. All these can be compared with the safety baseline. However, care should be taken not to report or use ineffective data and MI, which may obscure the key information: Not all information that can be measured needs to be reported.

7. The Defence organisation should establish, implement and maintain a process and a system for monitoring, measuring, analysing and evaluating performance which includes:

- a. Determining what needs to be monitored and measured, including:
 - (1) The extent to which legal requirements and other requirements are fulfilled;
 - (2) Its activities and operations related to identified hazards, risks and opportunities;

- (3) Progress towards achievement of the organisation's safety objectives;
 - (4) Effectiveness of operational and other controls;
 - (5) The criteria to be used to evaluate safety performance;
 - (6) When the monitoring and measuring should be conducted and when the results should be analysed, evaluated and communicated;
 - (7) The methods for monitoring, measurement, analysis and performance evaluation, as applicable, to ensure valid results; and
 - (8) The criteria against which the organisation will evaluate its safety performance.
- b. The systems to be used to record, manage, analyse and monitor including;
 - (1) Standardised leading, lagging, and cultural performance indicators;
 - (2) What and where data is recorded;
 - (3) How data is to be used and the necessary data quality management to ensure accuracy; and
 - (4) Timeliness and completeness of data collation.
 - c. Reporting needs and requirements;
 - (1) Relevant information required for quarterly reporting;
 - (2) How data and analysis enabled trend analysis and early warning of issues and emerging risks;
 - (3) How data is summarised to enable senior leadership oversight;
 - (4) How data is used in leading as well as lagging indicators; and
 - (5) How actions are identified and monitored based on performance results to correct performance deficits.

8. The Defence organisation should evaluate their safety performance and determine the effectiveness of their safety management system. The performance and analysis should be used to inform decisions on costs, schedules, military capability and help predict emerging trends to identify opportunities to proactively improve performance.

Performance evaluation

9. The Defence organisation should review the safety management system at planned intervals, to ensure its continuing suitability, adequacy and effectiveness. The management review should include consideration of:

- a. The status of actions from previous management reviews;
- b. Changes in external and internal issues that are relevant to the safety management system, including:
 - (1) the needs and expectations of interested parties;
 - (2) legal requirements and other requirements; and
 - (3) risks and opportunities.

- c. The extent to which the safety policy and the safety objectives have been met.
- d. Information on the safety performance, including trends in:
 - (1) occurrences, non-conformities, corrective actions and continual improvement;
 - (2) monitoring and measurement results;
 - (3) results of evaluation of compliance with legal requirements and other requirements; audit results;
 - (4) consultation and participation of workers; and
 - (5) risks and opportunities.
- e. Adequacy of resources for maintaining an effective safety management system;
- f. Relevant communication(s) with interested parties;
- g. Opportunities for continual improvement; and
- h. The outputs of the management review should include decisions related to:
 - (1) the continuing suitability, adequacy and effectiveness of the safety management system in achieving its intended outcomes;
 - (2) continual improvement opportunities;
 - (3) any need for changes to the safety management system;
 - (4) resources needed;
 - (5) actions, if needed;
 - (6) opportunities to improve integration of the safety management system with other business processes; and
 - (7) any implications for the strategic direction of the organisation.

10. The Defence organisation's senior management should use its MI to inform and develop organisation strategies and plans and then communicate the relevant outputs of management reviews to their personnel, and the Trades Unions or personnel representatives. The Defence organisation should retain documented information as evidence of the results of their management reviews.

11. The Defence organisation can continually improve the performance of the safety management system, by:

- a. Promoting a culture that supports a safety management system;
- b. Promoting the participation of personnel in implementing actions for the continual improvement of the safety management system;
- c. Communicating the relevant results of continual improvement to personnel, and, where they exist, the Trades Unions and personnel representatives;
- d. Maintaining and retaining documented information as evidence of continual improvement; and
- e. Sharing its MI where appropriate for the wider Defence benefit.

Reporting

Strategic performance reporting

12. The strategic performance framework for Defence safety performance is set out in the annual Defence Plan endorsed by the Defence Board.

13. Defence organisations are accountable for delivery against the Defence Plan which is monitored through the Quarterly Performance and Risk Reviews (QPRR). The QPRR details the Defence organisation's performance and risks based on the agreed Command or Corporate Plan and the agreed performance indicators, metrics and milestones.

Annual reports

14. Each Defence organisation is required to compile an annual safety assurance report to DSA copied to DDS. Each Defence organisation is required to include a self-assessment of performance by declaring their assurance level (in addressing each of the 12 Defence SMS elements) of their safety management arrangements and likewise for their Environmental Protection performance (Covered in JSP 816) which when combined will provide the Defence organisations Safety and Environment assurance report. Each Defence organisation is to describe the risks or issues relevant to its safety performance.

