FOURTH MEETING OF THE PESTICIDES FORUM
18 JUNE 1997, MAFF, NOBEL HOUSE, LONDON

1. Those present

Attendees are listed at Annex A.

2. Introductions

2.1 The Chairman welcomed members to the fourth meeting of the Pesticides Forum. In particular, Dr Buckenham who would shortly be taking over Mr Pike's responsibilities at the BAA; Professor Miller (AEA, deputising for Mr Saunders) and Mr Terry (FWAG, deputising for Mr Knight). There were apologies from Mr Willgoss (FPC/BRC); Mr Russell (Scottish Farmers Union); Dr Carter (ACP) and Mr Pemberton (CLA). Mr Pemberton had also resigned from the Forum owing to other work commitments and the CLA had nominated an alternative to attend future meetings (Mr Barnett).

2.2 Dr Abel was observing for DETR (in place of Dr Corcoran) and Mr Pogson for the Welsh Office (in place of Ms Griffiths).

2.3 The Chairman noted that the agenda for the meeting was very full.

3. Minutes of the Third Meeting (PF/min3) and Matters Arising

3.1 Mrs Olney reported on Actions arising from the last meeting.

3.2 Under Action 1, PSD's review of labelling was considering presentation and layout rather than actual content. A BAA paper was currently awaited to input into the review and there would be consultation with interested organisations later on in the year.

3.3 Under Action 3, it was confirmed that a broad definition of Integrated Crop Management (ICM) was proposed for inclusion in the revised Green Code. Discussion at the Objectives and Measures Sub-Group had concentrated on defining the responsible use of pesticides.

3.4 Under Action 7, Dr Shannon had sent letters to a number of Agricultural Professors and Principals at Universities and Colleges requesting information
on teaching of ICM at their establishments. Responses were due by the end of July and would be reported to a future meeting of the Forum.

3.5 Under Action 10, it was clarified that different arrangements concerning the use of herbicides on set-aside land had been introduced in Scotland, compared with England and Wales. However, the new arrangements were being reviewed later in the year by the Scottish Office, and consultation with interested parties would take place.

3.6 Mr Orme reported that progress with the new BASIS/LEAF ICM qualification was now well advanced. BASIS had recently received a letter from the AICC offering its support for the initiative.

4. Reports from Organisations / Forward Look: Members activities June - October 1997

4.1 A summary of BAA’s planned activities (July to December) was tabled along with the second update of the LINK Integrated Farming Systems project.

4.2 Dr Dawson reported that Scottish Natural Heritage’s new Targeted Inputs for a Better Rural Environment (TIBRE) manual ‘New Options for Arable Farming’ would be launched by a Scottish Office Minister at the Royal Highland Show. It would also be demonstrated at the Scottish Crop Event. The manual gave practical advice in relation to technology transfer and the responsible use of pesticides. It was available free to farmers and advisers in Scotland, otherwise it carried a £20 fee.

4.3 The revised LEAF environmental audit had been launched in April.

4.4 The AEA would be launching its voluntary spraying testing scheme at Sprays and Sprayers.

4.5 The NFU was working towards its horticultural crop protocol scheme being independently audited.

4.6 Mr Bruce reported that a new MAFF/PSD advisory booklet ‘Is your Sprayer Fit For Work?’ would be available within the next few weeks. This was the third in a series of booklets aimed at promoting the responsible use of pesticides (the first two being ‘Keeping Pesticides Out Of Water’ and ‘Pesticides and Integrated Farming - A Guide to Responsible Use’).

4.8 The Chairman noted that there was clearly a good deal of ongoing activity in the area of responsible pesticide use. It would be important to advise Ministers of this activity. By bringing groups together within the Forum it was hoped these efforts could be integrated and re-inforced.
5. **Progress on the Action Plan and Public Announcement**

5.1 The Action Plan had been revised to reflect discussions at the February meeting and circulated to Forum members for agreement. The Secretariat had only received a few comments back from this consultation and these had been incorporated into a final version.

5.2 Mr Bruce was pleased to announce that within the last day or so Ministers consulted had given their support to the continuation of the Pesticides Forum and to its Action Plan. Views of DTI Ministers would be sought following today’s meeting.

5.3 Officials were now working with Ministers to agree a public announcement welcoming the Action Plan. The new Government also wanted the Pesticides Forum and existing policy to evolve to reflect the new priorities and Departments would be exploring new ideas with Ministers over the coming months.

