

**HSC/E AGRICULTURAL INDUSTRY ADVISORY COMMITTEE (AIAC)
+ DEPARTMENT FOR TRANSPORT**

AGRICULTURAL TRANSPORT WORKSHOP - 'SAFE ON-ROAD / OFF-ROAD'

Report on workshop held at Stoneleigh Park, Warwickshire, 15 November 2007

Attendees

Alan.Plom (HSE – Chair) Alan Mendelson (JCB) Andy Scarlett (Scarlett Research Ltd) Carol.Grainger (HSE) Dave Beswick (Office of Rail Regulation ORR) David Knowles (ADAS) David.Owen (Lantra Awards) David Whitmarsh (ORR) Gary Crockford (DfT) Graham Howling (AEA) Hannah Moule (NFU) Howard Pullen (BAGMA) Ian Beeby (Unite/TGWU) Ian Jewitt (NFU Mutual)	Iain Knight (Transport Research Laboratory) Jamie Smart (NFU Scotland) Jill Hewitt (NAAC) Ken Hardgrave (AIC) Keith Christian (BAGMA) Marcus Themans (NFU) Michael Britten (NFU) Mike Simpson (NAAC) Richard Gard (R Gard Associates) Roger Lane-Nott (AEA) Steve Gillingham (DfT) Tony Mitchell (HSE)
--	--

Apologies

Adam Wyatt (BAGMA), Chris Brown (Easton College), Lawrence Thatcher and Rob Haggart (DfT), Nigel Davy (Safety Consultant/FISHNet), Roger Nourish (HSE).

1. Welcome and Introduction

1.1 Alan Plom (Head of Safety Section, HSE Agriculture & Food Sector) explained this was the fourth AIAC Transport Project Group workshop held since the Group was set up in 2005. This was a unique event, being run jointly with (and sponsored by) the Department for Transport (DfT) under the theme “Safe on road / safe off road”, and had brought together a wide range of stakeholders.

1.2 The main aim was to update delegates and interested organisations on recent developments in research, legislation and technology/equipment, and to identify possible options for the industry and regulators to respond to the findings. It was also intended to share information on current activities and to identify topics and opportunities for further cooperative work, eg guidance, publicity and research.

1.3 The findings of the joint HSE/DfT sponsored study by BAGMA into “Condition of Farm Vehicles” and a preliminary report on the follow-up research being carried

out by Scarlett Research on tractor/trailer braking systems (sponsored jointly by HSE, DfT and the Agricultural Engineers Association, with input from manufacturers of tractors, trailers and trailed equipment) were a main focus. Other topics included reviews of accidents on and off road - to put accidents involving agricultural vehicles into context - and progress reports on other research, including HSE's Whole Body Vibration research and the ongoing study of safety at rail crossings, being carried out by HM Railway Inspectorate/Office of Rail Regulator.

ACTION – HSE to make all papers presented are to be made available on the HSE AIAC Transport Group webpage
<http://www.hse.gov.uk/aboutus/hsc/iacs/aiac/transport.htm>

2. AGRICULTURAL VEHICLE SAFETY ON-ROAD

2.1.1 Setting the Scene and Future Priorities

Steve Gillingham (Head of Commercial Vehicles and Regulation, Transport Technology and Standards, DfT) welcomed this opportunity to bring the various interests together to identify problems and resolve issues. The Government has set Road Safety Targets for 2010 and DfT had received correspondence about safety of agricultural vehicles on the road. Although there were relatively few fatalities compared with other vehicles, DfT had commissioned TRL to review the latest statistics, to identify and prioritise areas they could address to further reduce casualties on the road.

2.1.2 Positioning Agricultural Vehicle Safety in the context of all accidents involving large vehicles

Iain Knight summarised TRL's detailed analysis of the UK Accidents and Casualties Database between 2003-05 (based on the 'Stats 19' police investigation reports).

Fatalities involving ag vehicles on the road remain fairly low and constant in UK at around 30/yr. This is comparable with the 14 other European States who contribute to the EU 'CARE' stats (although there may be some inconsistencies in reporting and recording accidents/injuries).

