Minutes of the 46th Meeting of the Pesticides Forum: 22 February 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 everyone to the 46th meeting, including four teleconference attendees, Nick Mole (PAN UK), Nigel Crane (Environment Agency), Marie Coventry (Scottish Government) Dave Thomas (Welsh Government), and introduced the following new members and visitors:

- Charles Sadler, the new Fresh Produce Consortium and British Retail Consortium representative, replacing Tony Palmer.
- Andy Povey (ACP), standing in for Professor Gay Hawksworth.
- Janet Williams (CPA), standing in for Anne Buckenham.
- Paul Singleton (Amenity Forum) standing in for Professor John Moverley.
- Caroline Kennedy (CRD), co-presenting with Grant Stark on Agenda Item 7.

1.2 The Chairman informed the meeting that Ruth Goldsworthy, wife of Patrick Goldsworthy (Voluntary Initiative), had passed away on 19 February. Although not a member of the Forum Patrick has attended a number of meetings and is a member of the Indicators Group who help produce the Forum’s Annual Report. A note of condolence would be sent to Patrick on behalf of the Forum.

Action: Secretariat

1.3 The Secretary recorded apologies for absence from the following members: Professor Gay Hawksworth (ACP); Alastair Leake (GWCT); Jeanette Longfield (SUSTAIN); Professor John Moverley (Amenity Forum); Anne Buckenham (CPA) and Robert Campbell (LEAF). The meeting also noted that since FWAG had gone into administration it is unlikely that their representative - Jo Oborn – would be able to attend future meetings. The Secretariat agreed to look into possible replacement organisations. The following observers also sent apologies for absence: Deborah Currie (DARDNI); Arwyn Davies (Defra CN); Mike Green (NE); and Aattifah Teladia (FSA).

Action: Secretariat

Item 2: Minutes and matters arising from the 45th meeting held on 19 October 2011

2.1 Comments received from Members on the draft minutes of the 19 October meeting had been incorporated into the final version, which had been accepted as an accurate record. The final version had been placed on the Forum website.
2.2 James Clarke reported the following completed actions against issues identified from the October 2011 Forum meeting:

- Container Management Working Group (CMWG): The Environment Agency (EA) had provided a progress report on the development of container continual rinsing guidance (as recommended in the CMWG report). The guidance has been delayed as the EA were awaiting further data from the Irish EPA triple rinsing trials to ensure that hazardous waste limits are not being breached. As a result, the draft guidance can now be drafted and circulated to the CMWG for comment in March. Forum members looked forward to receiving an update on the final guidance at the June 2012 meeting.

  Action: CMWG

- The minutes of the CMWG meeting of 30 September 2011 to discuss returnable containers had been circulated to Forum members. Alastair Leake had emailed his apologies for today’s meeting, noting that the minutes were a succinct summary of the group’s discussions; across all sectors, manufacturers/distributors/end users considered that the disadvantages outweighed the advantages. The CMWG wanted to see the continued implementation of their report recommendations as means of delivering best practice for re-cycling the container materials.

- Given that emergency authorisations processes were still under consideration, the ACP had agreed that Forum members with specific issues related to the loss of active substances should contact Mark Hawkins at CRD.

- The Secretariat had included a synopsis of the Forum’s 15th Anniversary presentations in the draft Forum annual report 2011, and this will be highlighted in the press release when the report is launched.

- Themes for future meetings, including ‘Integrated Approaches’ and ‘Pollution in rivers including the role of the Rivers Trusts’ would be covered at agenda item 6.

Item 3 – Future role of the Pesticides Forum; Development of the UK National Action Plan (PF179)

3.1 Members heard that following the stakeholder engagement review, as described in CRD’s letter of 20 December 2011, Minister’s view was that the Pesticides Forum would remain the principal stakeholder engagement group for the pesticides National Action Plan (NAP), developing and maintaining the NAP through a series of working groups and delivering through bodies such as the Voluntary Initiative and the Amenity Forum.

