



NOTES OF MEETING

Date: 3 February 2010	Location: HSE, Chemical Regulation Division, Mallard House, York	Taken by: Jackie Jones
Subject: AGRICULTURE INDUSTRY ADVISORY COMMITTEE (AIAC) MEETING		
Present:		
HSE	AIAC Members	
Marcia Davies (Chair)	Michael Britten (NFU)	
Judith Donovan	Marcus Themans (NFU)	
Graeme Walker	David Knowles (IOSH)	
Alan Plom	James Brown (AFAG)	
Alastair Mitchell	Tim Englefield (Landex)	
David Coackley	Madge Moore (Lantra)	
Rachel Corbridge	Ivan Monckton (Unite)	
Helen Coupland	Keith Christian (BAGMA)	
Garry Haseldine	Charlie Clutterbuck (Unite)	
Jackie Jones	Ian Beeby (Unite)	
Guests: (HSE)	Roger Lane-Nott (AEA)	
Richard Davis	James Eckley (NFYFC)	
Grant Stark	Richard Minton (NAAC)	

Item No	Description
1	Welcome and Opening Remarks
	Marcia Davies, AIAC Chair, welcomed members to the meeting held at CRD, Mallard House, York and thanked Richard Davis for hosting the meeting. The Chair also welcomed David Coackley the Sector's new Head of Agriculture Health, Education & Employment team; Jackie Jones as replacement for Nick Sangha and Garry Haseldine from the Sector's Agriculture Revisited Policy and Communications team. The Chair and Committee expressed their thanks to Nick Sangha for his sterling contribution to the work of Committee. Apologies had been received from David Bench (CRD); Keith Christian; Chris Kaufmann; Chris McCann; Pat Stanley; Jill Hewitt and Andrew Clark.
2	Matters Arising & Actions Outstanding from Previous Meeting
	(1) The majority of actions from the previous meeting had been discharged, were ongoing, or listed as an agenda item.
	(2) Ivan Monckton expressed his apologies for his absence at the previous meeting, as it appears that his message of apology had not been forwarded to the Chair.
	(3) The Chair advised members that she had received an update from Chris McCann about the Retail Consortium and that Graeme Walker has been invited to speak at Asda's Annual Ethical Standards Conference on 4 th March 2010. Ivan Monckton expressed concern that Unite had not been invited to send a representative. Graeme explained that this was a routine meeting of Asda's suppliers and not an industry conference per se. The Chair suggested that the way in for Unite might be via the Worker Involvement route.