To put road accidents involving agricultural equipment into perspective they had compared the cost with accidents involving other vehicles, by applying a standard 'Casualty Prevention Value' (CPV), ie the value of preventing 'KSI' (Killed and Seriously Injured) accidents. This value reflects lost output, insurance costs but takes account of the public's 'willingness to pay'.

The most common KSI accidents/highest CPV related to agriculture involved occupants of cars in collision with agricultural vehicles. But of the 244 'casualty groups', these were 47th in the list (at a CPV of £20.7m). Motorcyclists involved in

collisions with ag vehicles were 67th (£13.7m) and ag vehicles alone 69th (£11.5m).

Although the overall CPV of accidents involving ag vehicles was relatively low compared with the highest CPV of £354.3m (HGV/car collisions), and the second highest at £195.4m, attempts to reduce them could still show a potential 'good rate of return', in terms of CPV/accident ratio.

We need to identify where we should focus our efforts. Casualty severity differed notably to other 'typical' accidents involving HGVs. A higher proportion of motor cyclists are killed in accidents involving ag vehicles (particularly due to offside collisions). Serious injuries to car occupants are also higher as are the number of ag vehicles which overturn in road accidents (emphasising the value of wearing seat belts). The behaviour of drivers of the non-ag vehicles involved was also considered to be a significant factor. 10 of 29 accidents studied involved defective ag vehicles, 4 of which related to brakes. This is consistent with VOSA's findings on road checks.

In conclusion, ag vehicle accidents are a lower priority than preventing HGV/LGV accidents, but counter-measures could still be cost-effective, eg preventing injuries to people in cars and motor-cyclists colliding with ag vehicles (particularly when turning right), and the value of ROPS and wearing seat belts on tractors is evident. Defective brakes would be more of a problem as speed increases. However, we need to know prevalence/road distance travelled by different types of vehicle to draw more accurate conclusions and recommendations.

2.1.2 Study of Tractor Accidents on Rural Roads

Richard Gard updated members on his long-running study of road accidents. He had also analysed the Stats19 police reports over a rolling 6-year period (the latest available being up to 2005), from which he had identified 4840 accidents involving ag vehicles and 6766 casualties. He had also collected news cuttings/reports of road accidents involving agricultural equipment, nationally. These also identified non-injury accidents and often highlighted other causative factors.

There is a peak in the summer (due to transport during harvest). The prevalence and severity of 'turning right' accidents and tractor overturns due to skidding and jack-knifing of tractor/trailer combinations, eg caused by rear-end shunts, were highlighted. Disconnection of trailers was also significant, caused by worn or defective couplings.

A detailed analysis was presented in the slides, available on the HSE AIAC Transport Group webpage. His main conclusions and recommendations included:

- Journey planning - to avoid dual carriageways right turns.
- Improving security of towing linkages.
- Improved warning/recognition that ag vehicles are moving slowly.
- Investigation of why so many tractors overturn in accidents.

- Reduce injuries to tractor drivers – seat belt anchorages, drivers impact with control boxes etc in cabs.
- Wearing seat belts!

Discussion and Summary - These presentations concentrated on tractor/trailer accidents and tried to draw conclusions from a limited amount of data. The largest number of accidents involved agricultural vehicles ‘turning right’ and ‘going ahead’. Higher speeds could have an adverse effect on vehicle safety, resulting in more skidding and jack-knifing incidents where vehicle occupants can be ejected from the vehicle. Also ABS was seen as a useful counter measure to the safety risks of a growth in high speed tractors. Some recommendations might mitigate injuries but not necessarily solve the problem. Steve Gillingham concluded that this work indicated what factors need to be considered and could be done, if it was decided to be important.

2.2 Operational Condition of Agricultural Vehicles

2.2.1 Evaluation of Agricultural Vehicle Condition

Keith Christian summarised the findings of the BAGMA study carried out in 2006 by his predecessor and outlined the maintenance and testing services offered by BAGMA dealers. The study of on-farm vehicle condition funded jointly by DfT and HSE had confirmed the high number of defects found in tractors and trailed appliances.