3.2 Adrian Dixon (CRD) introduced PF179, re-iterating the Pesticides Forum’s role in implementing and reviewing the measures in the pesticides National Action Plan required by the Sustainable Use Directive, using experts working in focused topic groups, as and when required. Ministers recognised
a need for liaison groups to continue working in amateur and amenity areas, and a third 'grower liaison' group would be formed to work with industry on issues including the availability of crop protection products. These groups would form a link between the Pesticides Forum, stakeholders and Government, and provide a source of expert advice for the Forum on these areas.

3.3 **Annex to PF179** contained a draft matrix of interests which Forum members were invited to consider as a discussion starter. Adrian asked for the Forum’s help to shape the new short term working groups (STWG), and clarified the ‘Sales’ heading in the matrix meant ‘controls on sales’, in line with the legislation. Members suggested an additional column for application technology, in addition to that for aerial application. **James Clarke** asked members whether there should be other organisations to include in the matrix, or other government departments. Members and observers were requested to send their comments and completed responses to the Forum Secretariat by the end of February 2012, indicating all their organisations areas of interest and where they would like to have a leading role as Chair/ Deputy Chair of specific topic groups.

**Action: All Forum members and observers to return completed matrix to Secretariat by end Feb 2012**

3.4 Adrian reported that Government was drafting the new National Action Plan and a public consultation was likely, subject to Ministerial agreement, before the final version went to the European Commission by the 26 November 2012 deadline. He invited members’ comments on the following headline points:

- Scope for regional variation – was any new emphasis required?
- Objectives, measures and timetables - ideas for additions or presentational points?
- Delivery – in addition to existing avenues such as the Voluntary Initiative and Amenity Forum, could any other organisations be used?
- Implementation – issues and priorities for the Working Groups.

Adrian explained that the first point of developing a regional plan was to identify what was being done differently and why, so it could be fitted into the National Plan. Members mentioned issues with specific active substances in some regions and suggested that focusing on these could help provide local solutions to local problems. Members requested a regional Welsh focus on the basis of different user profiles and the language difference. They were reminded that, to ensure consistency across the plan, regional variations should be driven by the issue rather than the country, and regional issues would be linked to work on Indicators. Peter Pitkin pointed out that leading and driving a regional plan demanded resource and Marie Coventry responded that this was not currently available in Scotland; there was much similarity between England and Scotland, and unless a specific issue was identified a regional plan was not an immediate concern. **James Clarke** emphasised that if regional plans were to be developed, they should be issue led.
Item 4 – Future of industry initiatives and relationship with the Pesticides Forum and the National Action Plan

4.1 Richard Butler outlined the structure of the Voluntary Initiative (VI) since he had taken up its chairmanship in December. In addition to the main group which met twice a year, a new Strategy Group comprised the main sponsors. He noted the VI’s established good working relationship with the Pesticides Forum and their similarities in structure. While the Forum was the consultation body and mechanism for developing pesticides policy, Richard saw the VI providing the practical on-farm delivery of policy. He listed some examples of successful initiatives:

- NRoSO proved that voluntary initiatives could sometimes work better than restrictive legislation, as farmers would support positive benefits;
- Partners in industry included agronomists, who were undertaking BETA training.
- The VI Community Interest Company (CIC) enabled the VI to sponsor projects outside its usual remit, such as working in partnership with the Catchment Sensitive Farming Initiative.

Richard acknowledged the importance of delivering consistent VI messages to farmers, to complement the Pesticides Forum’s work. He saw opportunities to work closer with the Campaign for the Farmed Environment’s initiatives to avoid duplication and take advantage of their regional structure. Following his recent meeting with the Amenity Forum Chair, Professor John Moverley, he was looking forward to developing the VI’s working relationship with the Amenity Forum.

4.2 Dave Thomas asked whether Richard would be meeting with the Farmers Union of Wales. James Clarke agreed that engaging with the upland farmers, would be important and a good example of working across different voluntary groups. Richard confirmed he intended to talk to groups of Welsh farmers with a view to clarifying some initiatives. He also stressed the importance of maintaining links with the commercial sector and large scale industries; he had recently attended a city food conference and maintained a personal level of contact as a farmer and supplier to Waitrose.

