Purpose
1. To provide an overview for the Board on the work HSE does in the agriculture sector and in particular, to provide an update on progress since May 2009 (Board paper 09/40) with the Board’s Agriculture Revisited initiative.

Background
2. Approximately 530,000 people work in agriculture (Source: Defra Census 2008) which includes a range of sectors including, arable, dairy, livestock and mixed farming, the growing of fruit and vegetables, arboriculture, forestry, production horticulture, agricultural and animal husbandry services. The wider land based sector includes amenity management and landscaping, animal care, aquaculture, environmental conservation etc. Employment data is unreliable but these sectors probably employ at least another 100,000 people.

3. There has been a gradual decline in the level of employment in agriculture over many years. At the same time, the self employed population has increased relative to the employed population. Agriculture is further characterised by small and medium sized businesses and in particular micro-businesses and by an ageing workforce. It is also unique in having to deal with the presence both of children and members of the public on farms; the recent introduction of public access legislation, promoting greater amenity use of the countryside has focused additional attention on public safety. The use of agency, temporary and migrant working in the industry has been and remains a major factor in the industry. There are few formal management structures with which HSE can engage.

4. Although employment has been declining, the industry has remained a priority for HSE because of its consistently poor fatal injury record. Whilst it represents approximately 1.4% of the workforce, the industry accounts for between 15% and 20% of all reported work related fatalities in Great Britain each year. The main causes of fatal injuries include workplace transport, falls from height, being struck by moving objects and livestock; a profile that has not changed significantly in recent years. The fatal injury incidence rate is the highest of the main industrial sectors including Construction. However it is clear that the health and safety performance of the industry has not generated the same degree of public concern as other industries. This is in marked contrast to the political and public interest in public safety issues associated with the industry including the risk of zoonotic infections e.g. Avian ‘Flu and E. coli O157, the public use of recreational land and the risks from cattle.

5. Forty-two fatalities have been reported in 2009/10 year (up to 12 February 2010); consistent with the average of 45-50 p.a. over the past ten years and counter to the unusual low point in 2008/09. The trend over the past 20 years is presented graphically at Annex 1.
6. The position with non-fatal injuries is obscured by gross under-reporting. It is estimated that only about 26% of accidents to employees and 5% involving the self-employed are reported under the Reporting of Injuries Diseases and Dangerous Occurrences Regulations 1995; making accurate calculation of incidence rates and comparisons with other industries difficult.

7. The industry also has a poor occupational health record. As with other sectors, the statistical base is weak and provides limited intelligence. The Self-reported Work-related Illness (SWI) survey in 2001/02 estimated that ~30,000 people whose current or most recent job in the last eight years was in agriculture, suffered from an illness which they believed was caused or made worse by their job. The latest SWI module included in the annual Labour Force Survey estimated that in 2008/09 between 10,000 and 22,000 people whose current or most recent job in the last year was in agriculture, suffered from an illness which they believed was caused or made worse by their work; i.e. a prevalence rate of between 2,100 and 4,700 per 100,000 people (2.1% to 4.7%).

8. HSE’s involvement with agriculture and the wider land based sector and the existing strategy for tackling accidents and ill health in the industry was set out in HSC Paper 07/60 which included detailed information on activities carried out by both the Agriculture and Food Sector (the Sector) and FOD Divisions. Many of these activities are still continuing but since 2008, priority has been given to the work streams which comprise the Board’s Agriculture Revisited initiative.

9. The Commission’s decision to re-examine and refresh HSE’s strategic approach to agriculture in September 2007 was supported by the independent segmentation exercise carried out by Oxford Strategic Marketing in early 2008. Recommendations on a refreshed programme of work for agriculture were brought forward by Judith Donovan, (Board Champion for Agriculture) in Board paper 08/24. Acknowledging the lack of evidence of a medium-to-long term reduction in the number of reported fatal injuries in agriculture, the paper recommended a simpler, more focused and measurable strategy targeting more clearly and singularly, deaths in farming. The paper concluded that “What has been done was well done. But this now needs a short sharp shock with singularity of purpose. These proposals are meant to build on the best of what went before, whilst developing opportunities to do it differently and hopefully, make a difference.” It also cautioned against seeking “quick wins”.

10. In agreeing to the Agriculture Revisited initiative, the Board was clear that HSE should continue to work with the wider agriculture industry and the land based sector to tackle the poor injury and ill health record. This work led by the Sector in partnership with industry stakeholders and with support from the Field Operations Directorate (FOD) has continued. Further information on these activities can be found at Annex 2.

11. Building on the best of what HSE was already doing, the Agriculture Revisited initiative sought to raise farmers’ awareness and responsiveness to the industry’s fatal injury record through, amongst other things, a direct marketing campaign. Since 2008, the Agriculture Revisited initiative has been the main focus of HSE’s work with
the farming sector. It aims to reduce the consistently high rates of work related fatal injuries in the sector and effect measurable changes in awareness, attitudes and behaviours by:

- Better segmenting and targeting effort and resource to achieve greater impact; and
- Establishing a self-sustainable cultural change within the industry in which everyone has a role by working with a wide range of industry stakeholders.

through the following work streams:

- The “Make the promise” (MTP) communications campaign
- Further development of the farming Safety and Health Awareness Days (SHADs)
- Development of the HSE presence at Agricultural Shows
- Promotion of the uptake of training and vocational qualifications in farming
- Working with the equipment supply and second hand machinery supply chains; and
- Stakeholder mapping and engagement

Argument

12. These work streams directly support the new strategy for health and safety and in particular the objectives of creating healthier, safer workplaces, the need for strong leadership (by the industry stakeholders), building competence and customising support for SMEs.

13. More detailed information on the Agriculture Revisited initiative and the “Make the Promise” Campaign together with an account of progress since May 2009, is set out at Annex 3.

14. HSE’s activity in agriculture is wide ranging. The Agriculture Revisited initiative, and in particular the “Make the Promise” campaign, continue to resonate with the target audiences in this notoriously hard-to-reach industry and to raise awareness of key safety issues.

15. The Board acknowledged that delivery of cultural change in an industry like agriculture is unlikely to be achieved quickly. They recognised the range of work streams involved and the importance of others in the industry joining in to communicate the messages. Extension of Agriculture Revisited beyond 2011 will be dependant upon evidence of progress and HSE’s future financial settlements. The Ipsos Mori evaluation report should be available in the last quarter of 2010/11 and will give evidence, one way of another, of progress.

16. The initiative and in particular the Make the Promise campaign are designed to appeal at an emotional level. Achieving sustainable cultural and behavioural change will take time and relies on the continuing active support of the stakeholders.
17. It is too early to determine the success or otherwise of the Agriculture Revisited initiative and in particular that of the Make the promise campaign. It was agreed at the outset that the Initiative should be evaluated by an independent, retrospective study. Ipsos Mori was appointed by CSAG to carry out this work in January 2010 and will report at the end of March 2011, with interim findings during 2010/11. Further information on the evaluation exercise is set out in Annex 3. Pending the outcomes of the evaluation, HSE will not have the evidence to make decisions about the effectiveness and future direction of the Initiative or whether the current (or any other) mix of interventions is likely to have the greatest impact.

18. The use of direct marketing as an intervention approach is new to HSE. The response rate to the first three phases of the campaign has been very positive; higher than that of direct marketing campaigns run by other government departments and agencies. At a cost of £1.5million in 2009/10 and a budget of ~£1million in 2010/11 it is not cheap and is increasingly open to media and public scrutiny; not least on financial grounds. Following previous analysis, we believe that communications, rather than reliance on inspection and enforcement, is the most effective and cost effective method of intervening with the industry.

19. That having been said, there are a number of learning points which can and should be taken from the Make the Promise campaign; not least in the selection of targets, the identification and use of mailing lists, the early development of appropriate customer relationship management strategies, evaluation and programme management arrangements.

20. Building on the best of what has gone before, informed by the segmentation exercise and applying the previously untried disciplines of direct marketing, the Agriculture Revisited initiative has struck a chord with and generated a supportive consensus amongst the key industry stakeholders. It represents HSE’s best chance of promoting the sort of sustainable cultural and behavioural change required to tackle the industry’s unacceptable fatal injury record.

