

Open Government
Status:

FULLY OPEN

AIAC 08/11/01

**HEALTH AND SAFETY EXECUTIVE
AGRICULTURE INDUSTRY ADVISORY COMMITTEE**

AGRICULTURE REVISITED INITIATIVE - PROGRESS AND NEXT STEPS

Summary

1 This paper provides a short update on progress implementing the Agriculture Revisited initiative.

Background

2 Judith Donovan outlined the proposals in her Agriculture Revisited initiative at the July AIAC. The initiative follows on from the review of agriculture conducted for HSC (HSC/07/60), Oxford Strategic Marketing's Insight Report and a workshop with the AIAC, and was agreed by the HSE Board in late May this year.¹

Progress

3 Work has continued since July's AIAC to develop the proposals into a set of projects, being taken forward by HSE's Agriculture Sector, colleagues in other parts of HSE including our Communications Directorate, and with help from HSE's stakeholders. HSE's Minister, Lord McKenzie of Luton, was briefed by Liz Gibby on the initiative and other current topics in agriculture in mid-October and is supportive. He has asked to attend an AIAC meeting in 2009 (possibly the one to be scheduled for the Spring).

4 In project and programme management terms, the 'Mandate' for Agriculture Revisited is attached for information at annex 1. It summarises the objective of Agriculture Revisited as being to reduce the number of fatal accidents in agriculture, including changes to awareness, attitudes, and if possible behaviours. It also sets out governance arrangements, initial resourcing, the stages of the work, constraints and challenges, interfaces, quality criteria, and broadly defines the project workstreams. It is important to note that

¹ *Future plans for tackling H&S in agriculture*; paper number HSE/08/24 see annex 1 for 'Agriculture Revisited'.

the initiative is focussed specifically on farming as a segment of the whole agriculture sector.

The project workstreams

5 The Agriculture Revisited project workstreams are summarised below, and from which we will prepare an overarching and costed implementation or programme plan. Further details on the projects will be provided orally at the AIAC meeting:

(1) Safety and Health Awareness Days (SHADs): Project manager Samantha Peace

The objectives are to:

- increase the impact of SHADs;
- reduce the cost per SHAD to HSE and increase their frequency, with a new and contracted out programme of farming SHADs;
- develop an up to date contact list of farmers to support ongoing communication.

Three pilot SHADs are being undertaken this autumn using the invitation process recommended by Judith Donovan and different ways of administering the SHADs to assess cost savings to HSE. The results of the pilots will inform a potentially expanded farming SHAD programme in 2009/10.

(2) Integrated publicity campaign: Project managers Andrew Wetters/Chris Molde

A new campaign raising awareness of farming fatalities and seeking to influence safer behaviour is in development, and is likely to utilise a mix of advertising, direct marketing and public relations activities. More details of the campaign will be provided at the meeting.

(3) Improving competence and training: Project Manager Alastair Mitchell

This area of work is covered in more detail in paper [xxxxx], which includes a stock take of HSE's work to date, the wider context for training and vocational qualifications, and a range of options for taking work forward, including the specific recommendations from Agriculture Revisited.

(4) Equipment and suppliers/manufacturers: Project Manager Alan Plom

Following productive early meetings with AEA and BAGMA, proposals are being developed to further promote messages on the importance of the safe selection, use and maintenance of agriculture machinery. This project seeks to better utilise the supply chain and maximise related trade media opportunities.

(5) Stakeholders: Stakeholder activity cuts across all of the workstreams, and more and wider engagement is a key element of Agriculture Revisited. Judith Donovan will talk to this element of initiative.

Action/ Recommendation

- 7 AIAC members are invited to:
- note progress to date on the projects under Agriculture Revisited;
 - discuss in light of short presentations made at the meeting; and
 - consider what more they can do to help support this work.

Contact:

Rachel Russell
Injuries Reduction Division
8NW Rose Court
2 Southwark Bridge, London SE1 9HS
email: Rachel.russell@hse.gsi.gov.uk
Tel 020 7717 6464

Agriculture Revisited - Project Mandate

“What has been done was well done. But this now needs a short, sharp, shock with a 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.”

Judith Donovan, HSE Board member and Agriculture Champion, from HSE/08/24

This project mandate covers:

- (1) Governance
- (2) Resources
- (3) Project background
- (4) Project objectives
- (5) Project scope
- (6) Project stages
- (7) Project workstreams
- (8) Constraints and challenges
- (9) Interfaces
- (10) Quality expectations
- (11) Outline of the business case
- (12) Reference to any associated documents and products
- (13) Customers(s), user(s) or other interested parties
- (14) Executive and project managers

(1) Governance

1.1 The Board provide the strategic steer and are the ultimate decision-making authority, advised by Judith Donovan as Agriculture Champion who will keep them updated on progress at regular intervals.