4.3 James Clarke thanked Richard and acknowledged the VI’s cooperation and partnership with the Forum. He underlined the importance of integration across the voluntary approaches, and also between government and voluntary approaches.

4.4 Paul Singleton (Amenity Forum) gave a presentation on the work and key initiatives of the Amenity Forum (AF). He described the breadth and diversity of the amenity sector, and its size relative to the use of pesticides, and noted that although herbicides for weed control formed a major share of pesticides used, the sports turf industry applied fungicides and insecticides, and plant growth regulators were employed for railway herbage control. Amenity Forum objectives aimed to pull together the whole sector and act as a ‘VI for the amenity sector’. With funding sourced solely from the AF
members’ annual contributions, the focus was on delivering a serious message across the wide range of stakeholders.

4.5 Members heard that the AF supported plans for specific amenity CPD registers and hoped that the SUD would drive CPD improvement in the amenity sector. Two qualifications, covering operators and advisers, were currently recognised in statute, and training was also available for managers, supervisors and specifiers. Paul highlighted the Amenity Assured programme’s rigorous, annual three stage audit process and the pesticides stores inspection programme, and noted there was scope to increase amenity sector buy-in.

4.6 A key AF challenge was to improve links with Local Authorities (LAs) and, while mindful of their financial pressures, to encourage them to engage proactively with their contractors and pesticides usage responsibilities. Other focus items included water issues, the proximity of pesticides to the public in amenity situations, and concerns regarding product availability and reliance on glyphosate. Paul noted that some LAs were increasing their brushing regimes as part of an approach to integrated pesticides use.

4.7 Kerry Hutchinson suggested the Amenity Forum could approach APSE or CABE’s ‘Green Space’ project with a view to engaging more LAs. Paul asked for contact details. [Post meeting note: These have been emailed to him.] Regarding HDC membership of the AF, Paul said that as vice chair of HDC he also represented their ornamentals group. James Clarke suggested that amenity forum indicators could report the percentage of LAs specifying Amenity Assured contractors in their contracts, and quantify the percentage of railway network covered. He further enquired about the level of interaction between the VI and the AF, whether there was overlap, and about the opportunities for collaboration. Paul noted that, historically the amenity sector had been perceived as different from, and disregarded in comparison with, the agricultural sector. However, amenity’s invoiced value was worth half that of the crop protection sector, due to the labour and contract value involved. He agreed the VI and AF shared similar aims and objectives and that there was room for improvement, but wished to avoid duplication. Both groups shared a closer working relationship now than in the past. The two Chairmen had discussed customising specific VI pamphlets for the amenity sector, and reciprocal web links on both websites were being set up. John Moverley had attended the last VI meeting and Richard would be attending the next meeting of the AF.

4.8 James Clarke acknowledged the VI and AF’s work in the past and their willingness to work together in the future to help achieve the successful implementation of the NAP. He hoped that the Pesticides Forum would help to provide and develop links between the two bodies.

5.1 Nigel Chadwick reminded members that the draft Forum annual report for 2011 had been circulated to them recently by email. He gave a short presentation covering the main changes and new sections in this year’s report. It was hoped that the final report would be published online before the end of April. No paper copies would be produced. A press release was planned to highlight publication and Nigel asked members to help publicise the report through their own organisations and via their contacts with recognised industry publications. He invited everyone to send any comments on factual errors or omissions in the draft to the Secretariat by 29 February 2012 at the latest.

Action: ALL

Item 6 - Possible items from Members/Chair/Secretariat for next and future meetings

6.1 Members agreed it would be timely to discuss the National Action Plan at the June 2012 meeting, given the deadline for submitting the final version to the Commission by 26 November 2012.