21. However, HSE’s commitment should not be unconditional. We cannot maintain the momentum of the Make the Promise campaign without the active support of industry stakeholders. They will need to demonstrate more clearly that they are willing and able to take the lead (and responsibility) for promoting the campaign through their memberships. In taking this forward we need to be mindful of and to find ways of aligning with the needs of stakeholders; and in particular of the need to recruit 60,000 new people to the industry by 2015.

Financial/Resource implications for HSE

22. The issue of resources for the Agriculture Revisited initiative was addressed in the May Board paper (09/46). The Agriculture Revisited initiative is operating within the allocated budget and despite significant turnover since last May is now fully staffed. Other work streams are being delivered within the existing resource base.

Actions/Next Steps
23. The Board is invited:
• To note the current range of work being carried out by HSE in agriculture and the wider land based sector
• To note progress with the Agriculture Revisited initiative since May 2009
• To note the increasing level of interest in and with it, a degree of financial scrutiny of, the Make the promise campaign; and
• To agree that the Agriculture Revisited initiative be reviewed before the end of 2010/11 and that the review be informed by the emerging findings of the evaluation being carried out by Ipsos Mori during 2010/11.
• To agree that the aims and objectives of the Make the Promise campaign, cannot be achieved without the active support of the stakeholders and their willingness to progressively take ownership of the campaign.

Paper clearance
24. This paper has been cleared by the SMT at its meeting on 3 March. Judith Donovan has also been consulted.
**Annex 1**

**FATAL INJURY DATA FOR WORKERS IN AGRICULTURE**

**Figure 1**

Rate of fatal injury per 100,000 workers in agriculture

Note: Figure 1 shows that there is no clear trend in the fatality rate in agriculture. The 3 Year moving average rate smoothes out the peaks while still showing there is year on year variability.

**Figure 2**

Worker Fatalities in Agriculture showing best fit plot line

Note:
1. The number of fatalities are plotted against the year. The line shows the best straight line to fit those points, assuming a straight line trend.
2. An increase in the number of fatalities in 2009/10 will reduce the slope of the line, but not the overall direction.
3. Whilst there has been no significant change in the number of workers in the industry in the past 10 years, there has been significant change in the balance between the employed and the self-employed/family farms in favour of the latter groups.
CURRENT HSE ACTIVITY IN AGRICULTURE AND THE LAND BASED SECTORS

Background

1. HSE’s Agriculture Revisited Initiative aims to reduce the level of fatal injury in farming. It does not address the non-fatal injury or occupational health record of agriculture and the wider land based industries.

2. HSE’s strategy for addressing the poor health and safety performance of agriculture has changed over time. For many years, the interventions chosen were based on inspection (including that following an investigation of an accident), communication and stakeholder engagement. More detailed and background information on HSE’s previous strategic approaches to the industry can be found in HSC paper 07/60.

3. Analysis carried out by the Sector in 2003/04 suggested that while HSE’s inspection-based regulatory approach might be effective in larger enterprises and industries with clearly defined management structures, it was neither effective nor cost effective in tackling an industry such as agriculture characterised by micro-businesses, self-employment and family enterprises. This analysis has continued to underpin HSE’s strategic approach to the industry.

FOD Activity

4. Proactive inspection in agriculture has progressively declined in recent years following internal analysis which suggested it was not the most effective intervention approach given the structure of the industry. As a result, on-farm inspection has been largely limited to reactive work (e.g. investigation of accidents and complaints), local campaigns and projects and to a small extent, to following up non-attendees at Safety and Health Awareness Days (SHADs).

5. Given the regional and local importance of agriculture, some Divisions (e.g. Wales and the West and Scotland) have continued to allocate inspector and other operational resource to proactive inspection and to working with industry stakeholders. Proactive work has also been carried out in support of HSE’s developing strategy for tackling the abuses of vulnerable (in particular migrant) workers in agriculture and the fresh produce processing sectors. Inevitably as the balance of intervention has changed from inspection to other intervention approaches, including raising education and awareness (SHADs) and communications activities, operational knowledge and expertise of the industry has diminished.

6. This work has continued and Divisions’ follow standard FOD operational procedures such as those for the selection of accidents for investigation, the revised Complaints Procedure and the annual FOD Plans of Work. FOD HQ advises that in the two year period 2008/09 to 2009/10 (inclusive) activity under the Standard
Industry Classifications for Agriculture and Hunting (01) and Forestry and Logging (02) can be summarised as follows:

- 2632 non fatal injuries to workers and self-employed persons were reported under the Reporting of Injuries, Diseases and Dangerous Occurrences Regulations 1995 (RIDDOR)
- 337 of which were investigated by FOD inspectors
- 753 complaints concerning issues such as working time, the storage and use of agricultural pesticides, gas safety, construction on farm and other general health and safety matters were received and investigated by inspectors or Complaints Officers;
- 231 inspections were carried out within the industry
- 446 Improvement and Prohibition Notices or enforcement notices under the Food and Environment Protection Act 1985 were served; and
- 33 prosecutions were approved with respect to issues in agriculture, fisheries and forestry.

7. Divisions continue to make major contributions year-on-year to the delivery of the programme of SHADs, as they have done since the inception of the agriculture SHAD programme in 1999 and provide the staffing for the HSE stand at national, regional and local agricultural shows. Additionally by way of example, non warranted staff in the Southwest, have been very active in providing advice to farmers - reflecting the shift in the balance from inspection to advice - which aligns well with the Agriculture Revisited Initiative. Divisions also continue to be active in carrying out targeted enforcement action as evidenced by a series of product safety Prohibition Notices served on balers following a recent fatal accident.

**Sector activity**

8. The Agriculture and Food Sector, part of Operational Strategy Division (OPSTD), is heavily involved in delivery of the Agriculture Revisited Initiative which is managed as a programme by the Sector.

9. The unique feature of HSE’s sectors is that they bring together operational experience and policy. Sectors deliver a range of functions including:
   - Gathering intelligence, analysing data and horizon scanning
   - Developing advice and guidance
   - Setting legal and technical standards
   - Providing expert support to operational inspectors and to Policy sections;
   - Developing compliance strategies, targeting resources and monitoring delivery; and
   - Stakeholder engagement – with a gearing effect at industry and national level; and
   - Acting as a portal for stakeholders into HSE

10. Notwithstanding the valuable work delivered by FOD Divisions, the lead on intervention in agriculture and in the wider land based sector in recent years has been led by the Sector. Much of this work covers wide ranging, and often politically sensitive interests and carries reputational risk to HSE and is not targeted under the Agriculture Revisited initiative.
Machinery and process safety

11. The Sector supports statutory, technical and standards work on agricultural plant and machinery and liaises with key organisations and other Departments/Agencies. In 2008/09 for example, the Sector funded research jointly with Department for Transport and manufacturers into tractor trailer braking systems and this has led to the subsequent production and delivery of industry guidance and demonstrations of good practice at SHADs, shows and other events.

12. It has also developed and run ‘Transport Awareness’ events for farmers and stakeholders and has most recently worked with Network Rail and others to develop a joint SHAD addressing the risks to the farming community at user-worked railway crossings.

13. The Agriculture (Tractor Cabs) Regulations 1974 (ATCR), which provides for an approval scheme administered and charged for by HSE is managed by the Sector.

14. The Sector is also working closely with machinery manufacturers and importers, suppliers and other organisations through the Agriculture Industry Advisory Committee’s (AIAC) Transport and Machinery Group and the Agriculture Revisited ‘Equipment Supply Chain’ Project to improve standards of design, training and information provided to end users.

15. Recently, it has been working with the equipment manufacturers, vets and other Departments and Agencies to reduce the risks of fatal and non-fatal injury from livestock handling.

Arboriculture and forestry

16. Thirty-nine people (employees and self-employed) were killed in the treework sector in the ten years from 1988/9 to 2007/08 (i.e. 3-4 deaths per annum), although we know that numerous other incidents have been classified under other industries, e.g. construction or services. Whilst there are known to be ~22,500 people working in forestry the numbers in arboriculture are not known. The sector is characterised by ‘white van man’. Best estimates of the fatal accident incidence rate/100,000 suggest it is probably twice as high as the rate in agriculture.

17. Close contact has been maintained by the Sector with the arboriculture and forestry industries largely through stakeholder engagement, and in particular through the AIAC’s Arboriculture and Forestry Advisory Group (AFAG) and its working groups. These groups are actively involved in tackling a wide range of issues which directly supports HSE’s new strategy including the development of skills, competences and continuous professional development.