Item No	Description
	(4) Chris Kaufman had written to McDonald's, about their advertising campaign, but that to date, had received no response. The Chair thanked Chris for his continued efforts. It appears McDonald's will be re-running their campaign and so it would be entirely reasonable to re-new our discussions with them. The Chair suggested that given her extensive knowledge, contacts and experience, Judith Donovan might be best placed to escalate matters with McDonald's and IPA.
	(5) Marcus Themans and Michael Britten raised the actions recorded in the minutes for NFU to fund two new DVDs. They questioned whether this had actually been agreed and in any case NFU would not be in a position to sponsor these. The Chair and Graeme Walker responded that Andrew Clark had recently agreed the record was correct but accepted the NFU's position. They wondered, however, if NFU could not lead a collaborative effort with their own partners?
	Action: ➤ Chris Kaufman to continue to pursue McDonald's for a response ➤ Judith Donovan to raise with McDonald's and to approach the IPA to enlist their support
3	HSE and the Chemicals Regulation Directorate (CRD)
	(1) HSE and the Chemicals Regulation Directorate (CRD): presentation by Richard Davis
	(3.1.1) Richard Davis, Director of Regulatory Operations, welcomed members to one of HSE's newest Directorates. CRD was formed on 1 st April 2009 from a merger of the Pesticides Safety Directorate (PSD) and other relevant parts of HSE (primarily the Chemicals Assessment Schemes Unit), to form an integrated chemicals regulation function. Prior to that date, PSD was an Executive Agency of DEFRA. CRD is a full cost recovery Directorate that is now firmly embedded within HSE. CRD is led by Kerr Wilson, a member of HSE's Senior Management Team. Richard Davis stated that it had been a logical move to HSE; however, governance arrangements, which are shared by DEFRA and DWP, are somewhat complex. CRD are now able to look for and take full advantage of synergies on enforcement through via CRD's Compliance team.
	(3.1.2) Richard Davis then went on to outline CRD's structure (as detailed in the attached presentation). CRD's Strategic Communications although a new team, are looking for ways to become more proactive and adopt a more strategic approach. All sections within CRD are involved in some way with EU work, but the main lead is with the Policy team.
	(3.1.3) Roger Lane Nott asked whether the split in governance is causing any issues for CRD. Richard Davis said that it had in fact created an opportunity to look at synergies and also presented opportunities to break down any silos and merge where sensible to do so.
	(3.1.4) Richard Davis advised members that the proposed new Pesticides Regulations address hazards as well as risk. Charlie Clutterbuck asked what lessons HSE have learned from the Georgina Downs case. Richard Davis said that the biggest issue is around risk communication, which remains a challenge. CRD will shortly commence a period of consultation on the Sustainable Use Directive that will present an opportunity for members to register any feedback.
	Action: ➤ Members to register their views and feedback on the Sustainable Use Directive
4	(1) Pesticides and the New EU Regulations: presentation by Grant Stark, CRD
	(4.1.1) Grant Stark provided an update on the thematic strategy for pesticides (presentation attached). He explained that whilst there are some undoubted benefits, there remain some hazards associated with pesticides, which still need to be addressed. Additional controls will help to minimise these.
	(4.1.2) The new regulations update the existing European Directive. The key feature is a new way of regulating pesticides. CRD had carried out an impact assessment as the EU had elected not to do so. Grant advised that there are some new challenges for the UK, eg. National Action Plans and reduction targets, but that we have the necessary infrastructure in place, as user training is already a statutory requirement here. A key provision is to look at alternatives to pesticides.

Item No	Description
	(4.1.3) Agriculture Sector Assurance schemes have had a great effect in driving up standards. In relation to the Amenities sector, there is often a lack of understanding of the risks; and this poses a challenge for all.
	(4.1.4) The Chair thanked Richard and Grant for their comprehensive and informative presentations.
5	(1) Amenity and Landscaping: Alan Plom and Madge Moore
	(5.1.1) Alan Plom informed members that he had a draft paper to which he would add any comments from Committee members. Once completed, the paper will be circulated to members. Alan went on to highlight the main points contained within the paper.
	(5.1.2) Alan stated that the 2012 Olympics represented a huge challenge in this context as the activities are so wide ranging. It is important to determine how to best manage the risk and ensure a consistent approach. Madge Moore added that LANTRA had attempted to carry out an analysis of the sector and to estimate numbers based upon SIC codes. This had proved to be difficult as the codes did not necessarily provide for an accurate analysis. They had therefore had to estimate the numbers. Consequently, LANTRA are doing more research into the SIC codes. Madge circulated a Lantra research fact sheet containing labour market information for Horticulture, Landscaping and Sports Turf
	(5.1.3) Alan invited those who have concerns about the issues to share them with the Sub Group so that they can consider any views.
	(5.1.4) Alan's view is that apparent best value does not always deliver a good job and in addition that the diminishing use of pesticides is leading to a greater use of machinery. HSE is seeing an increase in spot weeding instead of blanket spraying.
	(5.1.5) HSE is focusing on reported incidents, however there is pressure from the industry to produce more guidance on how to manage the risks e.g. for Green keepers.
	(5.1.6) Alan stated that Local Authorities (LA), in their dual role as enforcer and client, provide us with an effective route into the sector, but we have to get the industry to commit to this. There is much good work taking place e.g. a cross-divisional HSE project that is looking at LA procurement of Contractors and a bespoke SHAD for Contractors.
	(5.1.7) Keith Christian asked whether the increase in the number of HAVS reports could be attributed to the fact that people are now more inclined to report incidents, or whether there had in fact been a rise in the number of incidents. Alan Plom replied that it was not entirely clear but that there were probably a number of factors involved.
	(5.1.8) Richard Minton expressed the view that the lack of enforcement within amenities, together with the way in which contracts are let, is likely to have had an impact upon the numbers. Contracts are awarded at a high level with little, if any, regard for what is happening at grass roots level. The threat of enforcement would help to drive up standards. Roger Lane-Nott expressed his support for this view, saying that he felt that LA Chief Executives were not taking enough responsibility for this. He advised that the Local Government Association (LGA) had been approached, but had not responded.
	(5.1.9) The Chair mentioned the ongoing work with colleagues in the Local Authorities across a number of fronts. New guidance and workshops on Waste and Recycling were well received by the LGA. The principles are the same and could easily be transferred to Amenities. The issue is about the partnership between the LAs and their Contractors. LAs are in a position to inform and shape opinion and should be setting an example. The same could be said of large Contractors. We could perhaps invite Chris McCann to include this on the agenda of his Ethical Conference. There was a suggestion that it would be interesting to ask them about their procedures, and how they monitor them.