6.2 Adrian Barker raised a BIS concern regarding the prioritisation work being undertaken at EU level to identify Water Framework Directive priority substances / priority hazardous substances, and/or similar work at a UK level to identify UK specific pollutants. The addition of three pesticides active substances (bifenox, cypermethrin and quinoxyfen) into the (EQS) Directive for water would lead to extra costs to industry. Nigel Crane said that although cypermethrin failures could potentially raise a similar situation to metaldehyde, the Environment Agency was not currently monitoring for cypermethrin emissions from arable agriculture. Targeted monitoring might identify cypermethrin failures, more likely in Eastern England. Bifenox was not seen as a general issue, although it might occur at failure levels in some localised areas. He emphasised the importance of good responses to voluntary mitigation measures, similar to metaldehyde.

6.3 Adrian Dixon suggested the water companies were concerned because of the costs of keeping water clean. David Williams explained that the main policy implications were associated with the introduction of new substances into the Environmental Quality Standards Directive 2008/105/EC, the re-classification of some from priority substance to priority hazardous substance, and the change of environmental quality standards (EQS) for certain substances. Quinoxyfen was proposed to be classified as a priority hazardous substance; however he considered that the water companies concerns were more focussed on non-pesticide substances such as naturally synthetic oestrogens, which would be more costly to remove. He suggested that the Commission’s impact assessment needed to be tighter and the costs and benefits should be looked at closely.
6.4 **James Clarke** considered that there should be a more strategic view of risk/benefit. He asked that the issue be discussed further between CRD, Defra and BIS and brought back as an update as part of the Pesticides and water quality theme in the October meeting, which would also tie in with the outcome of the Defra study 'Appraisal of cost effective policy instruments to tackle the impact from pesticides in water'.

**Action: CRD to update in October**

6.5 **Richard Butler** noted that today’s Pesticides Forum meeting clashed with the NFU AGM. He requested that the Secretariat try to avoid next year’s NFU AGM date when arranging the February 2013 meeting.

**Action: Secretariat**

6.6 **Tom Bals** asked that the implications of the Danish Pesticides Tax should be discussed at a future meeting. **James Clarke** thought the Indicators Working Group could cover the HAIR project discussions under a wider heading of hazard and risk. **Adrian Dixon** said that a CRD representative attended a recent Commission workshop on HAIR and noted that the Commission view HAIR as the basis for EU Indicators. Since indicators and also integrated approaches are identified as key priority work areas it would be worth keeping an eye on these developments.

**Item 7 - Implementation of the Sustainable Use Directive**

7.1 **Grant Stark and Caroline Kennedy** (CRD) presented this item. Grant outlined the objectives of the Directive, reminding members that Ministers had indicated a wish for implementation in a manner which minimised the burdens on business while maintaining the protection of human health and the environment, and the UK had a mature legislative base on which the new National Action Plan (NAP) could be based. CRD had developed draft legislation which was undergoing the usual cross-Government agreement process and was expected around or shortly after April 2012. The policy had already been outlined in the Government's response to a formal public consultation carried out in May 2010 and this had indicated what the implementing legislation would look like. The key priorities had been to:

- Ensure the directive was properly transposed;
- Minimise the financial and other burdens on those affected by the legislation;
- Ensure the requirements/obligations were proportionate to the outcomes, relying where possible on existing measures (such as pesticides in water legislation, subsidy schemes, and assurance schemes);
- Ensure that the implementation of the Directive would mean “business as usual” for the vast majority of businesses.

7.2 The government position was that legislation was just one part of the implementation package; non-regulatory approaches were an important, complementary component alongside regulatory measures. The aim of today's agenda item was not to discuss the policy, as that had already been decided by Ministers, but to look at the technicalities and consider how
implementation was going to work in practice. Grant welcomed views and feedback from members on any practical issues. The ensuing discussions looked at the following key areas: National Action Plan; Training; Sales; Equipment testing; Aerial applications; Protection of water and specific areas; Integrated pest management. It was important to remember that this would be a discussion of how CRD thought the legislation would work in practice, nothing could be considered settled until Ministerial agreement had been reached.

