Minutes of the 41st Pesticides Forum Meeting: 9 March 2010
Merchant Taylors Hall, York

Those present are listed at Annex A.

1. **Introductions**

1.1 The Chairman welcomed **Professor Dent** as a new member representing the Voluntary Initiative for Pesticides, and explained that two other new member representatives (Professor Elizabeth Dowler (Council of Food Policy Advisors) and Jeanette Longfield MBE (Sustain)) were unable to be present but looked forward to attending the June meeting.

1.2 The Chairman recorded the Forum’s appreciation for the input of **Keith Dawson** (SAC) since its inception, particularly his work on the Knowledge Transfer Group. He noted that **Jonathan Cowens** would be the SAC representative, although Martin Ballingall was attending for this meeting, and that EA representation had moved from Jo Kennedy to Nigel Crane. He recorded the Forum’s thanks to Jo, particularly for her work on the Indicators Group. He also welcomed **David Williams** (Defra) from Chemicals and Nanotechnology Division – the sponsoring Division of the Forum, **Jon Allbutt** (deputising for John Moverley), and **Cecile Smith** (for Peter Pitkin).

2. **Apologies for absence**

2.1 Apologies for absence had been received from the following member organisations: **Robert Campbell** (LEAF); **Anne Buckenham** (Crop Protection Association); **Tony Palmer** (FPC/BRC); **Jon Ayres** (ACP); **John Moverley** (Amenity Forum); **Peter Hall** (Advisory Committee on Organic Standards); **Peter Pitkin** (SNH); **Elizabeth Dowler** (Council of Food Policy Advisors) and **Jeanette Longfield** (Sustain). Apologies for absence were also received from the following observer organisations: **Angela Rabess** (BIS); **Mark Wilson** (Defra); **Mike Green** (Natural England); **Nigel Crane** (Environment Agency); **Bethan Slater/Garry Wiles** (HSE); and from **Grant Stark, Nigel Chadwick** and **Joy Wilson** (HSE, CRD).

3. **Minutes and matters arising from the 40th meeting held on 14 October 2009**

3.1 The draft minutes were circulated and comments incorporated. They were agreed to be an accurate record of the meeting of 14 October 2009.

3.2 Alastair Leake explained that Container Management Group had drafted its report. Following comments, the report is to go back to the Group for approval and presentation to the June Forum meeting. Alastair also highlighted a new container launch by one pesticide manufacturer which was nearly perfect in container management terms. The weblink for this is to be circulated to Forum members by the Secretariat. The Forum will consider at the June meeting whether a News Release could be issued on this subject to encourage action by other companies.

**Action: CMG/Forum Secretariat**
4. **Introduction to the consultation on the implementation of the Sustainable Use Directive**

4.1 Adrian Dixon explained that the consultation was launched on 9 February with a response deadline of 4 May. It was important for respondents to include factual numerical information in support of any positions where possible to enable the impact assessment to be as accurate as possible. Responses after the deadline would not be taken into account. After the consultation had ended, Ministers’ views would be sought on the way forward, and there would be a further consultation on draft legislation needed. The Chairman noted that the consultation asked respondents in the devolved regions to copy their response to the relevant administration, and asked about the potential for regional variations in implementation. Dave Thomas explained that concerns in Wales related to issues relevant for infrequent users, such as training and grandfather rights, and noted the lower participation in voluntary schemes such as NSTS and NRoSO. Martin Johnston stressed that in addition to the similar concerns in Wales, Scotland also had a keen interest in water issues, and significant use of aerial spraying.

5. **Consultation on the implementation of the Sustainable Use Directive: Discussion and break-out session on minimising impacts**

5.1 Adrian Dixon explained the format of the two break-out sessions (see Annex B). CRD had drawn up a list of questions for discussion to help inform the Forum’s response to the consultation should it wish to respond. (Questions at Annex C).

5.2 Following group discussions, rapporteurs fed thoughts back to the full Forum. Key points for both sessions are recorded at Annex D. The Chairman summarised the following key points:

- Where possible there was a need for incentives to improve practice as well as sanctions (carrot as well as stick). There were already clear examples where this was working eg through the assurance schemes, and their future development such as the livestock standards. However there were a number of areas of low uptake such as amenity and amateur sectors (the latter particularly with regard to disposal) where further measures were needed. Action needed to be proportionate/measured.

- Members had given a clear emphasis on the need for improving practice. In some areas such as amenity, appropriate regulation was needed with appropriate compliance measures/penalties.