242 inspections were carried out by trained examiners from BAGMA dealers across the country, using the BAGMA Vehicle Health Check Scheme (VHCS) 80-point check list. Of the 242 vehicles inspected, 166 had ‘faults’, ie 68% of tractors and 47% of trailers. These included inadequate/poorly maintained brakes on tractors (x%) and trailers (y%), defective tyres (z%), together with a wide range of other defects affecting the safe operation of the vehicle on and off-road.

The size of the sample is statistically significant and was consistent with other studies. These include a small scale study by DfT in 1997 involving 32 tractors (66% failure rate) and VOSA roadside checks in 2005-06 (60% found not to comply and 45% of which were considered not roadworthy, and were taken off the road). The full report is on HSE’s website <http://www.hse.gov.uk/research/rrhtm/rr554.htm>

BAGMA dealers are equipped to carry out tractor braking system efficiency tests, although during the 1-hour inspections for the study it was not always practicable to carry these out. However, although most of the tractors tested were found to comply with the minimum 25% braking efficiency standard, 56% of the 71 ‘trailed appliances’ tested were found not fit for on-highway use (mostly defective hydraulic hoses, then brake lights not working).

Keith outlined the relevant legal requirements, in particular the Provision and Use of Work Equipment Regulations 1998 (PUWER) and Construction and Use Regs 1986. He suggested that the existing voluntary Vehicle Health Check Scheme

offered and operated by BAGMA members provided a readily available and immediate means for the industry to improve standards and ensure compliance. He concluded that raising awareness of the requirements under current legislation and encouraging wider take-up of the VHCS by farmers would in turn help to demonstrate to regulators that action was being taken by the industry to ensure vehicles were properly maintained, and avoid the introduction of a mandatory 'MoT'-type scheme. This might also have a bearing on insurance. This is also a big issue for the amenity/groundcare sector.

The VHCS leaflet and check list is available free on the BAGMA website [http://www.bagma.com/vehicle_health_check_scheme.htm].

2.2.2 In-service Assessment of Agricultural Trailer and Trailed Appliance Braking Systems Condition and Performance

Andy Scarlett gave a preliminary report on his work on the in-service assessment of trailer and trailed appliance braking systems. This research is being jointly funded by DfT, HSE and the AEA, with support from manufacturers.

Brakes are considered to be a 'fit and forget' item, not important until you need them to stop! The increasing use of higher speed tractors, combined with increased weight of tractor/trailer combinations has outstripped the capacity of conventional braking systems and standards. Increased power and trailer capacity has meant that gross weights of 25-30 tonnes and speeds in excess of 40kph/25mph are common. UK is out of step with practice in Europe and the industry is lobbying to increase permitted road speeds to 50, even 60kph.

The current 25% braking efficiency standard assuming a road speed limit of 20mph/32kph is therefore insufficient. They should be rated at 50% to match current tractors but 'ag-spec' trailer braking systems are inadequate, increasing the risk of accidents and causing excessive wear and failure of tractor brakes (demonstrated by the significant increase in warranty claims reported by tractor manufacturers).

The new European legislation being introduced in 2010/11 would require an increase to 50% efficiency and failsafe brakes to be fitted, which operate when the tractor handbrake is applied. However, this will only apply to new equipment and existing trailers could continue to be used for 10 years. Trailers typically remain in service for 15-20 years, which together with the lack of maintenance, will further increase the risk of accidents.

We need to identify the extent of the problem and produce practical guidance. The recent BAGMA study did not assess trailer braking efficiency and his current research was looking at existing systems, to identify what can be done practically and realistically (cost-effectively) to improve/upgrade existing equipment, to enable it to be operated safely. He is also looking at the improvements that can be achieved through servicing, and would produce a series of case studies. However, the industry needs to be alerted to the requirements and the benefits of fitting

commercial standard 'high speed' trailer braking systems, to encourage these to be retrofitted. Such systems are designed with bigger drum pads and are able to dissipate heat quickly, increasing braking capacity and efficiency, and last longer..

He envisaged launching his provisional findings at an Institution of Agricultural Engineers Conference proposed in March 2008, together with a publicity campaign aimed at manufacturers, farmers and contractors during summer/autumn 2008.