National Action Plan:
7.3 Grant reported that the NAP describes what the Member States will do to meet the requirements of the Directive. Members raised several comments and Grant explained that the policy preference was that the activities would, as far as the new legislative framework allowed, be risk-based. The UK was required to submit the NAP to the Commission by 26 November 2012. Peter Hall supported the proposed approach. James Clarke emphasised the need to explore how the Forum feeds this back into the process if it is not being enacted by one area of industry. There was some discussion on managing regional differences in terms of the Devolved Administrations.

Training and (Controls on) Sales:
7.4 Caroline explained that although the Directive did not include an explicit requirement for professional users or advisors to be trained and certificated, there were controls at the point of sale that would go some way toward achieving this outcome, in that the purchase of professional products after 2015 would have to involve a person holding a certificate. However the Government was aware that industry wanted to see the existing general obligation for certification of users to be carried across under the SUD and this remained a possibility, subject to cross-Government agreement.

7.5 Caroline explained how the requirements for distributor certification were likely to look under the Directive. Distributors of non-professional products would in future need sufficient certificated staff to provide information to customers. What “sufficient” means is not defined in the Directive, this would be at the discretion of the business in question, so long as they could ensure that a person was always available at the time of sale (this did not necessarily mean they had to be physically present at the point of sale). In terms of the sale of non-professional products, the required level of training needed to be relatively basic. Courses such as the BASIS Guardian course already existed, although CRD agreed with industry that these were possibly aimed at a higher level than the minimum that might be required under the Directive. The CPA was interested in taking the lead on producing an appropriate syllabus that could be accredited by an awarding body and had suggested they might make this more widely available. CRD would be happy to proceed on this basis subject to the usual approval of the syllabus.

7.6 Caroline explained that it would be a case of “business as usual” for distributors of professional products. These businesses were already required to employ staff holding a Certificate of Competence for Sale and Supply (the advisors certificate) and the requirement for certificated staff under the
Directive could be interpreted as having the same effect. Therefore there would be no additional requirements on distributors of professional products.

7.7 There was some discussion of enforcement and compliance in terms of the sales restriction. CRD felt that it should be the purchaser who is liable for ensuring that they (or their staff) hold the appropriate certificate, rather than making this the distributors’ responsibility. This prompted discussion on the removal of grandfather rights since those individuals would need a certificate by 2015 in order to purchase products. Forum members suggested that the numbers involved might cause some difficulty, and Richard Butler asked whether it would be sufficient for the person to be NRoSO registered. Caroline replied that the public consultation and the Government’s response had suggested that three years NRoSO registration might be an appropriate benchmark on which to grant a certificate. Richard Butler felt that that would be very helpful for the industry. Certification would be ‘for life’, not time limited.

7.8 In regard to a query about where the responsibility lay at point of sale where the purchaser was not the end user, Caroline explained that it had been necessary to employ some flexibility in interpreting this provision in the Directive, in placing the onus on the pesticides purchaser to ensure that the end user had the required certification. This would prevent disruption of current practices where the purchaser is not the end user of the product. Peter Hall suggested that an integral part of the audit process was to ask ‘who is applying the pesticides?’ Charles Sadler pointed out that in Local Authorities, the buying department was a long way from the end user. Caroline explained that the intention was to arrive at a common sense approach that took account of how things worked in reality, in order to avoid unintended scenarios such as a person who did not use pesticides having to get certified in order to buy them over the phone for someone else to use. Although there are different purchasing scenarios, some less straightforward than others, and no ideal solution, someone would have to be ultimately responsible for ensuring the end user had a certificate, and it was most appropriate for that person to be the purchaser.