1.2 Geoffrey Podger as accounting officer and the SMT as resource holders will consider and have approval over the project implementation plan for Agriculture Revisited including the financial and resource allocations (aside from spend already committed under the 2008/09 agriculture communications plan). Jane Willis will lead for the SMT in the development of an appropriate plan etc, with the Director of Communications taking responsibility for communications aspects.

1.3 The Project Director is Elizabeth Gibby [from 27 October 2008 this will be Marcia Davies] with responsibility for keeping the work on track, to time and spend on a day-to-day basis. And the overall Project Manager is Rachel Russell. They will have regular contact with the Board Champion providing strategic direction and oversight to the work, as well as to check understanding and clarify elements of the project and to respond to further proposals and contacts, and playing these into the plan as appropriate.

1.5 A Project Group chaired by Elizabeth Gibby [Marcia Davies] will help develop and support the work, and include all parts of HSE involved in the project:

- Agriculture & Food Sector
- Chief Scientific Adviser's Group
- Field Operations Division HQ
- Communications Division

1.6 The Agriculture Industry Advisory Committee will act as an external reference group for this project.

(2) Resources

2.1 The resources currently attached to the development stages of the project include:

Staff time:

Project Director: Liz Gibby [Marcia Davies from 27 October], 0.1 SCS

Project Manager: Rachel Russell, 0.8 Band 2

Agriculture Sector: Samantha Peace, 0.5 Band 2; Chris Molde, 0.25 Band 3; Nick Sangha, 0.25 Band 4; Alan Plom 0.1 Band 2; Alastair Mitchell and Tony Mitchell 0.2 Band 3. Plus Head of Sector and Admin Support.

Communications Division: Andrew Wetters, 0.25 Band 3; Frank Dolan 0.1%; as a minimum from CD, CDS staff time cost recovered.

CSAG: Maria O'Beirne (Alan Spence and Kate Sweeney), total 0.2 Band 2.

FOD: Marcia Davies & Mike Sebastian totalled at 0.1 B2

Communications budget: £330K has been allocated to agriculture for communications in 2008/09.

2.2 Delivery of the project implementation plan will require finance and staff resources not found from within existing budgets and is likely to involve significant sums, including:

- Funding for: campaign activities and materials; contracting of SHAD delivery; appropriate awards; evaluation; and
- Staff time in the Sector and IRP; CD, CSAG, and FOD.

(3) Project background

3.1 The agriculture sector constitutes about 1.8% of the working population, but is responsible for about 19% of the fatal accidents in GB. There is a historically high incident rate of fatal accidents (about 8 per 100,000 workers). In 2007/08 there were 39 fatalities to agricultural workers and the rate of fatal injury was 9.1 deaths per 100,000 workers. HSE has undertaken a range of campaigning activities over the years, but fatal rates remain stubbornly high.

3.2 In October 2007, the HSC considered a stock take paper on agriculture that proposed options for the future to support improved health and safety performance in agriculture. The HSC concluded that its current agriculture strategy should be revisited and refreshed with the help of the Board's Champion for Agriculture, Judith Donovan.

3.3 After further work, including an Insight Report prepared by Oxford Strategic Marketing and discussions with stakeholders, the HSE Board approved a refreshed programme of work for agriculture, drawn up by Judith Donovan on 28 May 2008, under the title of 'Agriculture Revisited.'

(4) Project objectives

4.1 The overall ambition of Agriculture Revisited is to reduce the number of fatal accidents in agriculture. This will include measurable changes to awareness, attitudes, and if possible behaviours. The project will be base-lined and evaluated.

4.2 The steps by HSE towards achieving this ambition will be a range of refreshed and focussed activity with a strong, but not exclusive emphasis on communications and marketing; by having a simpler, more focused, more measurable plan; and are NOT to move towards a "quick wins" scenario per se.

(5) Project scope

5.1 The project is focussed specifically on farming as a segment of the whole agriculture sector.

5.2 Within that, there are two specific target audiences for the main publicity campaign workstream (see section 7):

(1) Older, self-employed farmers as identified by Oxford Marketing. They may be heading for or past normal retirement age so set in their ways, not very good at business, not well off, probably mixed and livestock farming. Almost certainly GRANDPARENTS.

- (2) Younger, but still middle-aged self employed farmers, who are better trained and have a more modern outlook but are still not wealthy and are highly likely to use their children around the farm, particularly their teenage children. De facto, these are PARENTS.
GRANDPARENTS and PARENTS – ie FAMILIES.

