

Health and Safety Executive Board Paper		HSE/07/78	
Meeting Date:	1 August 2007	FOI Status:	Fully Open
Type of Paper:	Above the line	Paper File Ref:	
Exemptions:	None		

HEALTH AND SAFETY EXECUTIVE

The HSE Board

Communications: Update on Quarter 1 2007/8 and implications for remainder of the year

A paper by Shelagh Molloy
Vinny Kenny

Advisor(s): John Lack
Cleared by Colin Douglas on [20] July 2007

Issue

1. Quarter 1 spend; and options for responding to an expected underspend over the year.

Timing

2. Decisions on any new campaign activity in 2007/8 need to be made now to allow adequate planning and gearing up of stakeholders.

Recommendation

3. The Board to note latest allocations to Programmes/Divisions; and decide whether expected underspend should be spent on communications activity – and if so, on which topics – or surrendered.

Background

4. The Board considered provisional allocations between programmes/divisions of the £8.7m communications budget at their 6 December meeting [B/06/114]. Those allocations were adjusted once communications plans were received and teams were notified of their revised allocations in May 2007 (see Table 1 attached).

Main changes to allocations

5. The Board wanted to approve changes of £100K plus. So far the two changes on this scale have both been budget reductions. Campaign activity is on a much more modest scale than we predicted last December:
 - a. Better Backs – an allocation of £2,270K has been reduced to £250K; this reflects a Fit3 decision to run sector based 'prevention' initiatives to reduce manual handling rather than a wide reach advertising campaign to reduce working days lost.
 - b. Workplace Transport / Moving Goods Safely – a decision to focus on manufacturers, suppliers and site owners rather than drivers has reduced estimated campaign costs from £1.5m to £900K.
6. Other small scale changes reflect changed activity plans: small increases to the Disease Reduction and Noise Programmes, support of an LGA/LACORS award instead of Business in the Community Award (£15K instead of £30K); and £6K for Fit3 programme activity. Changes in corporate communications simply reflect new accounting headings.

Likely / possible further changes to allocations

7. Other bids in the pipeline are awaiting firmer cost estimates, more information and/or sign off before we reallocate budget. These are for:
 - a. a FOD telephone advice line project – current estimate of £20K

- b. filmed Ministerial messaging for LA-HSE regional conferences - £15K
- c. advertising for Gas registration body contract tender exercise - £5K

Quarter 1 (April – June) 2007/8 spend

8. At 30 June, of total spend and recorded commitments of £1,254K, £406K was spend. Communications activity has always been slow in the first part of the financial year and in this period new factors suppressed spend: some was brought forward to 2006/7 and we had a COI advertising rebate of £104K in April. But a 14% spend/commitment in Quarter 1 is cause for concern.
9. Staffing resources over the rest of the year will be increasingly stretched and even allowing for customary end year loading it would be unwise to assume a significantly raised level of activity in the second half of the year. We are therefore proposing options which would make cost effective use of currently unallocated cash in the communications budget – some £2,524K at present.

Options for unallocated cash in the budget

10. Options for the Board to consider include:
 - 1 – new topic specific campaign – construction or stress
 - 2 – linked ‘old’ topic specific campaigns
 - 3 – more small scale tactical activity
 - 4 – surrender unallocated £2.5m.
11. **Option 1.** Two candidates for more intensive communications in 2007/8 are construction and stress.
12. **Construction campaign.** Rising construction deaths justify additional resource in this sector and a communications campaign could help raise awareness of risks with targeted audiences. It would add weight to the Secretary of State’s support to a commitment to target hard to reach groups and to Bill Callaghan’s commitment that ‘we’re on the case ‘ against a background of the government announcement to build 3 million new homes.
13. Approximately 70% of construction fatalities are in the smaller sites, typically involving speculative and domestic work, but we would struggle to reach the opportunistic developers responsible who may have little or no industry background. TV advertising or programme sponsoring would be the way forward but a campaign would have to run over an extended period, into 2008-9. Of a total client population of 150 – 240,000 clients, construction division estimate that some 100 – 170,000 are in this domestic market
14. Other targets are more diffuse but a campaign targeting tradesmen (estimated numbers of 1 – 1.5 million) who work on sites and architects/designers (225,000) would be feasible. Skilled tradesmen represented 38% of this year’s construction fatalities. With smart targeting we could get close to these audiences to deliver messages about risks to life (but ahead of market testing there can be no guarantees that we could develop specific messages and a creative approach to overcome attitudinal resistance). Site supervisors (estimated at 60,000) would be a secondary audience.
15. We do not have detailed evaluation evidence from advertising in construction with which to estimate impact but campaigns have generally had a higher impact in construction than elsewhere. For example, a construction specific ad in the 2006 Watch Your Step campaign produced 32% prompted awareness compared to an average 11% across all sectors
16. **Stress product marketing.** Communications activity to prepare the ground for wider HSE activity on stress could add significant impact to new web-based stress products now in development. In fact, without an effective awareness-raising campaign, the return on investment in the new products could be relatively poor. A large scale campaign targeting the private sector across a range of sectors later this year could create demand for the new products and provide the opportunity to assess levels of demand so that our response in

2007/8 meets customer needs. The campaign would highlight large firms representing exemplars in tackling stress, and the business benefits enjoyed – these would be influential in attracting similar large organisations.