18. Joint working and research with partners on AFAG is promoting safer working through the evaluation of new applications and technologies for harvesting trees, the reduction of occupational health risks and the revision and promotion of guidance on good practice in the industry. HSE publishes the series of AFAG guidance leaflets, which are used as the industry standard in UK and worldwide. In addition, the Sector has been at the forefront in developing new methods of communication e.g.
the use of IT and Podcasts, and in September 2009 launched a new Treework Website within the HSE website.

19. In 2009/10, the Sector has been directly involved in the delivery of SHADs targeting managers in Local Authorities and other large clients (including, highways maintenance and construction companies, etc), who commission arboricultural contractors. These SHADs aim to promote understanding of safe working techniques, the legal framework within which arboricultural contractors operate and to improve the selection, monitoring and review of contractors.

20. The Sector has also delivered a number of Forestry SHADs focusing on the management of forestry operations, currently using practical demonstrations of forwarders/transport of harvested timber, manual felling using chainsaws including the take-down of hung-up trees and the analysis of cut stumps as a tool to assess competence of operators and contractors. These are aimed at forestry works managers, site safety coordinators and land owners.

Landscaping and amenity

21. A significant and expanding sector, it includes maintenance of all sports, leisure, public amenity facilities as well as highways, etc. We believe it employs ~15% of the workforce engaged in the land-based industries. The Sector is currently actively promoting improved health and safety standards in sector where issues such as the overturning of mowing machines and the safe use of pesticide products have become increasingly important. It is also supporting an OPSTD cross-divisional approach to local authority procurement practices and is working with the LANTRA Sector Skills Amenity Forum to raise standards.

Aquaculture

22. Based in Scotland, the in-shore fish farming industry is important to the Scottish economy and the Scottish Government. The Sector works closely with FOD Scotland in a range of reactive and proactive activities, including the investigation of fatal and non-fatal injuries and with key industry bodies, through the recently formed Aquaculture Health and Safety Group, to raise health and safety standards in this sector.

23. Examples of key activities in 2009/10 include the delivery of joint SHADs tailored to the fish farming industry and work with the Royal National Lifeboat Institute, the Maritime and Coastguard Agency and others on current issues such as the integrity of buoyancy aids.

Occupational and public health

24. The Sector is involved in working groups with industry stakeholders, HSL and FOD Specialist Inspectors to tackle respirable disease in agriculture. Other recent occupational health initiatives include a review of the health risks in commercial mushroom production and setting up a joint HSE/industry working group to review application of recently published guidance for controlling respiratory disease amongst poultry farm workers.
25. The Sector is continuously engaged in the cross-departmental monitoring of current and emerging threats to public health from zoonoses e.g. avian 'flu and West Nile Virus. Recent high profile work in this area has included working with the National Pig Association and Defra to consider the risks to workers on pig farms following the emergence of the H1N1 virus (swine flu) in UK pig herds.

26. In addition to planned work in this area, the Sector has been heavily involved recently in working with the Health Protection Agency (HPA), the Department of Health, the Advisory Committee for Dangerous Pathogens (ACDP) and LACORS following a series of confirmed outbreaks of *E.coli* O157 at open farms during the late summer/early autumn 2009. It has provided verbal and written evidence to the ACDP and to the HPA’s independent expert investigation into the outbreak (the Griffin Committee) and has issued revised guidance to HSE and LA inspectors on inspection and enforcement issues at open farms. Amongst other things this has led to further work with the National Farms Attraction Network and to work with the Chartered Institute of Environmental Health (CIEH) to provide training to Environmental Health Officers.

**Pesticides & biocides**

27. HSE inspectors have been warranted to exercise powers under pesticides legislation for almost 25 years; during which time the Sector has provided operational policy expertise, support and guidance to FOD inspectors. Although in recent years HSE activity and enforcement of pesticides legislation has declined, it remains a controversial issue of interest to a number of individuals and organised pressure groups.

28. The Sector was involved in the integration of the then Pesticides Safety Directorate (now CRD) into HSE and works with them on the Advisory Committee on Pesticides.

29. Although it is no longer directly involved in handling complaints about pesticide usage, the sector has worked closely with Chemicals Regulation Directorate (CRD) and FOD in setting up the new National Pesticides Enforcement Teams (NPET). This virtual team will carry out interviews under caution on behalf of CRD in cases of alleged harm to humans, animals or the environment that CRD are investigating. In support of this development, the Sector completed a comprehensive review and revision of the suite of internal guidance on pesticides.

**Veterinary medicines**

30. By contrast with previous years, the Sector currently takes an ‘arms length’ interest in this area of work, except for long standing and politically sensitive issues such as organophosphate (OP) based veterinary products (e.g. sheep dips). Notwithstanding we continue to maintain good and effective working relationship with Defra’s Veterinary Medicine Directorate which can be activated as required.
Ammonium nitrate

31. Amendments were made to the Notification of Installations Handling Hazardous Substances Regulations 1982 (NI HHS) in 2002; requiring notification to HSE of quantities in excess of 150 tonnes. Ammonium nitrate based fertilisers are used in large quantities in farming and many farms in GB store in excess of 150 tonnes at some time during the year.

32. Following the 9/11 attack in New York, the security services in the UK expressed concern about the storage of ammonium nitrate on farm premises (and at docks) and asked HSE to maintain records of storage and to carry out a programme of inspection to newly notified premises. Working closely with HSE’s Security Officer, the Sector manages this register of sites on behalf of FOD and distributes information on new notifications as necessary to FOD Divisions (and other government departments including the National Counter Terrorism Security Office).

33. This work directly supports the Board’s strategic objective of avoiding catastrophe.

Vulnerable workers

34. Ever since the Morecambe Bay tragedy in February 2004, the Sector has been in the vanguard in helping develop and deliver HSE’s strategy for tackling vulnerable (including migrant) workers. As an industry, agriculture is heavily reliant on a flexible workforce; increasingly sourced from overseas. Amongst other things the Sector represents HSE in an ex-officio capacity on the Board of the Gangmasters Licensing Authority (GLA) and has recently been providing advice to the Minister, DWP officials and Construction Sector on the recommendation in the Donaghy Report to extend the remit of the GLA to construction.

Stakeholder engagement

35. The Sector has a long history of working with industry stakeholders, not least through the AIAC. Drawn from a wide range of organisations with the potential to represent, influence and act a sounding board for the industry, the AIAC has in recent months begun to transform itself from an advisory committee to an action group. There are encouraging signs on the part of many, but unfortunately not all of the members, to engage more proactively with HSE and the Sector is working to build on this, particularly in support of the Agriculture Revisited work streams.

36. It is hoped to use the outcomes of the recent stakeholder mapping exercise - carried out as part of the Agriculture Revisited Initiative, which reviewed existing relationships as well as identifying new ones - to inform future membership of the AIAC and to identify future partner organisations. The report of this mapping exercise is attached at Annex 4.

37. The AIAC has a number of task and finish working groups that are active in their respective areas; some of which have already been referred to above e.g. the Training; Arboriculture and forestry, Transport and Machinery, Livestock and Amenity/Landscaping. These groups can if necessary be redirected at short notice.
to address new and emerging issues, such as the new Livestock working group which will focus on the design of cattle handling facilities and the risks to vets.

38. The working groups also directly support the work streams of the Agriculture Revisited Initiative, for example the Training and Education group organised a seminar in October 2009. Targeted at employers in the farming sector the seminar promoted training and the land based farming vocational qualifications; with the aim of developing training, skills and competences in farming and increasing professionalism.

International work

39. The Senior Management Team’s Strategic Plan for International Engagement in 2009/10 (SMT/09/28) committed HSE to gathering intelligence on agriculture through engagement with international colleagues. During the past year the Sector has met with colleagues from Australia, Japan and Sweden, provided the UK government’s representative on the ILO working group responsible for developing a new code of practice on health and safety in agriculture and supported a FOD colleague on a short-term project in Denmark under the auspices of SLIC.

39. The Sector is currently engaged in a review of ILO (Agriculture) Convention 1969 (No: 129) and reflecting HSE’s reputational in the international agriculture community, have been invited to join the Advisory Board of the International Security Social Security Associations’ Section on Prevention in Agriculture.

40. The above sections give a flavour of the current and recent work of the Agriculture and Food Sector but are not exhaustive.