5.4 There was some discussion about publishing the Action Plan in advance of any change to the terms of reference of the Forum. It was clarified that any development of the policy would take some time and it was therefore preferable to go ahead and publish the Plan as a statement of the current position. This would not prevent further steps being introduced at a later stage.

5.5 The Secretariat agreed to circulate the finalised Action Plan to Forum Members for information in advance of any public announcement.

**ACTION: SECRETARIAT**


6.1 Mr Orson summarised discussions by the Objectives and Measures Sub-Group at their meeting on 15 April 1997. The Forum supported the definition for the ‘responsible use of pesticides’ within the draft Objectives and Measures paper (PF/18).

6.2 Mr Orson pointed out that PF/18 concentrated on minimising the impact of pesticides on the environment. Many measures to estimate impact were of a general nature, others were more specific. It was suggested that for the surveys of non-target populations (one of the general measures) use should be made of data on birds, insects and wildflowers.
6.3 Mr Orson tabled a draft checklist for the responsible use of pesticides (see Annex C). He believed that this idea could be used to improve practice at a farm level.

6.4 Mr Orson touched on the idea of developing farm specific Standard Operating Procedures. He was still working on this proposal.

**ACTION: MR ORSON**

6.5 There was general support for the paper and the Sub-Group were thanked for their efforts. There was concern, however, about possible overlap with other initiatives and 'information overload'. To assess the current position, the Secretariat was asked to produce a short paper summarising information and initiatives on 'best practice'.

**ACTION: SECRETARIAT**

6.6 The Sub-Group had considered that two specific issues were of immediate concern - point source contamination of water from the mixing and handling of pesticides and improving guidance on the environmental impact of individual pesticides to allow an informed choice by the farmer. These had been highlighted for the Technology Transfer Sub-Group.

6.7 Members felt that the Forum needed to focus on particular high priority issues. It was agreed that the matrix on responsible use in PF/18 would benefit from a fourth column outlining the initiatives implementing the identified principles and practices already in place. This would help to determine where efforts should be concentrated. It was agreed that PF/18 should be re-drafted and would return to the Forum for further discussion. At the same time, an update on the Agri-Environment Forum's work on indicators would be useful.

**ACTION: SECRETARIAT**

6.8 The Forum considered that data from the MAFF Crop Protection Questionnaire (PF/20) would provide useful information for PF/18. The questionnaire had been distributed to farmers in the recent PUSG arable survey in England and Wales but did not cover Scotland. To avoid bias it was suggested that surveys of this kind should avoid leading questions. The results would be reported to the Forum when available.
7. **Report of discussions at the Technology Transfer Sub-Group**

7.1 Dr Croxford reported that the first meeting of the Technology Transfer Sub-Group had been held on 16 May 1997. As requested, the group would be concentrating on *how* to transfer information and not *what* to transfer.

7.2 Following the first meeting, Sub-Group Members were consulting a number of organisations and individuals for their views on what hindered and what helped technology transfer and also ideas for improving the process. Replies were expected at the end of June.

7.3 Members’ findings would be presented to the next meeting of the Sub-Group on 14 July 1997. A third meeting was scheduled on 11 September 1997 to finalise a report for the October Forum meeting.

7.4 The Secretariat would be circulating minutes of the May Technology Transfer Sub-Group meeting to Forum members.

**ACTION: SECRETARIAT**

8. **Presentation by the EA / SEPA on pesticides in the Environment (PF/21)**

8.1 Mr Virtue, SEPA opened the presentation. The focus of his talk was on the impact of pesticides in the aquatic environment in Scotland.

8.2 SEPA considered that diffuse agricultural pollution including pesticides was the main threat to good water quality in Scotland. Incidents of pesticide pollution were thought to be under-reported and the problems were probably more widespread than reports indicated. Point source pollution of all forms was easier to control and measures were being put in place to tackle this. This would mean in time that diffuse pesticide pollution would become relatively more important. Mr Virtue stressed that information given to the pesticide user and adviser must be transparent to allow informed decisions to be made.