Discussion and Summary – This proposal was fully supported by delegates who expressed their concerns about increasing operation of overweight combinations on the road, and an apparent lack of knowledge of the requirements/limits. With the effectiveness of existing braking systems for trailers and trailed appliances called into question and with the legal requirements likely to become more stringent in the future, it would be prudent for operators to ensure their trailers/trailed appliances are fitted with commercial vehicle braking systems. This complemented a key message from the TRL/Richard Gard research on the problems with skidding and jack-knifing of tractor/trailer combinations. This suggests that with current braking systems, skidding and jack-knifing are likely to occur more often if tractors travel at speeds of more than 20mph, particularly given the high gross weights being operated.

ACTION – **Members** to receive details of the IAgRE Transport Conference asap, and publicise the event through their networks.

2.2.3 What Next? A Tractor Testing Scheme?

Roger Lane-Nott (AEA) gave the manufacturer's perspective. He had also discussed this with RoSPA. Although this issue currently seems to be a lower priority for Government, the industry can and should do more. The AEA advocated establishing a National Tractor Testing Scheme (NTTS), preferably run through the dealer network. This was based on the success of the AEA's Sprayer Testing Scheme. It would enable tractors and other self-propelled farm equipment which has been 'tested' and complied with relevant legislation to be recorded on a freely-available national web-based register.

He saw this as a way to stave off statutory 'MoTs' for tractors. and saw possible (financial) benefits to the industry, eg through enabling faster road speeds, supporting farm assurance schemes, reducing insurance premiums, etc. He estimated the cost to be ~£100/2hr test, possibly annual but could be every 2-3 years, depending on what the industry wanted. AEA member manufacturers support this proposal in principle and the AEA proposed a seminar with other interested parties be held early in 2008 to progress this.

Discussion and Summary - This option was keenly debated by delegates. There were some calls for the introduction of an annual 'MOT' type test but others saw difficulties. BAGMA suggested that the building blocks for such a scheme are already in place and could be taken up by industry through the VHCS 'code of practice'. The NFU wanted to avoid a statutory 'MoT' system or taxation but were

concerned about the cost implications. They also proposed to hold a meeting for all interested parties to discuss their proposed guidance early in January 2008.

ACTIONS – AEA and NFU to organize their respective meetings in Jan/Feb 2008 and invite relevant stakeholders.

3. AGRICULTURAL VEHICLE OFF-ROAD SAFETY

3.1 Review of HSE Transport Programme/Projects, latest statistics and information

Tony Mitchell (HSE Agriculture and Food Sector) outlined the current position on HSE's Projects and publicity campaigns, presented the latest available agriculture-related injury statistics and other available information. Transport accidents cause ~one third of all ag fatalities and between 2001 and 2006 there had been 74 transport-related deaths, with a further 14 so far in 2007/08, (compared with 4 or 5 in 2006/07).

A total of 597 transport-related accidents had been reported during this period, including the 74 fatalities + 284 major injuries and 239 'over 3 day' injuries. However, it was difficult to discern any trends from the relatively low number of incidents reported. (Nb. there is significant under-reporting of injuries under RIDDOR by farmers. Based on accident analysis across industries, major injuries might be expected to be 10-20x the fatal figure, and 3-day injuries up to 200x more).

HSE was not now committing field resource to joint roadside check inspections with VOSA. These had generated a high number of enforcement notices and attracted media attention. Steve Gillingham said that discussions were ongoing with VOSA about future resourcing/initiatives. He and other delegates expressed their disappointment as these were considered to be good 'value for money', in raising the profile nationally and locally.

The Agriculture Sector was raising awareness through articles in the farming press. HSE was currently concentrating on falls from vehicles, eg vehicles delivering to and from farms, safe access to/from vehicles, carrying passengers in unsafe positions, etc. Further information and publicity material is available on the Transport pages on HSE's website, as well as the Agriculture webpages.

3.2 Whole body vibration – Research update

Andy Scarlett presented a brief summary on his project sponsored by HSE. He had now completed his measurements of the range of operations identified as potentially causing high exposure levels. It was intended to summarise and publish this in HSE guidance for the industry.