7.9 Peter Hall suggested that the business using the product should be responsible, since the farmer is responsible for what comes on to his farm. Members discussed maintaining the existing requirement for certification of storekeepers. Caroline explained that storekeepers are not mentioned in the Directive and it would therefore be considered gold-plating to maintain this obligation under the SUD. A number of Members felt this was unsatisfactory in light of the risks associated with storage and Caroline and Grant explained that there would be general obligations on those involved with storage and handling of pesticides in relation to taking reasonable precautions not to cause harm to human health and the environment and that having certificated storekeepers could be one of these precautions. Members felt it would be preferable to have an explicit obligation, as now. Caroline explained that this would not be in line with the Government’s policy in respect of transposing EU legislation.
7.10 John Ford welcomed the responsibility being placed into the buyers’ hands. While 90% of professional pesticides distributed in UK went direct to the buyer, many of whom were known regular customers; he suggested it might be useful for a distributor to be able to make such enquiries of a customer where they were unknown to him, and where there may be concern as to the potential use of the product in the remaining 10% of cases, perhaps by voluntarily challenging buyers. Caroline noted that the distributor would not necessarily have co-responsibility and would not be required to make specific checks, as this was seen to be unnecessarily burdensome but they would be encouraged to disseminate information about the new obligation to their customers and there was nothing to stop them asking their customers whether they had a certificate. CRD was aware that the majority of their customers are well known to distributors. The Chairman said that it would be useful if illustrative guidance showing examples of compliant and non-compliant behaviour could be made available in time for the Directive’s launch.

7.11 Members discussed the most appropriate terminology in relation to what CRD were referring to as a training certificate that equates to the existing ‘certificate of competence’, and where there were issues of continuity. Adrian Dixon noted that the new wording was a result of the copy out approach to drafting the legislation. CRD agreed to look at the wording again.

Equipment Testing:
7.12 Caroline explained that the Directive required application equipment to be inspected at intervals of no less than 5 years between 2016 and 2020 and at intervals of no less than three years thereafter. After 2016 only equipment that had passed inspection could be in use. The Directive set out 3 types of equipment that must always be subject to this timetable (boom sprayers greater than 3m in length and equipment attached to trains and aircraft), but allowed for other equipment types to be subject to less frequent inspection intervals subject to a risk assessment, including an assessment of scale of use. Derogations were available; handheld and knapsack sprayers would be exempt from inspection. The competent authority would need to designate the body (or bodies) responsible for administering the inspection scheme and Caroline confirmed that it was envisaged that it would be very much in line with the NSTS tests,

7.13 Tom Bals was concerned that granular application and fogging equipment could be subject to a less frequent inspection interval, and that testing requirements would not differentiate between a 16 litre sprayer and a 16000 litre sprayer. Caroline noted that the SI had to be in line with what was set out in the Directive, and confirmed that standard amenity situation kit such as a two metre boom sprayer and hand-held lance could be exempt from inspection. Several members remarked on the Directive’s very basic level of requirement, and that many people already operated to a much higher standard. Members felt it would be important to communicate strong messages about this being a baseline level of inspection, with a preference for continued annual testing under the NSTS.

7.14 The scheme would be policed in line with existing compliance arrangements. Members identified there would be a need to work closer with
the assurance schemes, in order to uphold customer quality perceptions and concerns. Julian Hasler suggested that a different level of inspection could be applied to equipment owners who were not part of an assurance scheme.

Aerial Application:

7.15 Grant Stark explained that although the Directive prohibits aerial applications, it allows derogations provided certain conditions are met. The conditions included: aerial spraying having clear advantages in terms of reduced impacts on human health and the environment; the operator and aircraft to be certificated; and no spraying in close to residential areas. Spray operations must be done in accordance with an approved Application Plan and permitted. Users would submit Plans and requests for permits to CRD, who will be the competent authority for consider requests.

7.16 CRD did not intend to carry forward existing aerial spraying controls in the implementing legislation, but would consult with Ministers to see if any of these should be retained via their inclusion in the Permit. The new arrangements put greater responsibility on users to identify and mitigate risks to comply with a range of environmental and pesticide legislation. Operators would be obliged to comply with the conditions of the permits, and permits could be amended or withdrawn in certain prescribed circumstances.

7.17 Forum members supported the CRD proposals, adding that aerial spraying was also important to counter potato blight. Peter Pitkin noted the interface with Nature Conservation bodies was different in Scotland and Wales.

