Minutes of the 48th Meeting of the Pesticides Forum: 17 October 2012
Conference Rooms 1 and 2, Foss House, Kings Pool, York YO1 7PX

Those present are listed at Annex A.

Item 1: Introductions and apologies for absence

1.1 The Chairman welcomed all to the 48th meeting including telephone conference attendees Marie Coventry (Scottish Government), Nigel Crane (Environment Agency), Nick Mole (PAN UK) and Dave Thomas (Welsh Government). Sandra Bell, representing SUSTAIN in Jeanette Longfield’s absence, would phone in later.

1.2 The Chairman noted the final appearance before retirement of Pesticides Forum member Helen Bower; he acknowledged her long service representing the Women’s Food and Farming Union (WFFU) since the first Pesticides Forum meeting on 23 May 1996, and thanked her for her many useful contributions over the years.

1.3 The Chairman welcomed and introduced:
   • Jacque Dew (WFFU), due to succeed Helen Bower.
   • Rodger Hobson, Chairman of the British Carrot Growers Association and the new representative of the Country Land and Business Association (CLA). (The Chairman also thanked Robert Campbell (LEAF) for his help in securing the CLA nomination).
   • Hazel Doonan (Agricultural Industries Confederation), for John Ford.
   • Geoff Wilson (Amenity Forum) for John Moverley.
   • Mark Potter from Defra’s Sustainable and Competitive Farming Strategy team (SCFS), and guest presenter for agenda item 5.

1.4 The Secretary recorded apologies for absence from the following members: John Ford, (AIC); Peter Hall, (Organic Sector); Vicky Kindemba (Wildlife and Countryside Link); Alastair Leake (GWCT); Jeanette Longfield (SUSTAIN); Professor John Moverley (Amenity Forum); Charles Sadler, BRC/FPC. The following observers also sent apologies: Deborah Currie and Lorraine Turner (DARDNI); Gary Wiles and Pierre Cruse (HSE, ICU); David Williams (Defra, CET).

1.5 The Chairman informed members of the sad death of Professor Gay Hawksworth, Chair of the Advisory Committee on Pesticides (ACP). Pesticides Forum papers would be forwarded to the ACP Secretariat until a successor was nominated.

Item 2: Minutes and matters arising from the 47th meeting - 20 June 2012

2.1 Members’ comments on the draft minutes of the 20 June meeting had been incorporated and, subject to one further revision, the minutes were agreed and accepted as an accurate record. Following this revision, the final record of the June 2012 meeting will be placed on the Forum website.

Action: Secretariat
2.2 **The Chairman** highlighted the following actions from June’s meeting:

- Next year’s Pesticides Forum meetings had been arranged after consulting the NFU and NFU Scotland to ensure the dates did not clash with their AGMs or main conferences.
- Container Management Working Group (CMWG): Revised container rinsing guidance had been published under the Voluntary Initiative (VI) banner; Members had been sent the website link on 25 September.

2.3 **Richard Butler** (VI) explained that the revised container rinsing guidance aimed to encourage operators to ensure containers were cleaned properly before disposal, and reduce confusion among waste recyclers. The Environment Agency endorsed the guidance, which would be incorporated into NRoSO’s winter training workshops; a press release had been drafted. BASIS and AIC representatives noted that clarifications were required for one or two specific packaging types; these issues would be dealt with outside the meeting. Other members recounted instances of waste recyclers requesting farmers to remove paper labels or cross out the hazardous waste mark, and considered that the symbol referred to the contents, not the packaging. **The Chairman** concluded that further clarification was needed to explain that the container was hazardous when full, and non-hazardous when thoroughly clean. The Nigel Crane (EA) agreed to discuss the issue with his waste colleagues and report back to the Forum. **The Chairman** supported this action, and suggested a relevant case study could be included in the Pesticides Forum Annual Report 2012.

**Action:** Nigel Crane/Secretariat

---

**Item 3 – Farming Regulation Task Force (MacDonald Report), Recommendation 9.44. Online central register of data sheets to facilitate COSHH assessments.**

3.1 **Adrian Dixon** (HSE, CRD) covered this item in the absence of David Williams (Defra). He explained that due to the amount of interest and opinions at the February 2012 Pesticides Forum meeting, when members views were first sought on establishing an online central register of datasheets to facilitate COSHH assessments, the topic was being brought back to the meeting to allow more time for discussion and full consideration. He invited members to comment further and suggest a preferred course of action.