3.3 Safety at railway crossings - Review of research and accidents involving farm vehicles

David Whitmarsh (HM Railways Inspectorate/Office of Rail Regulation) described their efforts to improve safety at 'user-worked' (or 'occupation') road/rail crossings ('UWCs'), although in some areas these have become more widely used by the public. The user decides when to cross, but is often required to contact the local signaller. This is particularly important and on some lines trains can be travelling at up to 125 mph. However, there is evidence of bad practice and ignoring the basic precautions.

There are between 3k to 3.5k UWCs, ~44% of all crossings and mostly owned by Network Rail. This type of crossing generates the highest 'collision rate' per vehicle traverse between trains and road vehicles and there have been incidents involving ag vehicles or vehicles connected with farming operations, eg the multiple deaths and injuries in a minibus carrying migrant gang labourers, hit by a High Speed Train (HST) in 2003. In view of the potential for very serious accidents, ORR are looking into current 'user' practices and standards of crossings (suitability for vehicles currently using such crossings, visibility, etc).

The 3 categories of crossings and their different levels of precautions were described. ORR were interviewing farmers and other users (such as utility companies, etc) as well as Network Rail and local signallers. They were collecting information on farmer's risk assessments (R/As), systems of work and practices, particularly in areas where there has been a history of abuse or accidents. They have found patchy recognition of users responsibilities under HSWA and this hazard is often omitted from R/As. Their findings are being fed in to Network Rail in April 2008 and an inspection/enforcement campaign will start in 2008/09.

ORR intended to initiate an education/publicity campaign to raise the profile and emphasise good practice. ORR has already discussed this with NFU-Mutual and publicised the issue at the Royal Welsh Show in 2007. They were looking for publicity through other routes, such as trade bodies, Machinery Rings, etc.

Discussion and Summary – Delegates agreed a key issue was provision of adequate warning time for crossing users, particularly as equipment is getting higher and longer so crossing times are increasing. This is also affected by the sight-line, speed of approach and poor lighting on some trains. Some older crossings were not suitable for modern machinery and gates were awkward to open. Language is also an issue, and misunderstandings have occurred between vehicle drivers and signallers.

ACTIONS - Members agreed to support ORR and give this issue more publicity, eg in Newsletters, e-bulletins, etc. The ORR presentation (available on the AIAC Transport website) may be used freely. M Britten (NFU) will be highlighting these issues at a meeting of Rail Engineers in Feb 2008.

4. REVIEW OF MORNING SESSION

Outstanding questions/ issues arising were discussed. These mainly revolved around the BAGMA study and the proposal for a NTTS.

BAGMA Study - AEA called for more information to expand and build on the small-scale of the BAGMA study. The NFU had also been critical of the sample size. Tony Mitchell explained that the study was statistically significant – more than some widely quoted ‘cancer’ studies. It had confirmed what we suspected and the industry was ‘not surprised’ by the findings. Therefore HSE could not justify supporting a similar exercise.

Tony emphasized that although some had highlighted that many of the 68% of failures involved less significant defects which some may not consider to be ‘dangerous’ or cause vehicles to be ‘unroadworthy’, this was a red herring. Such faults as dirty windows, broken mirrors, etc had been highlighted, but these all have their part to play in improving visibility.

It was important to focus on the fact that the study had identified significant fundamental defects were not uncommon, such as the handbrake not working on 12% of vehicles inspected - i.e. 1:8 could not hold themselves stationary, let alone the (unloaded) trailers they would have been towing! In 2005-06 4 of the transport-related deaths on farms look like an unused/defective hand-brake was a significant causal factor.

The TRL study had also confirmed that defective brakes were a contributory factor in 40% of the road accidents analysed and VOSA had issued prohibitions on 40% of vehicles stopped. We now need to find solutions and raise awareness. Andy Scarlett’s work will also contribute more useful information on tractor/trailer braking.

NTTS - Jill Hewitt and others were concerned that an ‘MoT’-type test only provided an indicator at a moment in time. Vehicles were subject to wear and tear and the faults highlighted by the research were really ‘management’ issues. Marcus Themans also pointed out that it was impossible to test the myriad of tractor/appliance combinations used on each farm.

Alan Plom referred to the new requirement for Government departments to carry out a ‘Business Impact Assessment’ for any new proposed policy. The current figure for a detailed assessment to require formal approval is £5mill/year cost to the industry/UK plc. Keith Christian summarised the likely technical staff and equipment resources needed to service such a scheme. He estimated it would probably cost approx £3k/dealership.