5.3 The types of campaign messages will need to draw on the “Farming kills farmers and their families” proposition and focus on the main causes of accidents and injuries (ie vehicles/machinery; falls; hit by moving/falling objects).

5.4 Given the need to up-skill the industry, the project includes further work to promote vocational qualifications and other routes to training, and a focus on farming equipment reflecting the role of equipment in agriculture accidents. Further details on workstreams are given in Section 6.

5.5 **Not included** in the scope of this project:

- (1) Work on migrant workers which continues in the wider context of HSE activities for those groups, as lead by the Agriculture Sector.
- (2) Work on forestry and arboriculture.
- (3) Other agriculture sector activity which is in train; this will be reviewed in autumn 2008 alongside the emerging Agriculture Revisited plan (DN this doesn't mean that other current activities will stop).

(6) Project stages

6.1 The project will have the following **stages**:

Stage 1: Project initiation and planning

6.2 The objectives for this stage of the project are:

- a. to initiative development, testing and piloting of some campaign messaging and communications techniques, and undertake preparatory work for further SHADs, to help inform the project implementation plan; and
- b. to produce a costed high-level project implementation plan and baseline, by autumn to 2008 to implement the Agriculture Revisited proposals, for agreement to funding and delivery, with the bulk of activity to run for two years from April 2009.

6.3 To make the desired progress in the time available, project initiation and some early work stream activities are running in parallel, rather than sequentially as would usually be the case. This presents some challenges in ensuring work

dovetails, but will also enable more accurate costing to be prepared for the initial plan and test the viability of some options.

Stage 2: Delivery

6.4 The delivery stages will include impact assessment and piloting of activities as they continue to be developed and rolled out, and updates to the plan on a regular basis to reflect emerging detail and any revised costs. The plan will include appropriate review points during delivery.

Stage 3: Evaluation

6.5 Proposals for evaluation will be included in the planning stage and impact assessment of initiatives will be undertaken at key points during delivery. The final outcome evaluation will address the cumulative impact of the workstreams against the project objectives. There is no intention at the initiation and planning stage to do a full impact assessment.

(7) Project workstreams:

7.1 While different elements of communications and marketing run throughout the initiative (the details to be addressed are contained within the May Board paper), and there are some overlapping elements, the project activities can be grouped into the following **workstreams**:

(1) SHADs – a self-standing project, although we will be looking to link local publicity and action into wider campaigning opportunities and messages when these are clearer:

- Deliver 2008/09 SHAD commitments.
- Pilot new approaches in 2008/09 SHADs.
- Prepare for and contract out more and better SHADS in 2009/10, and monitor impact through follow up work.

(2) Publicity campaign(s) developed and tested for the two target audiences, comprising:

- a. Advertising
- b. Direct mailing/promotional initiatives
- c. Media and PR

A key shift in emphasis will be targeting these groups as consumers, rather than in business-to business terms: hence the proposition to use more emotive messaging along the lines of 'Farming kills farmers and their families.'

As part of this we will:

- (a) Review HSE's agriculture publications. This will include identifying material that can be used in its present form for mailing, inserts etc or provides the basis for developing new material (collateral) to support campaign messages.
- (b) Makeover and extend access to HSE's agriculture website and other e-opportunities.
- (c) Review and re-focus our use of agriculture and related trade shows (here we will still want business to business messaging), including maximising PR opportunities.

(3) Improving competences and training

First we will confirm the context for and coverage of HSE's current agriculture VQ and training work.

Then we will look at a possible three stranded approach, including publicity, to:

- (1) Promote uptake of our VQs, and further develop and promote our existing VQs as appropriate.
- (2) Explore potential for and develop Open and Distance learning materials. (For the longer term.)
- (3) Explore potential for developing a virtual academic institute of farm safety and qualifications to give status and gravitas to competences. (Also for the longer term.)

(4) Equipment suppliers/manufacturers etc

Building on work to date, and to explore a potentially fertile area for new partnership working and further publicity activity:

- Improving machinery safety design and messaging through manufacturers.
- Improve safety messaging through distributors.
- Better utilise the supply chain, with a focus on second hand kit, including messages through distributors, retailers and specifically auction house routes
- Maximise attendant trade media opportunities.

Again, the focus is on business to business messages.

(5) Stakeholders

Stakeholder activity cuts across the workstreams.

We will keep the AIAC informed and engaged. We are committed to present progress on the implementation plan to their next meeting at the end of October/early November.

We will undertake a stakeholder review and broaden networks and contacts for genuine partnering opportunities. Progress and timing will be dependent in part on the direction agreed by the Board on the future of IACs and other stakeholder groups.