Resources

41. It is difficult to estimate the level of FOD resource allocated to work in agriculture, though clearly the resource commitment to the SHADs and Shows programmes and to other intervention activities at regional and local level is significant and at Divisional level varies from year to year.

42. Sector resource in direct support of the work streams in the Agriculture Revisited initiative and other activities in the wider-land based sector is as follows:
   1 x Band 1fte
   3 x Band 2 fte
   6.8 x Band 3 fte
   1 x Band 4 fte
   1 x Band 5 fte
   0.5 x Band 6 fte
   In addition, Communications Directorate has appointed a Senior Campaign Manager at Band 2/3 equivalent for the duration of the campaign.
Progress with Agriculture Revisited Initiative since May 2009

Evaluation

1. Ipsos Mori has been appointed by CSAG to carry out a major social survey to evaluate the extent of behavioural or attitudinal change towards health and safety within the farming sector. The first of three tracker surveys of farmers’ attitudes was carried out in February/March 2010.

2. In addition:
   - Leading indicators for Agriculture Revisited are being agreed with CSAG for the 2010/2011 work year and beyond, including: the number of registrations for the health and safety vocational qualifications (VQs) and the take up of invitations to farming SHADs.
   - Qualitative research carried out into on farmers’ responses to the Make the promise campaign confirms that:
     - The farming community like the tone/language used in the campaign and HSE’s tacit recognition of the pressures under which they work.
     - The campaign has highlighted that what farmers previously regarded as being one-off local “accidents” are in fact incidents that are repeated nationwide.
     - Farmers do not regard a fatality rate of ~1 death/week in agriculture as high when compared to the fatality rate associated with road traffic accidents. This demonstrates the need to find more powerful ways to convey the high risk associated with farming.

3. We will continue to monitor the Make the promise campaign by introducing additional questions to the communications tracker.

The Make the promise communications campaign

4. Phase 2 of the direct marketing campaign, based on mailings, advertising and inserts, was completed in August and resulted in the recruitment of an additional 8,400 farmers; making a total of ~15,000 responders from Phases 1 and 2 of the campaign. It was targeted at those farmers mailed in Phase 1 who had not responded, together with some new mailings. Data on the response rates for Phase 2 is attached at Annex 1.

5. The overarching strategy for the campaign which aims to move farmers within the target audiences on a journey towards safe behaviour to prevent fatal injuries has been developed with the Central Office of Information and external agencies. This takes us to 2011. Plans for how we will continue the campaign after this time will be developed once we have established a relationship with the farmers and have a clearer idea of budgetary constraints.

6. Phase 3 of the campaign launched in December 2009 was designed following independent qualitative research of the previous phases and includes:
• A mailing to the campaign’s 15,000 **responders** in December 2009 with reminder that ‘It’s still happening’ and to keep promise at Christmas/New Year.

• A mailing to the 46,000 **receivers** (who had previously received mailings but not responded) in January 2010 including a copy of the revised ‘Lives Lost’ booklet and an invitation to request more promise knots.

• A mailing to 50,000 **new** addresses in January 2010 inviting recipients to sign up to the campaign. It is planned to mail an additional 100,000 **new** farmers early in 2010.

**Press and online advertising.**

7. Throughout the period June 2009 - February/March 2010, the campaign received good press and local radio coverage. Judith Donovan was widely quoted in news coverage The campaign was also covered during ‘Plough Sunday’ at Judith’s local church in January; the event being covered by Farmers Weekly.

8. The Agriculture & Food Sector and FOD Divisions have established relationships with BBC radio television and with local independent and radio and television stations; giving a number of interviews at the launch of Phase 3 and being filmed on BBC Countryfile for transmission on 21 February 2010.

9. We have also been contacted by various organisations/individuals and industry stakeholders interested in getting involved in some way, which suggests the campaign messages are hitting home. These include a church minister asking for postcards to give to farming families, insurance companies wanting information to give to farmers and the aforementioned letters offering to tell their stories. National Federation of Young Farmers’ Clubs is hosting pages on its website.

10. Work has begun on developing a MTP website to support future phases of the campaign with links to a number of stakeholder sites including BBC Countryfile.

**Performance data for the campaign**

**Acquisition activities**

11. During Phase 2, a further 8,000 farmers were recruited to the campaign, bringing the total number of responders to approximately 15,000. This is an excellent response rate that compares very favourably with other Government direct mailing campaigns. This was done through:

- mailing to 48,000 receivers (those farmers mailed during Phase 1 but who hadn't responded i.e. made the promise)

- trade advertising campaign with postcard inserts in some publications

- The ‘How Lives are Lost on British Farms’ booklet was offered as the fulfilment product for all the above. In addition, two further incentives were tested - a weather clock and a torch. The average response rate for all three options (booklet only, booklet plus clock, booklet plus torch) was 12%; again very good in comparison with similar direct mailing campaigns

- Prolog processed a total 8652 orders. In addition there were 1459 responses to the advertisements and inserts in the trade press and 6979 responses to
the acquisition mailing. 393 requests were received by telephone; the remainder by coupon or postcard.

- Research by Farmers Weekly into the impact of Phase 2 advertising showed high levels of recall, with one advertisement having recall of 90%, the second highest score in the magazine. The adverts performed above average in all categories but were particularly effective in the ‘depth of readership’ where they were 84% and 66% better than the average; ‘engagement’ where they were 46% and 38% better and ‘persuasiveness’ where they were 42% and 35% better. The advertisements were judged by readers to be the first and second most relevant; first and second most memorable; and first and second most persuasive.

12. Phase 3 was launched in December 2009. Mailings were sent during December and January 2010 to the 15,000 responders, the 46,000 receivers (i.e. those who received a first mailing, but did not reply) and to 50,000 new farmers. The responses to these mailings are now being received and evaluated. Informally, the early response rate for the responders mailing has been 8%.

13. Phase 4 will be launched in mid-to-late June and will run for four weeks.

Retention activities

14. During Phase 2 the 7,000 responders who had signed up in Phase 1 were mailed. The first mailing, in the form of a letter, thanked them for making the pledge to come home safe(ly). The second, a postcard sent out in August, reminded them to keep their promise at this busy time for farmers.

Media activities (which influence both acquisition and retention)

15. Media coverage during Phase 2 centred on the major trade shows (the Royal Highland, Great Yorkshire and Royal Welsh); on child safety on farms; and on safety during the harvest. The shows generated 12 local and trade articles and radio interviews. The two safety press releases generated 44 articles, all supportive of HSE/MTP messages. Both figures reflect the level of interest in our messages.

16. To date in support of Phase 3, there have been over 40 separate pieces in the national and trade press and local radio and TV, including articles in The Scotsman. In addition a piece has been filmed for Countryfile on BBC1 showing an inspector visiting Adam Henson’s farm (broadcast on 21 February 2010).

17. Development of other materials to support this phase continues, including further development of the web pages and DVD and other promotional materials for use by stakeholders.

Safety and Health Awareness Days (SHADs)

18. A plan for delivering the farming SHADs programmes for 2010/11 and 2011/12 has been agreed with FOD. This involves increasing the number of traditional farming events year-on-year in a rolling programme and is a positive step towards widening SHAD delivery. The plans seek to exploit geographical synergies
and together with a consistent adoption of the 3-stage invitation process, as recommended by Judith Donovan, is a significant step in addressing the Board’s concerns about the management of the SHAD programme.

19. Three innovative SHADS (in partnership with the Environment Agency) were delivered between June and September 2009. Work has also been undertaken and is ongoing to develop innovative SHADS with other partners, including for example, Network Rail, the National Federation of Young Farmers Club and tenant farmers in FOD Wales & West Division. Amongst the innovations being trialled are working with new partner organisations, the sharing of agendas, scenarios and funding, the use of novel venues and better scheduling to fit in with the farming day and calendar.

Agricultural Shows

20. HSE attended major shows in England, Scotland and Wales during the 2009 show season. The focus for the stands was the new edition of “Farmwise”, HSE’s essential guide to health and safety in agriculture re-launched in May 2009.

21. Although the 2009/10 show season was a transitional year whilst the visuals and exhibits for Make the promise campaign are developed, our presence at shows was well received and there was positive media coverage.

22. The MTP campaign will be the theme of HSE’s presence at agricultural shows in 2010/11 and an events company has been recruited to develop creative ideas for the show season.