Item No	Description
	Action: ➤ Committee members to forward any views, or concerns about Amenities and Landscaping to the Sub Group.
	Action: ➤ Chris McCann to be approached about including this for discussion at Asda's Ethical Standards Conference
	(5.1.10) Judith Donovan reminded members of the Strategy and suggested that Sandy Blair be consulted for his advice on how we might progress this with the Local Authorities.
	(5.1.11) Roger Lane-Nott mentioned that the Amenity Forum is not part of the Voluntary Initiative Steering Group despite efforts to engage with them to secure their commitment.
	(5.1.12) Ivan Monckton thanked Alan Plom for the interesting presentation, but expressed concern that there had been no mention of 'Rights of Ways' Contractors. Ivan stated that in his view, it would be useful to get Local Authorities to fund and run SHADs for 'Rights of Way' Contractors. It could be a rolling programme to ensure the necessary geographical coverage. Alan confirmed that although not specifically named in the draft paper, they were indeed included.
	(5.1.13) Grant Stark said that effective communication is a vital part of risk management; getting the risk message across is vital. Finding a good hook upon which to rest this (e.g. the new directive) would help to spread the message. CRD have commissioned a report in order to build up their evidence base. Alan's paper would sign post to the relevant pages, as the report is quite lengthy.
	(5.1.14) James Brown stated that Agriculture and Forestry have had to obey the law and he believes that the only way forward is to make it a criminal offence to be in possession of pesticides without a licence.
	(5.1.15) Richard Minton reminded members that everyone has an opportunity to make their views known via the consultation exercise and drew members' attention to the booklet "Pesticides in the Community" which was circulated for information.
	(5.1.16) Alan Plom concluded his presentation by advising members that his PowerPoint presentation will be available in due course on the website.
	(5.1.17) The Chair thanked members for their contributions to the discussion and acknowledged that this is a long running issue, which we should return to at a future meeting.
	Action: ➤ (1) Alan to post his presentation on the website ➤ (2) HSE to explore any further options and suggestions with Sandy Blair. ➤ (3) Committee members to contribute their views as part of the consultation exercise
6	Fatal Injury Statistics: This Item Was Deferred
7	(1) Make the Promise (MTP) campaign – Stakeholder toolkit: Rachel Corbridge and Helen Coupland
	(7.1.1) The Chair welcomed Tim Englefield, who joined the meeting in the afternoon and invited Helen Coupland and Rachel Corbridge to give members an update on the 'Make the Promise' campaign. (copy of slides attached). As the meeting was overrunning, Rachel and Helen delivered a truncated version of their presentation; the main theme of which was how AIAC members and other stakeholders can all work together to support delivery of the campaign.