In the meantime, we will capture and explore new partner/stakeholder opportunities as they arise, and in the context of the different work streams, and look at creating a new partnership group focussed specifically on farming, in parallel with AIAC, to help support this work.

(8) Constraints and challenges

8.1 Currently there is no additional resource within the agriculture sector team for this work, although IRP have been allocated a project manager to work with the sector and other stakeholders to develop the implementation plan. The sector's expert input is key to developing the implementation plan, but we need to recognise there are also ongoing demands on them time to deliver their current work plan. While there is some overlap, there are also differences in direction with work areas that will need to be managed in the planning and subsequent delivery stages.

8.2 There is little proactive FOD activity on agriculture at present (SHADs aside), and FOD resource remains stretched. Part of the purpose of this work is to reduce FOD time spent on SHADs and to focus a small amount of effort on enforcement activity where this can have a much wider impact from subsequent publicity.

8.3 In terms of managing external stakeholders, there is a risk that it may be hard to engage those who wish to see a return to higher resources devoted to proactive inspection of the agriculture sector and they may find the new proposals disappointing.

8.4 The project will require some new ways of working: balancing the Board Champion's very valuable 'can do' approach and ideas generation, with the need to take a step back during the planning phase and to put the proposals into context, cost, prioritise and evaluate them. This is a good challenge to HSE to up its game.

8.5 We will want to make the best use of HSE's considerable experience and knowledge on farming campaigns and agriculture to date, while pushing harder and further in our efforts to impact on fatalities.

8.6 The work of the London communications teams, and specifically press office, is in the process of moving to Bootle which provides some business continuity challenges, which the Director of Communications is committed to managing.

8.7 A risk register will be developed as part of the project plan.

(9) Interfaces

9.1 **Internal:** In addition to the arrangements for governance set out in Section 1 above, work will require input and activity from a range of internal stakeholders, specifically:

Agriculture Sector – agriculture expertise (Roger Nourish, Sam Peace, Chris Molde, Nick Sangha, Alam Plom, Alastair Mitchell, Tony Mitchell, among others)
CSAG – for baseline and evaluation (Maria O'Beirne and Alan Spence)
CD and CDS – for all aspects of campaign planning and collateral (leads are Frank Dolan and Andrew Wetters, but also Kenny MacDonald, Alf Williams, David Smeatham, Ruchi Shah-Mehta/Joe Sharp)
FOD HQ – for FOD operational input and legal issues (Marcia Davies and Mike Sebastian)
BSD – procurement on SHADs (Peter Bengner)
Planning, Efficiency and Finance Division (RR to check who)

It will also be important that HSE's internal communications colleagues work with the development of new external messages to support consistency of messages, and CD are geared to respond.

9.2 **External:**

(1) AIAC – for progress reports and views.

(2) We will engage with individual stakeholders in the context of developing specific work streams.

(3) OGDs – especially DEFRA.

(4) And beyond – as plans develop.

(10) Quality expectations

10.1 Delivery of a fit for purpose project implementation plan ie:

- (1) plan is coherent, with clear dependencies, and component parts are ordered to help maximise the impact of activities;
- (2) it reflects both the aims and detail of the initiative;
- (3) it includes baselines for overall evaluation and proportionate evaluation for component parts where appropriate;
- (4) it includes internal and external costs and allocates responsibilities;
- (5) it has early items for development and delivery in 2008/09 and a campaign roll out over two years;
- (6) it contains appropriate review points, monitoring, risk and governance proposals; and
- (7) is by necessity more detailed for the early stages.

And the plan has buy-in from key internal and external stakeholders.

10.2 Proportionate use of project and programme management tools.

(11) Outline of the business case (e.g. reasons why the project is required)

11.1 See main section (2) above and the October 2007 Board paper (below) on the size and nature of the problem.

(12) Reference to any associated documents and products

- (1) *Future plans for tackling H&S in agriculture*. HSE Board paper number HSE/08/24 (Annex 1 is 'Agriculture Revisited'), meeting date 28 May 2008.
- (2) *Tackling H&S in the agriculture (land based) sector: Future direction*. by Dr Elizabeth Gibby. HSC paper number HSC/07/60, meeting date 9 October 2007.
- (3) Oxford Marketing Insight Report: TRIM reference 2008/150229

(13) Customer(s), user(s) or other interested parties

HSE Board
 Agriculture Industry Advisory Committee
 DEFRA

(14) Project Director and Managers.

Project Director: Liz Gibby [now Marcia Davies], Head, Injuries Reduction Division
 Project Manager: Rachel Russell, Injuries Reduction Division