Element assurance framework

15. This element focuses on the extent to which the Defence organisation has put in place the mechanisms to generate and communicate complete and accurate Management Information on a timely basis. There are methods in place to define data requirements, and then collect, record, manage and report on its safety performance, including incidents, accidents, and good practice.

16. The expectations and performance statements for this element are set out in the following pages.

Expectations and performance statements

Element 9: Performance, Management Information and Reporting

The Expectations in this element are:

E9.1 The Defence organisation has effective systems and processes in place to collect, measure and monitor safety performance, using documented leading, lagging, and cultural performance indicators.

E9.2 The Defence organisation regularly reviews performance and conducts trend analysis to inform decisions and implement plans to correct performance deficits.

E9.3 The Defence organisation has mechanisms in place to produce, report and review the management information from performance indicators and trend analysis; acting on it in a timely manner.

E9.4 Leadership decisions around cost, schedule and military capability performance are data driven, including assessment of potential safety impact.

Documents often associated with this element:

- 1LOD assurance reports
- Accident, Incident, Near Miss Reporting System such as DURALS, ASIMS, NLIMS etc
- Agenda and minutes of management board and ExCo meetings
- Command / Corporate plan
- Continual Improvement (CI) logs
- Contract Management and Supply Chain management plans
- Defence organisation business plans
- Defence organisation Operating Model
- Defence organisation SMS
- ExCo / Command Board Dashboard
- HS&EP Organisation and Arrangement (O&A) statement
- KPI targets and metrics
- People survey or equivalent e.g., Attitude Survey
- Portfolio Management Reporting System (PMRS)
- Quarterly Performance and Risk Review (QP&RR)
- Review period of KPIs by a governance forum

Expectation 9.1 The Defence organisation has effective systems and processes in place to collect, measure and monitor safety performance, using documented leading, lagging, and cultural performance indicators.

Unsatisfactory	Limited	Moderate	Substantial
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> There is little or no evidence to demonstrate that the Defence organisation have a system in place to collect, measure and monitor safety performance. 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> The Defence organisation has mechanisms in place to collect, measure and monitor safety performance however leading, lagging, and cultural performance indicators are not standardised. 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> The Defence organisation has mechanisms in place to collect, measure and monitor safety performance which include standardised leading, lagging, and cultural performance indicators. 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> The Defence organisation has mechanisms in place to collect, measure and monitor safety performance which include the use of standardised leading, lagging, and cultural performance indicators and are regularly reviewed and shared with wider defence.

Expectation 9.2 The Defence organisation regularly reviews performance and conducts trend analysis to inform decisions and implement plans to correct performance deficits.

Unsatisfactory	Limited	Moderate	Substantial
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> There is little or no evidence of understanding that the Defence organisation review any performance or conduct trend analysis to inform decisions and correct general performance deficits. 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> The Defence organisation reviews performance and conducts trend analysis however this is not routine and is reactive to events and incidents. Performance and analysis are not used consistently to inform decisions and corrective actions. 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> The Defence organisation reviews performance and conducts trend analysis and this is both proactive and reactive in nature. Performance and analysis are used to inform decisions and corrective actions. 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Performance and analysis are used to inform decisions and helps predict emerging trends, to identify opportunities to proactively improve performance.

Expectation 9.3 The Defence organisation has mechanisms in place to produce, report and review the management information from performance indicators and trend analysis; acting on it in a timely manner.

Unsatisfactory	Limited	Moderate	Substantial
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • There is little or no evidence that the Defence organisation have mechanisms in place to produce and report safety management information. • There is little or no evidence that the Defence organisation's leadership review performance management information and trend analysis. 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • The Defence organisation has mechanisms in place to produce reports on safety management information but does not have defined standards and expectations for its content. • The Defence organisation's leadership reviews management information from performance indicators and trend analysis however this is not acted upon or used proactively. 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • The Defence organisation has mechanisms in place to produce reports on safety management information, with defined standards and expectations for its content. • The Defence organisation's leadership reviews management information and trend analysis and this proactively informs performance improvements. 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • The Defence organisation shares its management information for the wider Defence benefit. • The Defence organisation's leadership uses its management information to inform and develop organisation strategies and plans.

Expectation 9.4 Leadership decisions around cost, schedule and military capability performance are data driven, including assessment of potential safety impact.

Unsatisfactory	Limited	Moderate	Substantial
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> There is little or no evidence that leadership decisions around cost, schedule and military capability performance are data driven and include an assessment of potential safety impact. 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Leadership decisions around cost, schedule and military capability performance are data driven but there is not enough evidence of assessment of safety impact. 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Leadership decisions around cost, schedule and military capability performance are data driven and there is consistent evidence of assessment of safety impact. A record of decision making is available which evidences the information used to reach decisions. 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Safety considerations proactively inform leadership decisions on cost, schedule and military capability.