Roger Lane-Nott remained convinced there is still a role for a national testing scheme, and the AEA would continue to pursue this, in discussion with the industry. He asked how regulators could ensure safe vehicles are on the road, without requiring at least a simple annual check. Steve Gillingham responded that this proposal raised various questions, eg provision of adequate facilities and

equipment to carry out the tests, encouraging vehicles to travel on the road to attend test centres, and how a voluntary testing scheme would be funded and maintained.

Other issues - Other areas suggested by members for manufacturers and regulators to consider included the colour and lighting on tractors and fitting side-deflectors and extra lighting on trailers. However, these would not be an easy/quick fix, as it related to product branding and would need to be raised and resolved through European and International Standards.

ACTIONS – **Members** agreed that in the short term we need to focus on encouraging behavioural change and promote use of the VHCS. Roger Lane-Nott reported that the AEA would be convening their meeting to discuss the NTTS and had also set up a Trailer Manufacturer's Group, where these matters would be discussed.

5. DEVELOPMENT OF DESIGN AND CONSTRUCTION STANDARDS

5.1 EC Braking research and status of proposals

Iain Knight (TRL) highlighted the current compatibility issues between tractors and trailed appliances. There would be improvements such as auto braking of trailers if detached and although the new Directive will be a massive step forward, it will not solve the problems in the short term. However, many manufacturers already offered higher spec equipment and it is down to the industry to recognize the benefits and purchase these.

The TRL report had already been considered and discussed by some Member States. Some countries disagreed and others wanted specific regulations asap. The findings would now be discussed at the next EC Technical Progress Meeting. Andy Scarlett considered that the TRL report was balanced and sensible. Hydraulic systems can still perform adequately and 2 line systems are now 'standard' anyway. Together with manufacturers, they were looking at enabling compatibility with old systems.

5.2 OECD Tractor Codes development (ROPS)

Andy Scarlett reported on recent developments on discussions on Operator protection zones and structural integrity of ROPS. This followed a report of a catastrophic failure of a ROPS involved in a multiple overturn. There were concerns within OECD about the standard OECD test criteria now being inadequate to cope with the increasing weight of tractors (and the equipment and ballast carried on them). Original test was based on 4t unladen mass, but tractors now typically weigh 7.5t and carry 2.5t in mounted machines. OECD had called for further information and research on accidents. They would report back in summer 2008.

6. REVIEW OF MEMBERS ACTIVITIES

6.1 NFU Transport Guidance

Hannah Moule (the new Transport Advisor at NFU) confirmed that the NFU would advocate support for the VHCS and she reiterated NFU members' concerns about the practicality and costs of a national testing scheme. They also objected to any link with Farm Assurance schemes

She updated members on progress with the proposed guidance for farmers, started by her predecessor (Alex Dinsdale). This is intended to be industry-led, be comprehensive yet practical, in one document, in a simple format, without detailed quotes from legislation. It will cover the mechanical condition of vehicles and outline weight and width limits for use on the road. A number of delegates had commented on the draft and she proposed to convene a small working group asap with a limited number of interested parties (max 10) to progress this.

Marcus Themans added that the NFU also intended to incorporate key points in relevant sector Business Guides

Steve Gillingham welcomed this development and recalled that DfT had been asked to produce revised guidance at previous meetings. Gary Crockford reported that he had been working on this and handed out copies of the current draft. There was some discussion about format and content, and its suitability for the industry. It was accepted that the style, language and terminology used may need to be different in guidance from DfT but members hoped that it would still be understandable to farmers.

Tony Mitchell reminded members of the 2 detailed existing publications on this. He advised possibly using the Q & A format, favouring the style of the original Agricultural Training Board guidance booklet "Transport on the Road" for farmers purposes. This was written in a very simplistic style, yet contained all the key points, using illustrations.

Alan Mendelson (JCB) referred to a booklet JCB are producing to go out in their vehicles. This would summarise relevant requirements, and was intended to help operators counter any challenges on the legality of their machine if/when stopped on the road.