23. The National Farmers Union and Lantra (the Sector Skills Council for the environmental and land-based sector) have shared information with us on their respective evaluations of agricultural shows and this information has been used to develop a more comprehensive and consistent process for organising, assessing and attending shows in future. This is a significant step in addressing the Board’s concerns about our presence at shows.

Equipment Supply Chain

24. A “Safe Machine” Award presented to CaseIH at the Royal Show at Stoneleigh in July for the design of their axial flow combine harvester, attracted positive trade media coverage.

25. Articles were developed and provided for use by the agricultural equipment supply chain on the supply of safe second hand machinery and safe ways of braking tractor/trailer combinations; key issues in the manufacture and supply of new and used machinery to the farming sector.

26. Work on a revision of HSG 89 “Safeguarding Agricultural Machinery – Advice for Designers, Manufacturers and Users” has started which will support future work on improving safety in the design and supply of new and second hand machinery.
Promoting the uptake of training and farming Vocational Qualifications

27. The suite of Health and Safety Vocational Qualifications (VQs) has been successfully introduced in England and Wales with 808 students registered between 1 January 2009 – 30 September 2009. Additional registrations are likely as the academic year progresses.

28. A successful seminar for employers in the farming sector promoting training and the VQs was held in October, with the keynote address being given by Adam Henson, farmer and presenter on the BBC “Countryfile” programme. Adam is very supportive of the campaign and has offered to further facilitate contacts with the BBC.

29. Promotional visits were carried out to a number of land-based agricultural colleges to promote and encourage uptake of VQs in their curricula. Other colleges continue to be identified and targeted.

30. HSE has supported the development of a training course at VQ level 3 by Lantra Awards. A presentation was made to the Lantra Rural Development Programme for England’s programme managers to raise awareness of the VQs as a priority for funding.

31. Work is underway to revise the publication “Fit for tomorrow” a teaching pack for use by college tutors to help deliver VQ training.

32. Work is now underway with FOD Scotland to extend the availability of the suite of VQs to Scotland as a priority.

Stakeholder mapping and engagement

33. An independent contractor was engaged as part of a short-term project under the Agriculture Revisited initiative to carry out a mapping exercise to identify and classify new stakeholders and to review HSE’s relationships with its existing stakeholder network. The report was submitted at the end of January 2010 and will be analysed, reviewed and taken forward by the Sector. The report is attached at Annex 4.

34. Judith Donovan gave a well-received presentation to senior Defra managers and staff on the development and delivery of the first phases of the MTP campaign; thereby strengthening links with stakeholders in other government departments.

35. Clearance has also been obtained from Defra to use their farm census database to verify the commercial lists used as the basis of the campaign.

36. Work is underway to develop materials for stakeholders to use who want to support the campaign, e.g. by hosting small scale events. The toolkit will include materials for distribution via their newsletters and e-bulletins, talks and electronic knots for use on their own emails. We are exploring the viability of, and options for, progressively transferring ownership of the campaign to the industry beyond 2010.
Agriculture Revisited
Stakeholder Mapping Exercise

Who do Farmer’s Trust?
Introduction – Aims and Objectives

In 2009, The Health and Safety Executive contracted Tris Brown to carry out a stakeholder mapping exercise in England to support the Agriculture Revisited programme within the Executive.

Background

The Agriculture Revisited programme was initiated by the board member Judith Donovan and commands the full support of the HSE Board. It combines a number of workstreams, working coherently together to improve the HSE’s ability to deliver messages and affect a culture change within the farming and agricultural community.

The farming and agricultural industry employs 1.5% of the UK workforce, yet accounts for 15-20% of workforce fatalities. Agriculture Revisited provides the foundation for a culture shift that must last decades and over generations, changing the way the sector approaches risk and work-related fatal incidents.

Stakeholder Engagement is one of five workstreams, mapping out, then developing the relationship with, stakeholders that can influence and get messages across to farmers, improving both HSE’s effectiveness at delivering and the receptiveness with which the farming community will hear the message.

The Brief

Building upon the existing activity of HSE, the brief is to carry out a mapping exercise which will support the creation of a stakeholder engagement plan for Agriculture Revisited and support HSE’s corporate objectives towards communications with farmers in England.

Specifically, this will be achieved by concentrating on the following priorities:

1. **Identifying, researching and introducing stakeholders whose activities are currently unknown to HSE.**
   The first priority is to seek organisations, senior individuals or companies who play a trusted and effective role in the lives of farmers, of whom HSE are currently unaware. Through a process of research and contacts, the mapping exercise will provide HSE with information about them, including their capabilities and geographical reach.

   There will be a particular emphasis on developing relationships for HSE with organisations that are “grass roots”, in other words engender the maximum amount of trust and respect from farmers, by virtue of their closeness to them.

2. **Refreshing HSE’s existing stakeholders with updated information and analysis**
   The second priority is to review the current relationships HSE maintains with stakeholders, with a view to refreshing the information and knowledge held by HSE; obtaining feedback from stakeholders; analysing the potential of the relationship going forward; advising on the best methods for maintaining the relationship.

Introduction – results

The research produced a working long list that varied in number at different times during the exercise, but totalled around 200 at the end. This does not represent a complete list of farming
stakeholders in England. Time considerations and the local nature of much of the rural community means that without detailed examination in each region, there will continue to be many that escape notice.

However, this exercise has thrown up local, regional and national stakeholders who should provide useful opportunities and willing participants for HSE's future communication activities.

This report explains the categories created to explain these possible opportunities, and makes recommendations about the approach and expectations they may have.

Additionally, there were many potential stakeholders which were investigated with the final view taken that they don't exist. For example, it is an, accurate, perceived wisdom that the ultra-local nature of some farming relationships, if harnessed, could be very useful. Gossip and word-of-mouth form a significant part of the news-spreading process for most of the rural community, including farmers. Therefore, this exercise did attempt to locate hubs and/or networks for some of the members of this network, not always with success - the Post Office do not operate a network for their rural postmen. Similarly, St John Ambulance and the Red Cross do not co-ordinate the activities of their branches in rural areas.

Each stakeholder has its own needs and style, and will require approaching in their own unique way. However, there are some commonalities. One was a generally positive response to the work of the Health and Safety Executive and the new approach represented by Agriculture Revisited and the Make the Promise Campaign.

This openness to the Executive and a perceived sense of the growing importance of Health and Safety Areas, mark a new opportunity for the Executive, with many stakeholders wishing to help.

**Method**

The initial step was to seek leads and initial recommendations from the existing farming and agriculture team within HSE. This included existing stakeholder lists and members of the AIAC committee. There was also a continuous use of the internet as a search and research tool. Government reports were also used, for example, the Curry Report included lists of those who responded to the consultation and attended hearings in the regions.

Throughout the mapping process, newsletters from organisations, including those newly discovered, were searched for indications of new stakeholders that may be active in order to add them to the list for investigation.

Farmers’ Markets and other gatherings of farmers were used at various times, in order to gain a sense of the word-of-mouth element of stakeholder identification.

During the mapping exercise, a search of the Charity Commission’s records was also held to attempt to comprehensively identify all charities that are active in the agricultural field. It is worth noting that the vast majority of charities registered with an interest of agriculture are local branches of national organisations.

Finally, recommendations were continually sought from colleagues and those interviewed.

**The South West**

The project also included a trip to the South West to look at the progress made in that region, and identify a template for repeating the success in the region, including key factors and partners.

**The South West**
The South West had been considered, within the farming and agriculture team of HSE as a success for its relationships with farmers and stakeholder organisations.

Farming is a significant element of South Western life and one of, if not the largest, component of the economy in the region. One county in particular, Cornwall, is particularly cognisant of the role agriculture plays in its citizens lives.

The visit as part of this exercise was co-ordinated by Glenda Benger, who is based regionally in the South West.

Glenda has co-ordinated a number of activities for reaching out with Health and Safety Executive messages to the farming communities, including innovative SHADs (Safety and Health Awareness Days), and targeted campaigns to the children of farmers through local retailers.