3.2 Members backed the requirement for a register giving 24 hour access to detailed information. Many large companies published safety data sheets for their mainstream products on their websites and some agronomy software included these details, however details for generic products were not widely available online. One idea was for a central register to sit alongside CRD’s pesticides databases, although the burden of maintaining a centralised database was acknowledged; another idea was to require companies to take responsibility to make the information available down their supply chain. A member noted that current REACH legislation already required provision of datasheets, either in the packaging boxes, or via links on product labels, however other members emphasised the need to access the information.
before purchasing the product. The Chairman considered that the first priority was to determine the minimum legal requirements. He recognised the potential benefits of links from the CRD pesticides database to individual company websites and he thanked members for their useful inputs.

Item 4 – Biopesticides Review:
PF 180: Points for discussion by the Pesticides Forum
PS2810 – DRAFT Research report - Biopesticides Policy

4.1 Rob Mason (HSE, CRD) explained that an element of the SUD covered biopesticides and that biopesticides were mentioned in the recommendations of the Farming Regulation Task Force report. CRD sought to make best use of their available funding and resources by considering carefully priorities in this area, hence the review. The aims were to evaluate how far regulation was a barrier to the approval of biopesticides or whether there was a range of other influencing factors, and to establish an evidence base prior to further policy development.

4.2 James Clarke summarised the ADAS research project PS2810, and reminded members that they had received a draft, incomplete project report to aid their considerations; their comments would be fed back to the final version of the report. He invited everyone to focus their discussions around the questions in PF180, and suggested that the key priorities for consideration would centre on the commercial future of biopesticides, and what the Government might do with limited funds to support minor uses in general.

4.3 James explained that the term ‘lack of user knowledge’ was used in the report because biopesticides were considered to be more technically difficult to use than conventional pesticides. A member expressed concern that the difference between ‘no known environmental effects’ and ‘no known environmental risks’ could result in environmental damage from releases into the wild.

4.4 Members heard that there were numerically (but not proportionately) more biopesticides active substances authorised in the United States, but due to the differences in regulatory schemes they could not be brought into Europe without undergoing further evaluation. One member stated that although Government support for SCEPTRE (Sustainable Crops & Environment Protection – Targeted Research for Edibles) was strong and a number of pesticides were being evaluated through this route, there was concern that companies might choose rapporteurs in other Member States (MS) for their evaluations and UK expertise could be lost; mutual recognition was another option but it took time, and CRD’s biopesticides team should be more proactive. Members recognised the value of EAMUs (Extension of Authorisation for Minor Uses) and of Defra’s role as a facilitator to increasing biopesticides availability; however another member remarked that CRD’s approach was more of a barrier. Rob Mason challenged concerns about evaluations by other MS; particularly now that National Provisional Authorisations were no longer permitted under the new EU Regulation meaning that authorisations could not be issued in any MS until the EU
4.5 Although outside the scope of the report, a member noted that Africa also used biopesticides; their approach was to look for the solutions in the environment and to sell the programme of integrated control through advisors. But for the expense of EC registration, Africa could also be a potential source of new products. James said that if the intention was to provide protection for high value crops, the market potential aspect was very important, as future changes in chemical availability might affect industry perspectives on expectations and levels of achievement.

4.6 Members heard that biopesticides had initially been the domain of smaller companies specialising in minor crops, and many products were outcomes from R&D. Now that mainstream agrochemical companies were acquiring the smaller companies this approach might change. Members acknowledged the global influence of major manufacturers and asked why biopesticides used elsewhere in the world were not being brought into Europe yet. James suggested that SCEPTRE looked for solutions to multiple crop problems, so a biopesticide aimed at one specific target would not be included. Other members suggested that the potential market needed to be large enough and the regulatory process not too expensive; although if product development had already been completed in other countries the costs should not be prohibitive. The Chairman thanked everyone for their inputs and requested that any further comments be sent to Joy Wilson and copied to him, by the end of October.