8.3 Mr Barnden, EA gave a presentation on the England and Wales perspective and identified a number of priorities. Firstly, that monitoring needed to be extended (at present it was often only carried out in response to a known problem); further Environmental Quality Standards should be developed and Stewardship schemes like those for IPU, atrazine and diuron should be encouraged. Future monitoring would be guided by a risk assessment tool known as POPPIE (Prediction of Pesticide Pollution In The Environment) that was able to predict diffuse pollution. Mr Barnden also mentioned the need to develop, deliver and promote ‘best practice’ and to encourage environmentally sustainable policies including the need to reform CAP and to make set-aside more environmentally beneficial.
8.4 When implemented in the UK, the EC Groundwater Directive would have implications on current practices for the disposal of pesticides on farms. Additionally, if the draft EC Water Resources Framework Directive was enacted in its current form, the UK would be required to achieve 'good' water quality status by 2010. A major element of cost compliance would fall to the farmer, with diffuse agricultural pollution being a key factor.

8.5 Members were grateful for the presentation. It was recognised that many themes were of relevance to the Forum in its efforts to promote the responsible use of pesticides.

Discussion

8.6 It was pointed out that most failures of EQSs in the EA report ('Pesticides in the Aquatic Environment') were caused by sheep dip practices rather than agricultural pesticide use, although urea herbicides had breached EQSs at some sites. Limitations of the current monitoring programme were also recognised. It was noted that in developing best practice, it was important to appreciate that measures would need to get tougher in future.

8.7 The position paper (PF/21, paragraph 4) indicated that operational error or failure was often a cause of pesticide pollution incidents. It was agreed that it would help the Forum to have an idea of the types of errors or failures occurring. The Secretariat agreed to circulate supplementary information from the EA and SEPA to Members.

ACTION: SECRETARIAT

9. Variability of pesticide residues in fruit and vegetables (PF/20)

9.1 Mr Davis introduced paper PF/20. The incidence of high variability and occasional high levels of pesticides residues was apparent in UK-produced and imported fruit and vegetables. The ACP had concluded that adverse health effects were unlikely to occur from the residue levels detected but that safety margins had been eroded and needed to be re-established. Action had been initiated at an international level within the EU and Codex to consider the issue and any implications for risk assessment procedures.

9.2 The Forum were asked whether they were aware of any additional work being undertaken on the evidence of variability. Members indicated that supermarkets carried out their own residues testing, although some appeared not to have been able to reproduce Government data. This might be because their tests were not as sensitive and that their methodology was different (i.e. testing of batches rather than individual items). To supplement WPPR data, it
was suggested that supermarket chains could be invited to provide data to the
Forum or in confidence to the ACP.

9.3 Members briefly talked about what advice the Government could offer
in order to reduce organophosphate and carbamate use. Steps already taken
to reduce OP residues in carrots were used as an example. It was felt that
different solutions would be required for different crops. It was noted that the
possible environmental impact of any changes in pest control procedures to
meet residue problems also had to be considered.

10. Communication and Collaboration

Presentation by the NFU/Retailers on crop protocols for horticultural crops

10.1 Dr Wise of the NFU indicated that the NFU/Retailer Partnership (set up
in 1991), aimed to promote the production of safe food, through the progressive
and sustainable adoption of environmentally responsible ICM techniques. They
sought to reduce pesticide usage through good management. Protocols were
now available for 37 horticultural crops, with 41 expected by the end of the
year. The protocols were intended to be challenging but achievable. They
initially set a baseline for standards which could then be raised over time.

10.2 Their development was now being taken a stage further through the
introduction of a scheme to independently verify that participating producers
were achieving the standards set out in the protocols. At a cost of around £300
per year for each grower, around 6000 in the UK would be covered by the
scheme when fully operational. Self-assessment questionnaires would be
completed for the 1997/98 season and would be used to form the basis of the
audit.

10.3 Mr Tinsley (chairman of the Partnership) felt that it was essential for
industry to work together (i.e. not just retailers but also the processing sector,
etc.), and that this should be encouraged by the Forum. In particular, there was
still one major retailer not involved in the Partnership. The NFU and Retailers
were pressing for similar standards to apply to imported produce. Consumers
were suspicious that ICM only endorsed standard practice and there was a need
to convince them of its value. Pesticides were a sensitive issue and it was
important to aim for a reduction in their usage wherever possible.
Presentation on the Scottish Quality Cereals assurance scheme

10.4 Mr Brown, the Chief Executive of Scottish Quality Food Certification Ltd, gave a presentation on the cereals assurance scheme his company ran on behalf of Scottish Quality Cereals. SQFC were equivalent to the ‘Registrar’ intended in the NFU/Retailers scheme for horticultural crops. A number of organisations were involved in SQC (e.g. Scottish NFU, UKASTA, maltsters, distillers, etc.).