Item No	Description
	(7.1.2) Helen reprised the campaign strategy, reminding members that we are trying to engage farmers on an emotional level rather than adopt a legislative approach. We are asking farmers to 'Make the Promise' and once they have done so, to keep their promise. Over the life of the campaign, we will ask them to show and then share their promise by becoming advocates.
	(7.1.3) There has been a very positive response thus far. The approach and messaging appears to continue to resonate with farmers who say that they can relate to it, indicating that the language and tone are appropriate.
	(7.1.4) Helen reported that phase three of the campaign went live in the farming trade press in January and featured Andrew Pursey's story. The campaign has also featured in Farming Today and HSE inspector Tony Mitchell will appear in an edition of BBC's Countryfile (scheduled for screening on 21 February) when Tony will be seen carrying out a visit to presenter Adam Henson's farm.
	(7.1.5) We will continue to follow our strategy in taking the campaign forward. The next mailing will take place in March 2010.
	(7.1.6) Helen asked for the Committee's help in reaching 'new' farmers and reminding those who have made their promise to keep it, by lending their weight to the campaign. Members can help the campaign gain even greater credibility within the farming community in their role as representatives of organisations whose views carry weight.
	(7.1.7) Rachel Corbridge reminded members that she had circulated a draft note before Christmas and invited ideas asking members to contact the team to discuss them. She asked members to help by encouraging farmers to 'Make their Promise'. She advised the Committee that work is underway to develop a 'Toolkit', which will contain a menu of 'products' which members can use when promoting the campaign. The materials can be adapted to meet specific needs e.g. the team recently adapted the postcard to make it more relevant to students.
	(7.1.8) Rachel asked that the Committee consider how they could help. For example, when running an event to think about how the campaign might be included and promoted. There will be a range of materials on offer, from written contributions for publications, to presentations.
	(7.1.9) Following the request for materials at the last meeting, the team are working on a DVD, which it is hoped, will be available in April. Work is continuing on the campaign website. Rachel said that the team would welcome any thoughts, suggestions and ideas for additional materials.
	(7.1.10) Charlie Clutterbuck offered to create a link from his website to the HSE website, but stated that the existing webpage was not very engaging. Rachel said that the team are currently working with the design team to change this. Charlie offered to help and will act as a consultee.
	<p>Action:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ➤ Committee members to consider how they can help to promote the campaign.
	<p>Action:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ➤ Rachel and Helen to note Charlie's offer of support in developing the promise partner page of the website.
	(7.1.11) There was a consensus that we should adopt a more hard hitting approach, citing evidence and making comparisons e.g. with fatalities in the Afghanistan. Graeme Walker said that he had made such a comparison during an interview on Radio Cumbria and had received a complaint, but that in his view, we needed to be more robust and confront the issue. We will be publishing the statistics together with some regional data on the website.

Item No	Description
	<p>Action: ➤ Rachel Corbridge to discuss statistical data with David Coackley.</p>
	<p>(7.1.12) Marcus Themans raised some concern about the target audience, saying that he felt that the campaign should be rolled out to a younger audience and asked whether it is now time to move things on. Marcus also suggested that we should be more innovative and move into social media. James Eckley supported this view. Judith Donovan explained that the campaign has never been “either/or “, but that it has a designed roll out strategy and younger audiences would be targeted at the most effective time; that had not been reached yet. Hitherto it had deliberately concentrated on the older, harder to reach farmer. Press coverage reaches all age groups.</p>
	<p>(7.1.13) Judith reminded members of the 5-pronged strategy, which includes the different work streams and advised that it will take a long time to embed messages. It is for this reason that we need a mature marketing strategy. Young farmers are better trained and need a different approach. Social networking sites are facing a downturn in use and popularity and emails are overused. The Chair stated that it is largely a question of timing - we must have a controlled, researched rollout. James Eckley may be able to advise on this.</p>
	<p>(7.1.14) There was a view expressed that Agriculture Contractors should embrace the campaign and that ‘Make the Promise’ is a message that could be pushed at the Contractors SHAD on 25 March 2010.</p>
	<p>(7.1.15) The Chair asked when the website would be ready and was advised that It is hoped that it will go live at the beginning of April. Presentations from the agency due in the next 4 weeks, whilst articles for internal journals are available now.</p>
	<p>Action: ➤ Helen Coupland to circulate a timetable of when the materials would be ready.</p>
	<p>(7.1.16) Charlie Clutterbuck reminded the Committee that it is Workers Memorial day on 28 April 2010 and that the day now has Government support. Charlie asked if this might present us with a good opportunity to get out some key messages. Helen advised that the PR agency have been briefed and they will seek out suitable opportunities.</p>
	<p>(7.1.17) Some members expressed their unhappiness with the term stakeholder. Following some discussion about the use of the term “stakeholders”, it was suggested that “Promise partners” would be more acceptable. The Chair asked if members were happy with the concept of “Promise partners” and the Committee confirmed their assent.</p>
	<p>(7.1.18) Michael Britten asked how this would fit in with the Strategy Pledge. The Chair explained that it fits perfectly as all the work streams support and link into the Strategy. For example, leadership – the Committee, as opinion formers are well placed to help influence and shape. Worker Involvement and competence are fundamentally aligned. Judith Donovan stated that Agriculture has progressed further than others have, as it offers a practical implementation of the Strategy.</p>
	<p>(7.1.19) The Chair expressed a hope that all who sign up as “Promise partners” would share the moral impetus to do something about farming deaths it and asked that the Committee agree to carry out relevant activities and report back on what has been delivered. Madge Moore voiced her support, but said that proving an outcome would be more difficult. Graeme Walker reassured members that HSE would not be asking members to explain what difference they had made.</p>
	<p>(7.1.20) When asked by the Chair if all were happy to commit on that basis, members gave their unanimous agreement. The Chair advised the Committee that the team would work up the basic membership criteria.</p>