Alan Mendelson also suggested that the manufacturers would probably be willing to endorse the DfT guidance (perhaps through the AEA), and may wish to print their own copies of it for their clients.

Andy Scarlett pointed out that the difficulty will be explaining the current (1986) regulations which have fallen behind the technical developments and custom and practice within the industry. NFU could not advocate use of illegal practices!

Ian Beeby pointed out that he was aware of vehicles being operated illegally on motorways and on other roads. It was clear that the Police do not understand the rules either. It should also not be forgotten that the average reading age is quite low. We must not forget that we need to educate workers as well as employers. Guidance is needed for young students/new entrants and migrant workers too, so they know the requirements on them, know their rights and where they stand.

ACTION – NFU to convene the Transport Guidance Working Group, asap.
Members agreed to comment to Gary Crockford on the draft DfT guidance and **Tony Mitchell** to supply copy of the original ATB guidance booklet.

6.2 DfT Guidance on Transport Legislation

See DfT response and agreed actions above.

6.3 Economic Impact

Alan Plom had referred earlier in the meeting to the new requirement to carry out a Business Impact Assessment for new proposals. He also pointed out the Group had still not delivered and collated information on the cost of accidents or case studies, for publicity purposes. The NFU-Mutual were initially willing but there were concerns over disclosability of personal information and publicising cases that could be identified. Permission would be needed. This would have to be carried over.

Alan pointed out that Ken Hardgrave had supplied some useful information on accidents within his company. It can be anonymous and generic. Richard Gard thought that some of his information might be suitable, if some cost data could be applied. Marcus Themans bemoaned the loss of HSE's Annual Fatal Injuries in Agriculture Report. This was used at NFU Committee meetings to highlight typical accidents.

ACTION – HSE/NFU-Mutual: Alan Plom to discuss with Ian Jewitt.
All members to review their available information for possible case studies.

6.4 HSE Insurance Industry Initiative

Unfortunately, Roger Nourish (Head of Agriculture & Food Sector, HSE) who is leading on this initiative could not attend. Alan Plom outlined the work HSE/Ag Sector has been doing with CMi developing a model for insurers based on HSE's CD-based self-assessment tool for farmers. It was hoped this would form the basis for risk-assessed under-writing, which in turn enable insurers to reflect good vs poor management of risks in their premiums.

7. REVIEW/FEEDBACK & SUMMARY OF ACTIONS

Alan Plom concluded the meeting by noting (from the positive comments of all attending) that this Workshop had been successful. It had brought a wider range of organisations and interests together, and several significant outcomes and other actions were planned. These included:

1. Transport conference proposed by I Agr E in Spring 2008 [“Agricultural Transport – Which Way Forward”, to be held on 12 March 2008 at East of England Showground, Peterborough <http://www.iagre.org/agtransconf.shtml>] ;
2. Guidance on “Use of Agricultural Tractors on Public Roads” being produced by DfT – Members to comment to Gary Crockford on the draft DfT guidance and Tony Mitchell to supply copy of the original ATB guidance booklet;
3. Transport guide being collated by NFU – NFU to convene the Transport Guidance Working Group. [Meeting planned in January 2008.];
4. Publicity/Communications - Members to focus on encouraging behavioural change using information contained in presentations available on HSE AIAC webpage <http://www.hse.gov.uk/aboutus/hsc/iacs/aiac/transport.htm> .
5. Members to promote use of the Vehicle Health Check Scheme http://www.bagma.com/vehicle_health_check_scheme.htm
6. Members to publicise rail crossing safety through newsletters etc, using info from ORR’s presentation. [M Britten (NFU) will be highlighting these issues at a meeting of Rail Engineers in Feb 2008.]
7. AEA to convene meeting to discuss Tractor Testing Scheme

In view of the restricted time left, HSE would review progress on any other proposed actions and matters arising from previous AIAC Workshops to ensure that these have been/are being dealt with.

Future of the AIAC Project Group - There was general consensus that the AIAC Transport Project Group should continue to meet on an ad-hoc basis, to discuss emerging issues and themes - at least annually. All members would continue to liaise meanwhile.

ALAN PLOM
HSE Agriculture & Food Sector
Alan.plom@hse/gsi.gov.uk