10.5 The assurance scheme promoted good practice and it was intended that the majority of cereals in Scotland should fall within it. It covered record keeping; staff skills; machinery condition and efficiency; pesticide / fertiliser storage and usage; production and harvesting; and grain storage.

10.6 SQC had been running for three years. Maltsters and distillers were now actively requesting certification which provided an incentive for farmers to join. Every farm was independently assessed, with an annual cost of between £80 and £300 to the farmer.

10.7 SQFC ran a number of other assurance schemes (e.g. for beef, lamb, pig, trout) and SQC represented 1500 out of the 10,000 farms working under their system. SQFC was now accredited to the European Quality Assurance Standard (EN45011).

Presentation by the NFU on crop protocols for all combinable crops

10.8 Mr Petyt of the NFU, advised that the NFU scheme for all combinable crops was very similar in set up to that of SQC. It was, however, in its early stages of development, its crop protocols having only recently been launched at Cereals ’97. Interest shown by growers so far was promising. Food safety was a primary issue for the scheme, more so than ICM. The NFU had become involved in the initiative partly to avoid the threat of a plethora of schemes being developed. This differed from the scheme for horticultural crops in that it was not an NFU/Retailer Partnership.

10.9 The scheme advocated good practice. Record keeping (field; store; maintenance; personnel) was the basis of the system with justifications for actions taken required. Storing the harvested crop hygienically was an important issue. Haulage was another area of concern.

10.10 An independent company to sponsor the scheme had not yet been formed although an Industry Steering Group was in operation with participation from LEAF, maltsters and others.
Discussion of presentations

10.11 The Forum found the presentations extremely useful and thanked the presenters for attending.

10.13 A number of issues were raised. The differences between the schemes and their objectives were noted. Presenters indicated that the schemes were naturally evolving over time but an initial step was to ensure their uptake before introducing more controls or raising standards. This was the current position with the latter two schemes and their greater emphasis on food safety.

10.14 Members felt strongly that a plethora of schemes should be avoided. It was also suggested that the Forum needed to encourage supermarkets to avoid the possibility of conflicting advice to growers. Making recommendations on best practice for retailers to consider might be a way forward.

10.15 It was clear that further information was required before the Forum could develop aspects of the Action Plan relating to communication and collaboration. It was agreed that the Secretariat would produce a discussion paper on the current position in relation to crop protocols and assurance schemes and suggest possible criteria that the Forum could use to judge its support for such initiatives.

ACTION: SECRETARIAT

11. Promotion ideas for the revised Green Code (PF/23)

11.1 Mr Davis introduced paper PF/23 inviting the Forum’s views on the promotion of the revised ‘Code of practice for the safe use of pesticides on farms and holdings’. It was important to ensure effective distribution of the revised ‘Green Code’ to growers and other key groups and also to ensure that it was used by those groups. Although currently a priced publication it was intended that the revised version would be free.

11.2 Mr Davis drew attention to market research published in 1996 on the impact of other codes of good agricultural practice. For the ‘Water Code’, approximately 50% of farmers had heard of it with only 25% actually holding having a copy. Those owning the code were more likely to be observing good practice than those who did not.

11.3 Members supported PSD’s proposals in the paper for the launch and distribution. Mr Orme confirmed that BASIS was willing to distribute the Code to BASIS registered distributors and those on the BASIS professional register. Similarly, LEAF and FWAG would be able to distribute the Code to its
Members. Other suggested recipients were NPTC certificated operators, FEPA trainers and the NAAC.

11.4 It was suggested the Code could be targeted to influential holdings. Letters could also be sent to other relevant organisations asking them to encourage implementation of the Code. Members agreed that direct mailing to all growers had some attractions although costs would be high and there was no guarantee that copies would be kept and used. On the other hand, relying on distribution via a variety of alternative sources could result in multiple copies reaching some farmers whilst others received none.

11.5 In preparing for the revised Code’s launch, PSD would consider all suggestions by the Forum.

ACTION: PSD

12. Any other business

12.1 Mr Bruce briefly outlined proposals in the James report for a Food Standards Agency and possible implications for PSD. The suggestions aimed to restore public confidence in food safety. Mr Bruce hoped that all the best parts of the current system would be maintained. He noted that many Forum Members had already made comments to the Cabinet Office as part of the consultation process. Legislation implementing any changes to the current arrangements was not expected until 1998/99.