Protection of Water and Specific areas:

7.18 Grant noted that although protection of water and specific areas were dealt with separately in the directive, there were a number of similarities and consequently the implementing legislation would cover these in a single regulation. ‘Specific areas’ covered public spaces, conservation areas, and areas which had been recently treated which would be accessible to agricultural workers. The implementing legislation would carry forward clauses from existing legislation relating to: the need for users to take reasonable precautions to protect human health and the environment; and confine spray applications to the target area. This would be supplemented by two new provisions: firstly, relating to users ser to: minimising use in particular situations: and secondly giving preference to products not classified as dangerous to the aquatic environment or containing priority hazardous substances. Grant suggested that if users followed practices consistent with those in the current Code of Practice they would have a reasonable basis for demonstrating due diligence in complying with legislation. CRD reported that, subject to Ministers agreement, a new Code of Practice would be issued. Members agreed it was important that this was done quickly.

7.19 Peter Hall noted that because assurance schemes already required practices which could help deliver the outcomes sought by the directive, it would be ‘business as usual’ for the responsible user; legislation would drive up the standards of those not yet in voluntary schemes.
7.20 In response to a question from Vicky Kindemba, Grant said the directive’s definition for a conservation area was essentially the Natura 2000 and SSSI sites. CRD did not interpret the directive as requiring controls on spraying adjacent to conservation areas.

7.21 Tom Bals noted that the principal risk to water was point source pollution or run off / drain flow, not spray drift. It was noted that issues regarding sprayer cleaning and filling needed to be developed in the new Code of Practice. When asked whether the location of pesticides stores and the degree of bunding was relevant to consider here, Grant replied that it was and that provisions in the implementing legislation on handling and storage required users to take ‘reasonable precautions’ to ensure that such operations do not endanger human health or the environment.

Integrated Pest Management
7.22 Caroline explained that the Directive did not oblige us to introduce new regulations in respect of IPM but that non-regulatory approaches were adequate to meet our obligations.

7.23 Nigel Chadwick briefly updated members on some of these plans such as the Thanet Project – an ongoing research project on integrated pesticides management in the amenity sector. He noted that work was also being carried out with the Assured Food Standards and LEAF organisations to develop an integrated management plan. These various voluntary measures build on existing practise and can be merged into the action plan. Nick Mole welcomed this update and stressed the importance of continuing development of integrated pesticides management knowledge and practise.

7.24 Concluding the whole session, Grant Stark asked for industry’s help to promulgate the general messages including those areas where the SUD meant ‘business as usual’ and where there would be new requirements, and with work to develop guidance Peter Hall said that he felt the message to be taken from the meeting was that the SUD meant business as usual for good operators and raising of standards for the less good, which was a very welcome from the industry’s perspective.

7.25 James Clarke thanked everyone for their contributions to the discussions which reflected the Forum working at its best and, he suggested, indicated an urgent need for a new Code of Practice.

Item 8 – AOB and possible press release

8.1 David Williams drew members’ attention to the Government response to the MacDonald Report on cutting farm red tape, and Recommendation 9.44 proposing the establishment of an online central register of datasheets to facilitate COSHH assessments. He asked for members’ views on whether such a register could easily be achieved, and how to do it. Members suggested something similar to the LIAISON database for crop assured scheme members or the CRD online pesticides database could be used as a model for a central system. Janet Williams noted that all product labels have
safety data sheets and these were already available on the approval holder’s websites. **James Clarke** suggested that the issue might benefit from further discussion at a future meeting.

**Action: Secretariat**

8.2 James noted that, at the appropriate time, a press release would be drafted to publicise the launch of the annual report and members would be asked to circulate it within their own networks. He had sent the Secretariat some additional Defra links for possible use in publicising both the annual report and availability of pesticides issues.

**Action: Secretariat**

**Item 9 - Date of next meeting**

**Wednesday, 20th June 2012 in Foss House Conference Rooms, York.**

Details will be sent out nearer the time.

**Close – 15.30pm**
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