Over three days we visited a number of organisations, listed below, to discuss with them their own activity, but also the contribution the HSE has made to their operations, and the shape of support they require. Their responses have fed into the wider report, however some highlights are included below:

- Cornwall FYFC
- Duchy of Cornwall College
- Mole Valley Farmers
- Bickton College
- Ginsters
- Farm Radio

**Duchy of Cornwall College**
The most exciting project on display was the Duchy of Cornwall College’s Rural Business College which had developed a network of informal co-ordinators who were themselves farmers to guide the college’s training provision.

Using European money from the Cornwall’s previous designation as an Objective One area, the Duchy of Cornwall College was able to invest in this network and empower them to order their own subsidised courses (provided by either the college or other providers) in order to match directly the needs of the farming community.

Post-Objective One, there is a hope that the Rural Development Programme for England (RDPE) would continue to finance the scheme, and it would be rolled out across all the counties in the South West.

The Health and Safety Executive has been able to interface with this network, through Glenda, and discuss the most appropriate ways of supporting training, identifying needs, or simply providing information.

**Mole Valley Farmers**
Mole Valley Farmers is a trade retailer, providing a wide range of goods and equipment that a farmer may need. Their trading results are strong, and the company is confident of their own success going forward. With a number of branches in the South West, and a few beyond, they are focussed on being responsive to their customer’s needs and providing a hospitable place where farmers can meet.
Co-ordinated by Glenda, the HSE has already run a pilot campaign in a number of their stores aimed at children who need to be aware of the dangers of being present on-site of either the family farm, or a farm they are visiting.

Using dedicated materials and displays, Glenda would be present at the front of the store and hand out leaflets or other attractive items, while talking to both children and adults about Health and Safety issues. The response from customers was warm, and as a result the feedback from the stores was very positive.

Based on the success of that pilot, Mole Valley Farmers is willing to discuss future campaigns. For the company they see the interaction with HSE as being a way of helping farmers perform better, as long as the approach is to provide useful information. For the retailer, it consolidates their position as being a place where farmers can visit and leave with an improved sense of how to run their farm.

Mole Valley Farmers is also a co-operative, and as a result communicates regularly with its shareholders. A regular e-newsletter is produced and as a result of the ongoing requirement to fill the e-newsletter, they are always interested in articles or other written resources that they can use.

**Ginsters**

Ginsters is part of the Samworth group, who produce a wide range of food products. Ginsters of Cornwall is proud of their ability to source their supply chain locally and use local farmers.

As a factory, they are also very proud of their health and safety record, for no other reason than it is a sign of a well-run company.

Having made the connection with Glenda in order to source information, training and any other resources to achieve their own goal within the factory, Ginsters has also become aware of the potential impact they could have on their own supply chain.

Because of their reputation and relationship with local farmers, Ginsters wants to explore the running of their own health and safety awareness days, providing information and resources to help their suppliers.

For Ginsters the practice is not only good Corporate Social Responsibility, but may also have an added impact on productivity for their own benefit.

**Local Contact**

The Health and Safety Executive has benefited from many years of staffing by inspectors who have approached the role as needing a light touch. Stakeholders and farmers who were interviewed spoke highly both of the past, but also the present work being carried out by Glenda.

For them, the contact with someone whose objective is to help them rather than inspect, made a big difference in the willingness to approach the HSE and discuss problems and potential solutions. In turn this has facilitated the acceptance of Glenda into the farming community.

**Lessons Learned**

It is hoped that HSE will be able to replicate some of the successes that have occurred in the South West, and the following are highlights of the key factors that have contributed to those successes.
1. **Approachability is key, by a local contact.** Several Stakeholders expressed the same sentiment that the difference knowing Glenda makes is that she enables them to navigate a bureaucracy that they wouldn’t attempt to otherwise. There might be a great wealth of information the HSE can provide, but having a local contact ‘push’ it on to them, has a disproportionally beneficial impact.

2. **The link between training and Health and Safety.** Although it may seem obvious to many, training, and in particular ongoing skills development, is a huge opportunity for the continual reinforcement of health and safety messages. In addition, when presented in this context (as opposed to a regulatory one) it is welcomed by farmers. Agricultural colleges also provide an infrastructure for that continuous engagement and, in the case of Cornwall, in extremely innovative and effective ways.

3. **Local partners (1).** The most effective piece of best-practice for consideration in other regions is the multiplier effect that occurs from partnership with local partners. Glenda’s ability to navigate local partnerships and her own commitment to out of hours working and attend meetings, has developed the relationship and allowed her to influence the shape of projects and respond to the needs of South West farmers.

4. **Local Partners (2).** A strong advantage for the South West, is the historic recognition by local public bodies of the importance of farming to the local and regional economy. It is a major factor in the provision of vibrant and effective networks that can be utilised by HSE and it is the public investment in those that has made the region a natural candidate for finding the most innovative of programmes. Although out of the control of HSE, the Executive could consider working with others like the Local Government Association to identify best-practice for others to follow.
The National Farmers Union

The NFU is a giant amongst farming stakeholders. Its networks, policy development, NFU mutual offices and extremely high levels of membership make it a significant and intertwined member of the agricultural fraternity.

Due to the size of this particular stakeholder, it was decided to focus on investigating the opportunities for engaging with the organisation, and at what level discussions may occur between the NFU and the HSE to achieve Agriculture Revisited's and Make the Promise's aims.

The NFU has several positions on the HSE's AIAC Committee, reflecting their position in the community. However, these individuals do not necessarily reflect the communications needs the HSE has in order to achieve its campaign aims.

Instead, the HSE needs to interface with parts of the NFU that:

- Communicate directly with farmers
- Can respond to requests of partnership

The NFU, because of its size is a complicated beast. It is also undergoing change to make its own relationship with its members more effective. As a result there is a varying degree of reliability within the NFU's structure for outside organisations.

A (potentially overly) basic summation of the NFU's structure is thus:

- Local branches exist to cover a small geographic area. Branches are administrated by local NFU Mutual Agents who call meetings, organise agendas and distribute invitations. Branches are numerous and small, with active membership totalling around 30 in each one.

- NFU regions provide policy, campaigning and PR support for the NFU's activities with an executive board that oversees it.

- At the regional level, there are also commodity boards, covering Combinable Crops, Livestock, Poultry, Horticulture and Dairy.

- National Committees and Boards form the next tier, with a nationally elected President to lead the organisation.

The NFU is attempting to change the emphasis of its structure away from small geographic branches towards the commodity boards, as they believe delivery of relevant and useful services will be easier through this structure.
**Who do farmers trust?**

Trust is a vital issue for farmers. The nature of their work, their lifestyle, and a literal physical isolation mean that farmers can be very focussed on hearing only the information that is most pertinent for them.

Information for farmers must be relevant, timely, useful and, as has been stressed several times during interviews, recognizant of farmers' wide-ranging levels of literacy.

DEFRA research has shown that farmers' families score very highly in levels of trust for farmers. However, on a slightly separate score for whether a farmer is likely to respond to suggestions and recommendations and *change* the way they work, other farmers, and collections of farmers score much more highly.

On a combined score it’s worth noting that DEFRA and the NFU score similarly, implying that DEFRA has achieved some level of success in presenting itself as “on the farmer's side” even if that score is not very high.

Based on interviews a key factor for the farmer is the perceived 'distance' from their farm that the organisation is.

Clearly an organisation that can afford to have a representative in every village or county has the opportunity to be very responsive to local conditions and each farmer. As a result it could earn a high trust score.

However, in the HSE's case where that is simply impractical, then some recognition for this trend will help the Executive identify organisations that present the best-possible 'reflected' levels of trust.
The Stakeholder Mapping Exercise has identified a great number of organisations that are active in the farming, agriculture and rural communities, with a wide range of remits.

The exercise has a stated emphasis on grass-roots organisations, but there is also an imperative to consider the opportunity the stakeholder represents to contribute positively to HSE's communications as part of existing and planned campaigns.

For this reason, stakeholders have been categorised to focus consideration of their benefits to the HSE, and the kind of approach that may be necessary towards them. Stakeholders may belong to more than one category, which represents the different parts of the organisation and the different functions they have. For example, Mole Valley Farmers is both *locally focussed* on their customers in Cornwall, but also have an *email list with benefits* to their co-operative shareholders.

In truth, the complex nature of stakeholders, especially within a sector as wide ranging as farming and agriculture will always provide a challenge. The categories are an attempt to flag those stakeholders with whom the greatest and easiest successes may be attained.

Although not the focus of this report, stakeholders have also been listed under the 'viral' categories created by Judith Donovan, so that they can be used for any activity that occurs using those headings.