12.2 The Forum offered initial views on the JNCC report ‘The indirect effects of pesticides on birds’. It was recognised that pesticides were only one of a number of factors that could be influencing farmland bird populations. There was therefore danger in interpreting the data in isolation. The report pointed to a number of data gaps and further thought was needed on the recommendations. Members saw the merits in having a fuller discussion on this topic at a future meeting, with the RSPB invited to give a presentation. A presentation by the Allerton Trust on bird populations would also be welcomed.
13. **Date of next meeting – 8 October 1997**

13.1 Likely items for the Agenda for the October meeting were outlined. There would be an update on progress of the Action Plan and public announcement; a return to the Objectives and Measures paper and to crop protocols; discussion of the draft Forum annual report for the November ACP meeting and a report from the Technology Transfer Sub-Group. Indicators would be considered with a SAC project in this area. A further possibility would be consideration of the RPA report commissioned by the DETR on the private costs and benefits to farmers of pesticide minimisation techniques. Lastly, on the topic of training and education results of the ICM survey of Agricultural Professors/Principals might be covered.

13.2 Dr Croxford agreed to circulate the RPA report to Forum Members.

**ACTION: DETR**

13.3 For the future, as well as presentations suggested under AOB, Members supported inviting CWS Agriculture to outline the Focus on Farming Project and Scottish Natural Heritage to discuss TIBRE.

13.4 Some Members felt that the Forum should begin to focus its discussions on more specific issues. Addressing public confidence and how ideas were presented to the press and in turn the public was also considered important.
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ANNEX B

ACTION LIST

SECRETARIAT

1. To circulate the final text of the Action Plan, as approved by Ministers, to Forum Members for information in advance of a public announcement.

2. To prepare a short paper summarising existing schemes and information available on ‘best practice’.

3. To develop the Objectives and Measures Paper (PF/18) to include information on activities to implement the identified principles and practices. This would help to determine where further efforts should be concentrated.

4. To provide an update on the Agri-Environment Forum’s progress on indicators.

5. To circulate minutes of the Technology Transfer Sub-Group meeting held on 16 May to Forum members.

6. To obtain supplementary information to PF/21 from the EA and SEPA on the types of operational failures and errors that commonly led to pollution incidents.

7. To produce a discussion paper on the current position with regard to crop protocols and assurance schemes and the possible criteria that the Forum could use to judge its support for such initiatives.

8. PSD to consider suggestions by Forum Members on the promotion of the revised Green Code.

9. DETR to distribute the RPA report on the private costs of benefits to farmers of pesticide minimisation techniques to Forum Members.

MEMBERS

1. Mr Orson to develop his proposal on Standard Operating Procedures relating to the responsible use of pesticides.
## ANNEX C

### The Pesticide Forum - 18 June 1997

**The responsible use of pesticides - a draft checklist**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>What should be done</th>
<th>Information source</th>
<th>Who?</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Crop planning to ensure competitive and sustainable production while minimising risk of resistance to pesticides and their impact of pesticides.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Development of farm plans to indicate high risk areas for the impact of pesticides on the environment and to enhance biodiversity.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>All those responsible for pesticide use are trained and fully aware of their obligations under all regulations and codes of practice.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Check advisers are BASIS registered.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Well maintained facilities are provided for emergency procedures, the safe storage, mixing, transferring and application of pesticides and for cleaning application equipment and protective clothing.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Spray stores are correctly maintained and managed.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Crop protection decisions are justified by cost/benefit and environmental risk assessments.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pesticide selection based on thorough assessments and reliable information, including consideration of the potential environmental impact.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Application equipment is checked regularly to ensure it is in good working order and is calibrated to apply the correct quantity of pesticide.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The product label and any other reproduced information and advisers recommendations for use have been read and understood.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>A COSHH assessment is carried out.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Environmental impact during application is minimised through avoiding contamination of features identified in an environmental plan and by minimising drift and by timing of application to avoid bees and other non-target species.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The correct quantity of pesticide is added to the tank to prevent waste.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sufficient and well maintained PPE is available.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Appropriate PPE is selected and worn.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Steps have been taken to ensure any specified re-entry into the field is observed.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>A record is made of the pesticides to be used, COSHH assessments, PPE worn and justification for use.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ensure emergency procedures are in place.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Arrangements have been made for the safe disposal of any waste pesticides and their containers.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Arrangements are in place to prevent the contamination of water from mixing, transferring and decontamination of sprayers and PPE.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Seek opportunities, through exploitation of new technology, new information, education and training to reduce further any adverse impact of pesticides on the environment. To phase out older technologies which are less cost-effective and which have a higher impact on the environment than the current or new alternatives.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>