Item 5 –The review of environmental advice and incentives for farmers and land managers

5.1 Mark Potter (Defra, Sustainable and Competitive Farming Strategy) gave a presentation covering the ongoing Defra project to review environmental advice and incentives, the Integrated Advice Project and the review of voluntary approaches. He outlined the complexity of the overall ‘delivery landscape’ (the model by which various public and other partner bodies help to deliver Defra’s aims), and went on to describe the progress for streamlining some of the component initiatives. The main aim of this more integrated and efficient approach was to help farmers and land managers improve the economic and environmental performance of their farms.

5.2 Mark identified some key points: recognising the need to deliver at local level using trusted sources; targeting objectives and advice to hard to reach farmers; exploring the use of social networks and peer to peer relationships for knowledge transfer; reducing multiplicity and increasing working in partnership; further integration of the many separate advice schemes, to the forthcoming review of Natural England (NE) and the Environment Agency (EA); and the development of the .gov.uk website. He cited the Campaign for the Farmed Environment (CFE) initiative as an example of a successfully co-ordinated local approach to dealing with specific problems, and the Taylor
Review as a model for reviewing multiple codes of practice. The project was almost complete (dependent on the outcomes of the reviews of the RDPE and NE/EA), and the results would be circulated around stakeholders.

5.3 Members were fascinated by the breadth of the project. One considered the information crucial to help sustainable farming move forward and asked whether models outside UK had been considered, such as in Denmark, where farmers go on field trips to learn about IPM delivery. Mark said that the project had not yet looked beyond UK; however each of the devolved regions took a different approach to providing advice. For example, there were more subsidies in Scotland, Wales and Northern Ireland than in England. Members identified the Business Link website as a good source of advice for farmers and Mark confirmed that all the key information would transfer to the GOV.UK website. One member suggested a farming equivalent of the driver’s speed awareness course as a possible penalty for minor non-compliance activity.

5.4 Richard Butler was concerned that the project survey results appeared to display a poor recognition of the VI; he suggested that VI Manager Patrick Goldsworthy might liaise with Mark about this. The Chairman recognised the difficulties and inherent conflicts of a focus group dealing with broad issues. Mark acknowledged a possible issue with recognition generally; however he noted that the VI was viewed as an exemplar, with favourable comparison to others. The Chairman thanked Mark for his interesting presentation; he expressed the desire of both the VI and the Pesticides Forum to keep in touch with the project’s progress, and AIC’s representative seconded this.

Item 6 – Update on the aerial applications process

6.1 Adrian Dixon (CRD) described the background behind the recent introduction of new procedures for requesting and issuing authorisations for aerial applications of pesticides which had been developed by CRD in conjunction with conservation and environment agencies.

6.2 Adrian provided details from the early implementation period. He explained that an aerial application plan contains information about a whole job of work for a landowner or a group of landowners, so one plan might contain several individual applications covering different geographical areas; 367 applications had recently been submitted by just four operators. Civil Aviation Authority rules applied to all flying heights and distances, such as proximity to residential areas; bad weather conditions could be worked around since the application and authorisation did not specify exact flight dates.

6.3 One member thanked CRD for providing a good set of arrangements, while another member conceded that integrating nature conservation legislation with regulatory legislation was very difficult, particularly if conservation expectations were high. The Chairman thanked Adrian for his presentation and concluded that, since the new arrangements satisfied the requirements of SUD, the subject would not need to come back to the Forum unless any related issues arose.
Item 7 – Update on Indicators Group meeting; proposed new structure and content for next year’s Pesticides Forum Annual Report; development of new indicators.

7.1 Nigel Chadwick (CRD) noted that a draft outline of the 2012 Annual Report had been sent to everyone, along with questions for their consideration and response. He described the report’s intended objectives and explained that the new structure was designed to reflect the headings in the new UK National Action Plan, taking into account guidance from the recent ADAS research (reported at the June 2012 Forum meeting) and the Indicators Group discussions on 13 July 2012. The existing indicators had been re-positioned under the new heading categories, although he acknowledged that some did not transpose comfortably.

7.2 Nigel talked members through the different sections, summarising the indicators identified for each and inviting comment and feedback on the indicators, content and style of the draft. He highlighted a couple of key deadlines in the report production process, and emphasised that extra time had been built into the process this year to enable Forum members to circulate the draft report around their own membership organisations, gather views and provide a co-ordinated response to the Secretariat.