The Categories are:

- National Organisations (with branches)
- Email with benefits
- Campaigning Organisations – for the betterment of farming
- Busy/focussed organisations
- Locally focussed
- Public Sector
National Organisations (with branches)

National Organisations are the big beasts within the farming community, but there are still many out there to provide surprises.

Born of farmers, by farmers, for farmers most national organisations receive a relatively high level of trust from farmers, however the more professional the national body gets the more a farmer is likely to filter out the messages and treat them in a professional manner, as opposed to taking them on board personally.

Some of these national organisations have branches locally, others have regional branches, but for all of them there is an expectation that control over messages exists at the national level, which is where any relationship with the HSE needs to start, possibly in a more formal manner than with necessary with other bodies.

A clear attraction for the HSE is gaining access to the network of branches, but in return a commitment to resource the relationship will be required - not necessarily financially but in terms of the materials needed, stories written and case studies researched in order to feed the activity to its required level.

The downside of such a relationship is that the message is conveyed at a level several steps away from the farmer, and will quite often be combined with other news, announcements or messages and diluted or become less important by the time it has reached the farmer audience.

However, the size and reach of national organisations is too important to ignore, and therefore this report recommends engaging with national organisations in order to build an agreement, with set deliverables or outcomes which the national organisation can feel a sense of ownership over, hopefully leading to them protecting the activity.

A good example is the activity already undertaken by HSE with the National Federation of Young Farmers Clubs. Here, their express agreement in a partnership has been achieved and together the programme has developed as part of the Make the Promise Campaign.
**Email list with benefits**

The key characteristic of stakeholders in this category is that they (or rather the element most relevant to the HSE) exist in order to disseminate information.

They seek content in order to communicate with their farming members and their stated goals are to assist farmers by providing information to them.

These stakeholders are normally based in a particular geographic area, with list membership to reflect that. Their newsletters advertise services by other agencies, events that may be occurring, or provide the occasional nugget of advice or information to come from an agency.

Timings will be regular, say monthly or twice monthly, and as a result there is always a need to find content to include.

Although there is a variance in how their newsletters are produced, whether produced in house using a simple Microsoft Word document, or using designers and increasing the style and photographic elements, they are almost always distributed via email to save on the costs of postage.

There is significant potential for HSE to communicate with this stakeholder group as there is an almost explicit matching of each other’s aims – the dissemination of information to farmers.

There is also a trend with this stakeholder group to develop the relationship they have built up through the delivery of their newsletter. In discussions, many intend to consider adding new features, such as holding events and discussion groups, or in the case of retailers inviting them in-store.
Campaigning Organisations

There has been a growth over the last 5-10 years of organisations concerned with the welfare of farmers. The Plunkett Society is very old, but more recent additions to the sector, such as the Farmers Crisis Network have also been focussed on building a network across the country that can effectively deliver a service to any farmer who requires help.

As a result of this welfare role, they are seen in a very positive light by farmers with a high level of trust. The only challenge is that these organisations are normally seen after a problem develops, but there is an explicit desire to be more active before problems occur.

Another feature of these organisations is how networked they are with each other, using each other to fill in gaps in service delivery, or referring cases for their specific specialities.

Being so focussed on the welfare of the farming and rural community, there is a natural affinity with any campaign that aims to assist farmers’ health safety. For this reason, there is a great deal of interest in exploring how they and the HSE can work together.

However, these stakeholders are also serious organisations, with their own unique stated objectives and busy plans for achieving the growth of their own networks.

Partnership working with campaigning organisations will require a formal element of approach, and a clear path to achieving mutually agreed aims. The partnership may also require many distinct phases, in order to allow planning on both sides with defined parameters and project plans for each phase.

Investment might also be necessary in order to allow them to share their resources for HSE-related activity. This could be crucial towards the effectiveness of any partnership, because the structure of the organisations will not lend itself easily to the implementation of many new top-down directives.

Unlike National Organisations, with branches or not, who have an infrastructure designed to deliver capacity at every level of the country, these campaigning organisations have very strong centres with delivery agents at the local level. A small increase in activity requested by the centre is a disproportionately large increase locally.

As a result of these characteristics, partnership working with stakeholders in this category will provide a strong and useful results for the HSE, but require a commensurate commitment to develop the relationship over time.
Busy/Focussed

These stakeholders are typically relatively small and focussed on one thing in particular, whether it is registration and support for farmers of a particular breed, or the affairs of the wider rural community.

Their singular focus means that although they have a high level of recognition with their own farmer membership, their trust levels are not particularly high, as they have rarely engaged in anything not in their remit. Communications outside the range of that remit would appear odd and unsettling, limiting their attractiveness as part of this exercise.

However, they are also fully aware of their limitations, as a result of their focus and/or a lack of resources, they have also responded during this exercise in a way that implies they are not necessarily open to partnership with the HSE, making them very difficult to engage.
**Locally Focussed**

There are many stakeholders who, by virtue of their business or structure target a very particular geographic area.

Machinery Rings by definition tend to be locally focussed, as are local hubs and discussion groups.

The branches of national organisations, such as the NFU and the Federation of Young Farmers Clubs are also by definition locally focussed.

These stakeholders have a high level of recognition and trust among farmers, as they are quite often made up by their peers. Topics of interest can be wide and varied, and involvement in Machinery Rings, in particular, will be of interest to the HSE.

The challenge for the HSE with this particular stakeholder category will be the practicalities of communicating with them. Representing hundreds of separate stakeholders across the UK, those without national organisations will require significant resources to make contact, while those with a national organisation will be easier to communicate with but face a dilution of the message.

Also included in this category are food processors or manufacturers who source the raw ingredients from farmers in their locality. Their interest in the local supply chain gives them the same characteristics in this category.

In addition, the customer/provider relationship gives food manufacturers additional influence over farmers they interact with. Not all manufacturers are interested in promoting health and safety messages or even using their influence in such a way, but the likes of Muller and Ginsters consider it good Corporate Social Responsibility.

A partnership approach with food manufacturers would give the strongest chance of using locally focussed stakeholders to communicate the Executives messages.

Relevant to all stakeholders in this category is their requirement for information that is responsive to the local situation. Generic and general information will lower effectiveness considerably.

Additionally, those interviewed expressed a preference for materials other than the written word, reflecting the reality that their relationships are built not on the basis of a newsletter but a more personal and physical relationship. Instead they were interested in stickers to place on lorries, badges and representation of the Make the Promise knot.
Public Sector

DEFRA’s own research has mapped out the bodies who interface with farmers over the year. Farmers will undergo inspections, receive application forms and payments, call helplines and interface with a number of public sector organisations, but not necessarily in a format that is most conducive to carrying a message.

DEFRA’s own bi-monthly magazine, the RPA’s communications and local authority communications all carry potential to be included in a concerted campaign by the HSE.

However, although this should be simple to achieve, the reality is that the range of operations being carried out by the departments and agencies involved makes agreeing a singular message more, not less, difficult.

A strategic approach by the HSE may pay dividends over time and an easy win should be the interconnection between the Executive’s communications team and the team that produces the DEFRA magazine.
Recommendations

It’s a good time for Health and Safety, a good time for HSE

There are many factors which contribute to the perception that this is a good time for health and safety messages within the farming community.

CSR
The increasing level of corporate within the farming sector also brings a growing sense of needing to show good Corporate Social Responsibility.

Farming companies, Food Producers, Manufacturers and Retailers (both grocers and trade retailers) are all under increasing scrutiny.

Encouraging greater care and consideration as an attempt to lower the numbers of deaths and accidents is seen by the likes of Ginsters as an excellent way of displaying Social Responsibility – especially when displayed as useful tips and advice that will help any farmer improve their business.

Other professional organisations, such as Mole Valley Farms (which is a co-operative trade retailer operating in Cornwall), are also aware of their relationship with stakeholders and are eager to find ways of being supportive of have influence over the farming sector. For them, the inclusion of regular sections on health and safety in their own newsletter is a logical and worthy use of their own communications – they just lack the knowledge and information to do it.

Professionalisation
Another trend to exploit is the growing professionalisation of farming. Members of Young Farmers Clubs willing to talk about their own development showed an interest in being seen as part of a movement of modern farming, which is seen as more responsible and professional. This is, no doubt, in part a response to the growing challenges of farming, necessitating a more educated and informed workforce.