Item No	Description
	(7.1.21) Judith Donovan suggested that there should be a web order form containing a tick list for "Promise partners", which would help identify what partner support is available. Michael Britten asked how partner support would be recognised e.g., would there be something on the website? Judith Donovan asked what partners would want in return.
	(7.1.22) Michael Britten then asked what could be made available for farmers who have made the promise. Michael suggested that letterheads stating that they have made the promise might be worth considering. Judith Donovan acknowledged the suggestion, but went on to explain that as we are still at the stage of explaining what making the promise means, anything further would have to be an aspiration at this stage in the campaign. The Chair suggested that farmers could perhaps host a mini SHAD on their farms. Judith Donovan emphasised that the key thing is that it is a private promise and as such, some will choose to spread the word, but that it should not be a requirement. However, we may be able to do something for those choosing to act as advocates.
	Action: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ➤ Campaign team to draft the membership criteria for further consideration. ➤ Graeme Walker, Jill Wakefield and Rachel Corbridge to follow up offers of help.
8	(1) AIAC Plan of Work 2009/10 & Beyond
	(8.1.1) The Chair invited members to update the Committee on their progress against the work plan. Alan Plom advised members that there is lots of ongoing activity via the AFAG e.g. the development of a separate tree work website containing information from a number of sources.
	(8.1.2) James Brown asked whether it would be possible to obtain the figures relating to fatalities for the last ten years. David Coackley replied saying that the Fatals Injuries Report 2007/08 would shortly be published and available on the website.
	(8.1.3) Ivan Monckton advised the Committee that Unite's Migrant Workers Support Unit has fallen by the wayside, but that he is exerting some pressure on his colleagues to get it re-established. Graeme Walker said that Chris McCann's work at Asda is relevant to this. David Coackley is now the Sector contact for vulnerable workers.
	(8.1.4) Graeme Walker stated that lessons are being learned from Agriculture Revisited, which are now being applied in the wider land based sector.
	(8.1.5) Ivan Monckton said that Chris Kaufman was hoping to sign an agreement with the Horticulture Society in relation to the Horticulture Committee's work in prison farms. They would ensure that health and safety is foremost in the agreement. Judith Donovan asked whether we could get prisons to do the VQ. Alan Plom replied that the idea had been suggested, but not pursued. Madge Moore advised that the Learning Skills Council (LSC) is responsible for offender training and that the City College in Manchester have a useful contract. Madge explained that prisons do not have their own budgets and that the Skills Funding Agency is to deal with offender learning and management.
	(8.1.6) Alan Plom informed the meeting that a bibliography of guidance material will shortly be available on the AIAC livestock group web page.
	(8.1.7) Alan Plom advised that the next Transport & Machinery project workshop would take place on 29 March at BAGMA.