7.3 Members discussed the Executive Summary format and a proposed new ‘Government comments’ section. The meeting agreed that a Government section was probably not required. Members also agreed that a form of words should be drafted which recognised the diversity of views in the Pesticides Forum membership and acknowledged that the interests and priorities of the component organisations might prevent concurrence on some issues. The draft wording should be circulated and agreed by all Pesticides Forum members and inserted in the 2012 Executive Summary.

Action: Secretariat

7.4 Members agreed that a new page showing the overview of progress with the National Action Plan was required.

Action: Secretariat

7.5 Members also noted or commented on the following items:
Section A - Indicator Headings: the need for indicators to be signposted or cross referred to other headings, possibly under a sub heading ‘Other relevant data’ at the end of the appropriate section, or for example, ‘Sales Data – other indicators to be read in conjunction:’

Part 1 - Training: No mention of CPD, due to difficulties extracting data in usable form.

Part 2 – Sales: Additional data sets on Home and Garden (Amateur) product sales and storekeeper’s qualifications would be welcomed by the Secretariat.

Part 3 - Information and Awareness Raising: the definition of MRLs exceedences was queried, but the Chairman concluded that the existing
explanation should remain. Responsibility for ‘distributor’s awareness raising’ was clarified as resting with the distributor(s), or whoever is responsible for the sale of the product. On format and coverage of the available MRLs data, the current method of collection limits data manipulation and comparison capability. The poisoning incidents subheading needs clarification to link it back to the Directive. Defra now collects data on moths and butterflies although because of these species susceptibility to poor weather this would need to be referenced in the report. Sustain’s representative volunteered to ask Vicky Kindemba (WCL) to arrange the provision of information on mechanisms for monitoring under the Birds and Habitats Directive; the Chairman welcomed either data or a case study.

**Action: Sandra Bell / Vicky Kindemba**

**Part 4 - Application Equipment:** Data representation was currently limited by regional variations in data collection methods - a desire was registered for greater co-ordination although other significant differences also exist. The focus in Scotland is on incentives. Wales too has less arable and more livestock farmers than England.

**Part 5 - Aerial Application:** Possible provision of a case study on asulam use.

**Part 6 – Aquatic Environment and Drinking Water:** EA and SEPA are working to achieve better agreement. AHDB is involved in a Hortlink research project that could be a case study.

**Part 7 - Risk in specific areas:** Scottish Water’s best practice incentive scheme is funding drinking water protection measures. Amenity Forum has no hard evidence, only anecdotal information; STRI data may be useful. SNH’s representative agreed to speak to the Secretariat outside the meeting regarding possible information on SSSI infringements.

**Action: Peter Pitkin/Nigel Chadwick**

**Part 8 - Handling and Storage:** Breaches of compliance; container washing guidance. Possible case study of pesticides container recycling workshop looking at risks associated with disposal of amateur containers. Need some text to clarify the difference between professional and non-professional (home and garden) products, and important to use consistent terminology.

**Part 9 - IPM:** Crop Protection Management Plans fit in the non-regulatory section, data to indicate trends in uptake.

**Part 10 –Indicators:** Usage data and cropped areas.

**7.6 The Chairman** asked members to submit any further comments on the draft to the Secretariat by the end of October, so they could be taken forward to the next Indicators Group meeting on 8 November.

**Action: All**

**Item 8 – Update on implementation of the Sustainable Use Directive (SUD) and development of the National Action Plan (NAP).**
8.1 Adrian Dixon (HSE, CRD) provided an update on the implementation of the SUD and more details on progress with NAP development. Emphasising that the policy approach to implementation had already been determined, he welcomed members’ views and feedback on related practical issues.

8.2 Members heard that the key objectives in NAP were protection of water and IPM, and also that:

- City and Guilds (Land Based Services), together with CRD and the NFU were working up a possible approach to resolving the issue of certificating those with grandfather rights by November 2015. Caroline Kennedy (CRD) explained the thinking so far in terms of what ‘grandfathers’ might need to do to achieve a certificate, the possible cost involved, and the necessity of imposing limitations on the type of work the certificates would cover. There was a possibility of extending this certificate to cover ‘infrequent users’, but in order to do so it would be necessary to come up with an appropriate and workable definition of infrequent use.

- CRD hoped to contact the colleagues in the Devolved Administrations, farming unions and other directly affected parties with more details in due course. Neither grandfather rights nor this specific new type of certification are relevant to users in the amenity sector.