In response to that need, there is a plethora of training opportunities. Many Agricultural Colleges are more innovative in their course delivery methods, specialist training providers are more common, and information networks much more advanced.

A significant investment by regions, using Rural Development Programme for England (RDPE) money, has also exploded the numbers of working partners providing training.

Together these trends have increased the openness of both stakeholders and farmers themselves towards the increased attention on Health and Safety matters.
**Prioritisation**

Clearly, the Health and Safety Executive is going to have to make some decisions, and prioritise those organisations which can deliver the best-possible results.

The Stakeholder Mapping exercise has identified many organisations and there are many who form a significant part of the farming community. In examining organisations like the NFU we find those that on the face of it are perfect partners for the HSE and provide an easy win.

However, this exercise has also looked at the possible effectiveness of engaging an organisation to carry out the specific communications needs of the HSE. It is on this measure that large organisations with either their own, or many competing, agendas fail to serve the HSE.

It is important to state that they remain excellent representatives of the farming community and experts in their right.

Instead it is as a communications channel for the HSE that we become drawn to some non-traditional alternatives for further partnership work.

The chart below, indicates the challenge faced when considering the range of organisations, from large organisations (with one point of contact, but representing tens of thousands of farmers), to small local organisations (trusted and listened to by a small number of farmers but exist in their hundreds, if not thousands) across the country. The ideal is represented by the middle column where we find large-enough organisations to be in touch with thousands of farmers, but small enough to be both responsive to HSE’s communications and provide an easy point of contact for the Agriculture Team.
What do They want?

Many stakeholders expressed a willingness and an interest in using their communications channels to either spread health and safety messages or take part in the Make the Promise Campaign, whose style and simplicity makes engagement an attractive option.

Every stakeholder has their own remit, and a finite level of resources. It should be remembered that if the level of commitment required by HSE exceeds their capacity then they will cease to respond to the Executive’s requests.

In recognising the extremely networked nature of the sector, the HSE will also be competing with a number of other organisations who are all trying to interface with stakeholder communications. DEFRA, ADAS, NFU, local groups and local events all provide communications materials or promotions for inclusion in newsletters or bulletins.

These pressures cannot be overlooked, and as a result this report recommends the following:

Easily accessible resources. Some health and safety messages will be timely, in response to recent developments. Others will be more generic, but both must be easy to get hold of. The HSE needs to establish a repository of information, articles, case studies and other materials – preferably online – and make it accessible to stakeholders and informing them when resources are updated.

Articles and other written resources need to be in a number of different formats and lengths in order to give stakeholders a choice that is most suitable to them. Some stakeholders simply use Microsoft Word to produce newsletters, while others have the luxury of designers. Providing information in a basic electronic format will allow everyone to access the information and use it in a way that best fits their own needs.

Once this method of obtaining information and resources is established, it could be used for the dissemination of physical materials, such as MTP knots or HSE publications.

Please note, that feedback has highlighted the difficulty of navigating the HSE as an obstacle for participation, meaning that the establishment of a dedicated resource that is 'pushed' to farming stakeholders is likely to be more effective than expecting them to be 'pulled' onto the existing corporate website with the expectation they will be able to find materials relevant to them.

A single point of contact, preferably local. The perceived size and complex nature of the HSE, and as a bureaucracy, is a barrier to people’s partnership with the Executive. As a result they don’t know how to approach the Executive, how to make contact and invite their partnership. Therefore, it is up to the HSE to make the first move, and identify a way for them to navigate the organisation or find the resources necessary to take an active part in campaigns such as the Make the Promise campaign. This contact will preferably be local, based on the lessons learned in the South West, but it is more important that there is a named contact that is accessible, wherever they are based.
Agricultural colleges

Agricultural Colleges vary wildly in terms of quality, size and influence. However, as a sector they also hold a unique position in farmers' hearts. Trusted to have no more of an agenda than to improve their wellbeing, colleges are also responsible for the increasing professionalism of the farming community.

Agricultural Colleges are also responsible for significant innovations in the identification and provision of training courses (see earlier chapter on the South West).

There is undoubtably a great deal more that colleges are engaged in, especially through the use of RDPE funding, which would be of great use and interest to the HSE.

Agricultural Colleges already have a strong, working relationship with the HSE, and it is considered effective and valuable on both sides.

However, in light of the other activities which might be of value to the HSE, this report recommends opening a new dialogue with the Agricultural Colleges, perhaps by exploring how colleges are sharing best-practice about the RDPE scheme, and using the Duchy College Cornwall as an exemplar scheme both for training provision and HSE involvement.
**Strategic intervention**

This report has remained focussed on identifying the organisations with which the HSE may operationally have the most success – approaching and integrating with their communications in order to achieve the HSE’s communications objectives.

However, there have been some areas uncovered where there is undoubtedly an opportunity for a more strategic partnership over the long term, or where changes, which are outside the gift of HSE, could be made and would have a significant impact.

This report recommends three areas where a more strategic intervention, at Board Level for example, may create opportunities that HSE may be expected to support and yield proportionately large benefits.

**RDAs**

The Rural Development Programme for England is a national programme, funded by DEFRA and delivered by Regional Development Agencies in the regions. As a result there is no central point of interface with the programme to influence its aims and objectives.

However, it is rarely the nature of RDAs to actually deliver a programme themselves either. Instead a tender process, identifying key performance indicators will fund delivery of a set programme of activity, usually through existing organisations. As a result, influencing the strategic direction of the RDPE, despite its significant impact on health and safety in areas such as Cornwall and the South West is very difficult.

The RDAs have a national agricultural or rural network, that brings together the respective heads of departments from each RDA. There is also a national secretariat whose role it is to co-ordinate national networking like this, and it is my recommendation that the HSE make contact and seek a meeting with national chairs during their regular meetings in London, in order to discuss the collective partnership that Agriculture Revisited could represent.

**Local Authorities**

In Cornwall we saw how decades of continued investment by many partners has built the infrastructure for engaging with and providing training for farmers. Sometimes overlooked, and yet crucial to this success, is the local authority.

While performance is mixed, especially in those authorities with both rural and urban populations, there remains significant scope for a concerted approach, encouraging partnership working, and involvement in Make The Promise campaign, as well as acting as a gateway for communications materials.

The Local Government Association has a Rural Group, which operates relatively informally and involves elected members, rather than officers.

For this potentially very important group, there needs to be an approach which is seen as senior enough to reflect elected members’ own position and open enough to reflect the range of interest that develops from each authority’s unique situation.
Red Cross/St John Ambulance
These two organisations make a significant contribution to the UK’s social fabric, providing piece-of-mind presence at public events, education and training courses, and running their own information campaigns.

They are frequently found at agriculture shows and festivals, sometimes for safety and other times playing a more active role in educating attendees.

However, each branch is autonomous in these organisations. Their attendance is negotiated locally, and the services they provide and even their specialist knowledge will depend on local factors or the local volunteers and their backgrounds.

There may be a mutually beneficial arrangement to partnership working between these organisations and the HSE, to provide a national framework for best-practice sharing and learning, and campaigning.
**Market Place**

Many Stakeholders have expressed a desire to get involved in either HSE-run activity or more generic Health and Safety activity.

Indeed, some have expressed desires to organise it themselves. However, there are considerable barriers to them achieving this on their own, most linked to their own knowledge of other stakeholders that either provide or share an interest in health and safety matters.

It is therefore recommended that HSE, in considering the future of its Agriculture Revisited programme or the Make the Promise campaign, bear in mind the interest out there in the sector and seek ways of facilitating the empowerment of other organisations to organise their own Health and Safety activity.

This could be in the form of opening up the ownership of the Make the Promise campaign, allowing other, vetted, organisations to run their own activity under a common banner.

Otherwise it could take the form of some sort of social networking either on a website or in person, (regionally for example).

A theoretical example of the kind of exchange that might occur would be if the branch of an organisation – such as a Young Farmers Club – decided to commission their own safety event, with training. Currently that might seem too large a task, with no clear distinct path to organising it, and possibly even involving several different organisations.

However, there are companies and services that will happily negotiate the mix and create a package to fit our theoretical Club's needs. A HSE-organised “market place”, from which to locate such a service would both improve the general health and safety awareness of the sector, but also indicate HSE's new approach of problem-solving rather than tough measures.