Item No	Description
9	(1) Agenda, Dates and Venues of Next Meetings
	(9.1.1) Ivan Monckton informed the Chair that Unite would have to rescind the offer of a venue for the June meeting due to building work scheduled to take place at that time. David Knowles offered to look into the availability of IOSH facilities. Alan Plom said that he had some contacts, which he would follow up to determine whether they might have a suitable venue. The Chair stated that the Committee must hold an open meeting at some point and suggested that that may be part of making the commitment as a “Promise partner” e.g. “partners” could host a meeting and/or lead a session at the open meeting. It was agreed that the team would consider as part of the “Promise partners” membership criteria.
	(9.1.2) 21 June 2010 - HSE, Redgrave Court, Bootle
	Action: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ➤ David Knowles to check availability of IOSH venue. ➤ Alan Plom to identify and determine suitability of potential venues ➤ Chair and team to agree date and venue for June meeting.
	(2) Other Business and Closing Remarks
	(9.2.1) James Brown wished to draw the Committee’s attention to an innovation in livestock handling involving a crush for use during belly clipping. He stated that belly clipping results in major injuries and is subject to significant under reporting. The Committee were informed of an example where an abattoir had been persuaded to install a device (costing around £40,000) at the front of the line, thereby removing the risk to farmers. The Chair and Judith Donovan asked members from the NFU whether the NFU are supporting this and whether they are doing anything to promote it e.g. lobbying. Michael Britten said that he did not know the NFU stance, but that he would check and report to the Committee.
	(9.2.2) The Chair stated that this could be a campaigning, or sponsorship issue. David Knowles suggested that there might be an issue with regard to biohazard security if abattoirs were to set up such points. Alastair Mitchell explained that the majority of accidents occur because the incorrect crush is used and that the issue is about having the correct crush. He stated we could never eliminate the risk and that ‘live versus dead’ clipping is actually a food hygiene issue. There is a dead clipping facility in Shrewsbury; however, it is not always operational due to staffing shortages. There is also a cost implication as it costs £3 per sheep. Alastair advised that any further discussion should involve the FSA and that the NFU, not HSE are best placed to lobby on this topic.
	(9.2.3) Madge Moore advised the Committee that Hilary Benn (Defra SoS) would be launching the AgriSkills Strategy on 10 February 2010. The AgriSkills Strategy Action Plan contains several actions, which will help promote skills and competency. Michael Britten asked why there is no training needs analysis on legislation, as the Environment Agency has one, albeit that it is very complex. The Chair responded by saying that there is a great deal of ongoing SMEs focused work in this area which is being led by Judith Donovan.
	(9.2.4) Madge Moore stated that as colleges face mounting financial difficulties, it could adversely impact upon the work on VQs. She mentioned that Lantra are working with Landex, as Lord Mandelson’s strategy does not cover our sector; we must lobby otherwise the funding to the industry will be cut. Judith Donovan suggested that members should lobby new MPs - she has already done so in her own area – and advised this should be done now, before the MPs get too busy.
	(9.2.5) The Chair thanked members for attending the meeting and for their contributions towards the AIAC plan of work.
	Action: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ➤ Michael Britten to report to the Committee on the NFU stance on managing the risks around belly clipping.
10	Summary of Actions
	(1) Chris Kaufman to continue to pursue McDonald’s for a response.
	(2) Judith Donovan to raise with McDonald’s and to approach the IPA to enlist their support.

Item No	Description
(3)	Members to register any views and feedback on the Sustainable Use Directive.
(4)	Committee members to forward any views or concerns about Amenities and Landscaping to the Sub Working Group.
(5)	Chris McCann to be asked to include the procurement of contractors on the agenda for discussion at the Ethical Conference.
(6)	Rachel to discuss statistical data with David Coackley.
(7)	Committee members to consider how they can help to promote the campaign.
(8)	Rachel and Helen to note Charlie's offer of support in developing the promise partner page of the website.
(9)	Helen Coupland to circulate a timetable of when the materials would be ready.
(10)	Campaign team to draft membership criteria for consideration.
(11)	Graeme Walker, Jill Wakefield and Rachel Corbridge to follow up any offers of help.
(12)	David Knowles to check availability of IOSH venue.
(13)	Alan Plom to identify and determine suitability of potential venues.
(14)	Chair and team to agree date and venue for June meeting.
(15)	Michael Britten to report to the Committee on the NFU stance on managing the risks around belly clipping.