- Subject to Ministerial agreement, the intention is for the NSTS, as run by the Agricultural Engineers Association, to be a body designated to administer the equipment inspection regime.

- Subject to Ministers agreement, there were plans to update and possibly amalgamate the codes of practice relating to pesticides; consultation would be undertaken in 2013.

Item 9 – Pesticides National Action Plan – delivery bodies: information papers (PF 181 and PF 182)

9.1 Adrian Dixon summarised the papers describing the membership, objectives and work of the Grower Liaison Group and Amateur Liaison Group. These were two of the three stakeholder groups with specific expertise to support delivery of aspects of the National Action Plan; the Amenity Forum would cover the Amenity sector. Short term working groups would be set up to consider specific identified issues. The Chairman noted the importance of the Pesticides Forum keeping up to date with work in all these areas. There was at least one Pesticides Forum member in each of the three liaison groups, and he asked these members to brief the Forum regularly on their discussions.

9.2 Welsh Government and Department of Agriculture Northern Ireland representatives requested the list of members of the Grower Liaison group in PF181 was corrected to add details of the industry representatives from Wales and Northern Ireland that were omitted in error. The revised paper (PF181 rev) will be published on the Pesticides Forum website.

Action: Secretariat
Item 10 – Possible items from Members/Chair/Secretariat for next and future meetings.

10.1 Members were reminded that the Water topics originally intended for the October 2012 agenda would be covered in February 2013, along with a session on IPM. Adrian Dixon explained that the deadline to report to Europe on IPM was 30 June 2013, so he intended to circulate a paper and questions on IPM before the Forum meeting in February, in order to gather members’ responses and formulate a way forward. The Chairman invited suggestions for meeting topics in June and October 2013 and beyond into 2014. He encouraged members to send the Secretariat further thoughts and ideas as and when they arose, rather than wait until the next Forum meeting.

Action: All

10.2 The areas below were proposed for February and June 2013 meetings.

- **Pesticides and Water Quality**: (February 2013) including
  - Update on the outcome of the Defra study ‘Appraisal of cost effective policy instruments to tackle the impact from pesticides in water’.
  - Catchment Sensitive Farming, and the Scottish perspective.
  - Environment Agency focus on pesticides and drinking water protection, and related policy areas.
  - CRD update on BIS, CRD and Defra discussions on EU prioritisation work on WFD priority substances.
  - Pollution in rivers and the role of the Rivers Trusts.

- **Integrated Approaches**: (February 2013)
  - European (SCAR, ENDURE, PURE) and UK perspectives
  - The Forestry Commission’s IPM approach

- **Possible field visit**: (June 2013) – perhaps to a farm or situation with a challenging environment, or experiencing areas of difficulty with compliance. Severn Trent water and the River Leam catchment area were suggested as Catchment Sensitive Farming Initiatives (CSFI) had not produced good results here. The Secretariat would liaise with NFU about a meeting with Stoneleigh as a base.

Action: Secretariat

Item 11 – AOB and communication of relevant activities (standing item)

11.1 Two forthcoming events were publicised: new Amenity Assured standards would be launched on 22 November at Pride Park in Derby, and the Amenity Forum planned to sponsor an ‘Amenity Sprayer of the Year’ award.

11.2 The Chairman noted some correspondence received from PAN (UK) on non-targeted spraying, which had been copied to relevant organisations in the Pesticides Forum. Several views had been expressed via email outside
the meeting, and he welcomed other comments. CPA’s representative noted that the two main issues in the correspondence referred to: the use of hand lances from moving vehicles, which was a ‘best practice’ and not a legal matter; and the application of pesticides to hard surfaces which, in terms of specific target applications, the CPA considered a legal issue. The Amenity Forum’s representative said that the points raised had been fully discussed at previous Amenity Forum meetings and their majority position in support of the Amenity Assured standard was clear, as they believed this aligned with HSE’s guidance. The Chairman added that any evidence of illegal activity should be reported to the regulator.

**Item 12 - Dates of next meetings**

- **Wednesday, 13th February 2013**
- **Wednesday, 19th June 2013**
- **Wednesday, 16th October 2013**

The next meeting will be held on: **Wednesday, 13th February 2013 in Foss House Conference Rooms, York.** Details will be sent out nearer the time.

**Close – 15.00pm**
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