17. **Option 2.** An alternative approach would be to maintain momentum from earlier campaigns and deliver a higher profile for health and safety through more continual messaging. We could boost campaigns already planned (workplace transport, MSD, asbestos, hairdressing) with additional activity on slips and trips/ falls.
18. More slips/trips campaign activity could focus on food manufacture/catering/retail. This would provide an earlier opportunity to impact on slips and trips numbers which are not coming down substantially enough to impact on the overall major injury figures by the end of the PSA period. Targeting food manufacture (5,900 employers), catering and hospitality (152,000 employers) and food retail (46,000 employers) would support existing programme plans and help increase impact. These sectors account for some 5 million workers and 3,500 major slips/trips injuries. The campaign would be designed as a prelude to inspection activity in 2008/9.
19. Applying impact rates from the earlier campaign we might expect that by targeting the 204,000 businesses in these sectors we would reach 130,000. Watch Your Step indicated that 13% of employers targeted would claim to plan to or have taken action one month later as a result - 26,520 businesses. With some 'desirable response' bias likely and a very cautious assumption that only half of these actually act, we would expect to achieve action in over 13,000 businesses. This estimate may well be over conservative - the Watch Your Step campaign was not sector specific and we would expect sector specific messages and creative treatments to have greater impact. This rough estimate of action in 13,000 businesses can be set in context of up to 100,000 FOD contacts in a year.
20. A Falls campaign could be run alongside a slips and trips campaign. Latest statistics show that a third of all falls major injuries were among building and plant maintenance workers – some 1029 injuries from among 5 million workers in all in 250,000 companies. Major falls incidents have plateau-ed and further communications will help keep risks back onto the employer and employee radar screen. The 2006 Work at Height campaign saw 11% of employers claiming action. If we halve this (again, to allow for a 'desirable response' bias in results) we would expect 13,750 businesses to take some action.
21. The Don't Chance it, Change it strap line would link messages about disparate risks to give coherence to a wide variety of risk messages aimed at different audiences.
22. **Option 3.** Invited to consider options for further spending, Fit3 programme teams have come up with new proposals, often for small scale one off events/publications/evaluation research. It is not clear whether or not staffing resource is available to deliver more activity of this kind, why some of it was not included in original plans, and whether some of it is consistent with priorities. Although the activity is mainly tactical rather than strategic, if the staffing resource is available we might be able to spend more of the budget – perhaps up to £200K – on additional small scale activity. This would still leave a large amount of unallocated cash to return to the centre.
23. In all cases we could scale activity up or down to adjust to different cash sums that might be available. But timing is critical – decisions are needed now to run activity in this financial year.
24. **Option 4.** The Board may prefer to take back the unallocated sums to the centre. It is for PFPD to advise whether pressures elsewhere on the budget make this an option to consider.

Consultation

25. CDS, Fit3, Construction, Vivienne Dews, PFPD

Presentation

26. Internal scepticism about communications spend makes the decision to spend money on additional campaigning a sensitive one. We shall need to explain any decision to extend planned campaigning and demonstrate how it can add value to other HSE activity.

Costs and Benefits

27. N/A

Financial/Resource Implications for HSE

28. We have not provided an end-year forecast spend profile for programmes/directorates but will do so for the next update in Autumn after a September review with teams.

Environmental Implications

29. N/A

Other Implications

30. N/A

Action

31. Board to decide whether or not expected underspend in Communications budget should be surrendered to the centre or reallocated; and if reallocated, how it should be spent.

Allocations and spend to programmes/directorates for 2007/8 at 30 June 2007

	<i>May 2007 allocation £000s</i>	<i>30 June allocation £000s</i>	<i>30 June total spend /commitments £000s</i>
Fit 3			
Agriculture	200	200	23
Construction	455	480	71
Disease Reduction: skin, asbestos, resp disease/MVR; cancer.	514	525	37
Fit3 Strategic Programme	0	6	0
Managing sickness absence	30	30	0.5
Manufacturing	50	50	12
MSD Backs inc campaign	2,270	250	2
Noise & Vibration	80	83	0
Slips & Trips	100	100	9
Public sector/Stress	435	435	126
Workplace Transport	950	900	6
Major Hazards			
HID	137	137	10
ND	120	121	9
Strategic Programme	160	160	12
Operational/cross cutting			
FOD	245	245	17
Business Involvement	46	46	4
Enforcement Programme	10	10	0
Local Authority	60	60	0.5
Worker Involvement	5	5	0
Policy and Corporate			
Contracted out work	150	150	11
Audience/corporate messaging / TV fillers	120	140	4
Awards	30	15	0
Diversity	10	10	0
Media/GNN	810	829	782
Management information/research	177	177	22
Publications (non-priced)	400	400	81
Stakeholder Engagement / events	170	170	52
Policy/Health Work and Wellbeing	100	100	0
International Unit	0	0	0.2
Strategy	0	0	1
Web Development	410	410	81
Comms budget unallocated	524	2524	0
Comms rebates			-120
Total	8768	8768	1229