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| **Minutes of the meeting**Martina Jakob welcomed everybody to the meeting and gave floor to Milena Milonjic from Montenegro Ministry of Science. She told that their ministry is supporting COST Actions and other EU projects and their aim is to get COST Grant Holder position in the future to Montenegro. As a new COST member country Sacurima is one of the first COST Actions, which Montenegro has been joined. Montenegro want to support young researchers, biosciences and scientific collaboration. She welcomed us to Montenegro and wished us a fruitful day and work. Deputy director Senad Begić welcomed us on behalf of IPHMNE Public Health and Medical Issues department. After the opening Montenegro Labor Inspector Zlatko Popovic told us about OSH activities, structures and OSH legislation of Montenegro. His presentation included the main OSH institutions and safety and health labour measures in Montenegro agriculture. According to data from the Statistical Office (MONSTAT), 2178 persons are employed in the Agriculture, Forestry and Fisheries sector. The total number of agricultural holdings in 2016 was 43,791, while in 2010 it was 48,870 (index 2016/2010 is 89,6). The total area of utilized agricultural land in 2016 was 25.5845,8 ha, while in 2010 it was 22.1297,6 ha. Mr Popovic presented also some spreadsheets, how they collect safety information. Montenegro have had several OSH programmes like Campaigns, Conferencies, Workshops, Seminars, Round tables, Study visits and Good practic awards. These are also related to public awerness, new regulation, EU campaigns.This was a good insight to OSH programs in agriculture in Montenegro.. Martina Jakob asked about labor law implementation in Montenegro agriculture. Implementation is in general a challenge and legislation is under construction at the moment. Agriculture there is not so much problems based on the statistics, but this may due also that many small family farms are not registred. Stephan Van den Broucke reminded the behavioral change may need also educational programs and multidiscipline research. Enisa Kujundžić from IPHMNE gave presentation about Specialist course program for persons who use plan protection agents. The main objective of both the training program and the National Plan is to reduce the negative impact of plant protection products (pesticides), that is, to reduce the risks to human health and the environment. In this work they are aiming to establish pesticide use into EU systems, systematize marketing, clear up the stakeholders roles and monitor pesticide residues in food. Risk reduction measures are needed. The program has been suxxessful and they have trained 550 farmers so far. Dr Jarkko Leppälä told that pesticide risks and alternative plant protection methods have great interests in Finland. Dusica Santa from Noth Macedonia presented OSH activities, national structure,legislation of North Macedonia. North Macedonia became independent country 29 year ago and is applied EU membership. In legislation challenges there are “The current legislation provides a satisfactory framework for the application and promotion of OSH, but there is a lack of continuous improvement and bylaws such as occupational safety and health standards and OSH directives.’’\* Basically Dusica told us that there is no any difference in medical care on injured farmers. All injuries are treated on the same medical principles. In case of accident at work of employed farmer, employer is obliged as soon as possible (latest the 48 hours) to report the accident (that causes temporary work disability longer than three working days) tothe State labor inspection. Macedonian Association for Safety and Health at work as NGO hassome initiatives concerning safety at work including the farmers too. The main challenges are that more research for OSH in Agriculture, Intersectoral collaboration, implementation of the legislation, information about the infrastructure state, connect OSH in agriculture curricula at the Faculty of Agricultural sciences and food are needed in agriculture sector. Bjorn Hilt from Norway commented that disabled people and pregnant women may need special programs and information. Do self-employed farmers have same possibilities for OSH services than others? Inger Johanne Sikkeland also from Norway commented that young institutions need study cases to evaluate the progress and implementation.Kari Kjestveit (Norway) gave presentation about Norwegian agriculture and OHS througha system lens. It included considering political-economic system as a starting point. In agriculture politics and economics intertvinned to a higher degree than other sectors. Change in Norwegian agriculture towards larger farm units and “smart farming”. Other change factors are domestic market factors, interests of international capital and the climate changes. Kari compared agriculture OSH system to construction and petroleum sector OSH systems. Sociotechnical system model for workplace safety was applied as a baseline (Carayon et al. 2015). Similarities and differences were checked from organizational structure, authority actions, type of work, industry structure, regulations and types of accidents. All these industry sectors have high risk of accidents. Process risks are linked to organization work types of the sector and personal risks are connected to human safety behavior. Minimizing risk is more successful if the system stability is high. If it is more flexible system like in agriculture more coping of risk management tools are needed. However, other variables should be noted too like tasks and processes, people characters, organizational structure, technology level and external relationships. On regulation level there are external regulation policies and self-regulation strategies. in agriculture self-employed farmers are dominated and work environmental act regulations are only for workers. More thinking that a farm enterprise is much more than just the farmer is needed. It is a complex organisation with many sub departments. Agriculture risk context is dependent on farm production , choice of technology , work organization. Programmes, common goals, and joint activities are important efforts for increasing OHS in small enterprises. Basically the interest group actors and organisations need to work more together to achieve the required OHS focus in agriculture. Workplace / enterprise characteristics more important than individual characteristics? Safety climate (good, organized?) moderates the injury risk. Significant injury predictors were highly challenging workplace design, production categories : cattle (not dairy ), fodder and « mixed », over 1700 annual work hours off farm, high acceptance of injuries. Higher injury rates was found for family farming and having employees. Comments: Agriculture injury statistics show also strong association on some individual behavioral characteristics? Stephan asked, which independent varaiables and predictors were used. Farm size was one. How to measure safety climate on self-employed farmers? Inger Johanne pointed that as farm is a complex system for one person, the farmers need help/support for risk management. Catherine Laurent form France noted that different types of workers should be considered. Kari-Anne Holte from Norway told us about making OSH training relevant for farmers. There is lack of effects of OSH interventions. Educational interventions have found to be useful as an component in multifactorial interventions. The main idea is that various combination of activities, including training may improve exposures, behaviour and health. Another point is that interventions are taking place in a context, which could be considered. Similar interventions behave differently in different contexts. The course program included legislation, internal risk management tools, OHS in agriculture in general, KSL quality management system in Norway and L-HMS OSH services in Norway. The participants were interviewed before and after the course. Method used is abductive reasoning. Interventions surrounded by larger social systems being the context, that has to be understood when interpreting why interventions succeed or fail. Course achieved short term increased awareness , minor changes and minor system related efforts and adding responsibility and that it is relatively easy to make safety improvements not requiring many resources. WEA regulation makes the issue mandatory for farm employers. Quality management system (KSL) makes it system connected with OSH regulation and auditing. Auditor translate regulations to farmers practices. This makes OHS training practical for farmers. Stephan Van den Broucke mentioned that he has had also studies on cultural adaptability between different sectors.Then we went to the Plantaze Company vineyard. It is largest vineyard farm unit in Europe making 15 000 000 bottles of vine per year. Quality and process management is very important to Plantaze. John McNamara from Ireland was leading a group discussion about H&S advisory systems and integration into country policies. There has been collected advisory system survey from 16 countries. Trainer education in OSH may be needed also in Europe. In USA there has been Agricultural Medicine cources for farm advisors. Next year there is Agricultural Extension conference in Ireland. Minutes written by Jarkko Leppälä. |
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