- There was a need for further evidence gathering to meet information needs, and for R&D.
• There was a need for standardisation and consistency between UK regions and measures adopted by the different administrations. This also needed to recognise that different sectors were developing at different paces.

• There was a need for emphasis on alternative approaches to pest, weed and disease control, and to ensure a diversity of products available for use.

• Actions should be intended to reduce risk and impact of pesticides, not use per se.

• There was a need for use of protection zones/buffer zones where appropriate to protect water.

• Use of technology/IT should be encouraged; this would also have compliance benefits.

• National measures need local solutions – not one size fits all.

6. **Consultation on the implementation of the Sustainable Use Directive: Discussion and break-out session on best practice and control measures**

6.1 Again following feedback from the discussion groups, the Chairman summarised the following key points:

• Implementing measures needed to be cost-effective with clear benefits.

• Members were keen for measures to improve best practice and to promote this.

• Training and skills provisions showed a need for succession planning. Regulation on users was not always appropriate; different players in the pesticide use chain needed to be considered.

• There was a clear need for continuing professional development (CPD) and for this to be built on.

• There is a need for clarity on definitions/concepts of Integrated Crop Management and Integrated Pest Management to help implementation. IPM as set out in the sustainable use directive would normally be regarded as ICM (particularly since it refers to weeds and diseases).

6.2 The Chairman thanked members for their contributions to the discussions, and asked for any additional points to be passed to CRD by 19 March.

**Action: Members**

7. **Consideration of letter from ACP (and PIAP) on the continuing human health incidents resulting from use of boom sprayers**

7.1 Members discussed the papers provided, focusing particularly on the practical
issues associated with spraying such as increasing pressures on sprayers if weather conditions reduced the number of spray days. The number of incidents in relation to the number of spray events was very small and seemed to be declining. The data raised a number of questions such as number of incidents in previous years, whether there were any regional patterns, how the incident data related to weather patterns. The Chairman undertook to write back to the ACP Chair with these concerns.

Action: Chairman

8. Discussion on draft Forum Annual Report

8.1 A draft had been circulated to members, and the Chairman asked for comments and any appropriate pictures to illustrate the text to be sent to Nigel Chadwick/Edward Heywood in CRD by 12 March. He thanked them both for their work on the draft to date. Members agreed that it would be useful for key graphs to be available as a reference resource in Powerpoint format on the Forum website.

Action: Members

9. Items from Members/Chair/Secretariat for next meeting

9.1 The Chairman noted that the next meeting of the Pesticides Forum would take place on **Wednesday 23 June 2010 in London.** A number of areas had been suggested for future meetings including BREAM/ application technology, and a visit to a water treatment plan (to link with the water action plan/WFD progress). Given the ACP/COT work on BREAM follow-up and Tom Bals’ absence in June, it was agreed an application technology session should be scheduled for October or later. A visit to a water treatment plant could form the Forum “awayday” for 2010. It is hoped that the June meeting can include a further update on the Sustainable Use Directive implementation. The Chairman stressed the need for the meeting agenda to be developed for a couple of meetings ahead each time.

Action: Secretariat

10. AOB

10.1 The Chairman noted that there was no Forum news from this meeting requiring a Press Release; the Annual Report needed to have a separate News Release from one on the report of the Container Management Group.

11. Date of next meeting


Adrian Dixon
Pesticide Forum Secretariat
6 April 2010
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Annex B

Pesticide Forum discussion on the Consultation on the implementation of EU pesticides legislation

Format of discussion groups

Following an introduction on the consultation, the Forum will break into three groups as listed below. These will look at the areas raised by the consultation over two sessions (based on the CRD internal arrangements to implement the EU requirements).

Session one will look at ‘minimisation of impacts’ (national action plans, aerial spraying, water, specific areas, handling and storage).
Session two will cover ‘best practice’ (training, sales, Integrated Pest Management, Information and Advance Notification).

Each session will discuss all questions if possible, leaving about 20 mins at the end of the session for a plenary discussion and agreement of key points for the Forum response to the consultation.

For session one, Group 1 will start at Q1, Group 2 at Q8/9 and Group 3 at Q4
For session two, Group 1 will start at Q12, Group 2 at 10/11 and Group 3 at Q14/15

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Group 1</th>
<th>Group 2</th>
<th>Group 3</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Adrian Dixon</td>
<td>Briony Lattimore</td>
<td>Caroline Kennedy</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>David Edwards</td>
<td>James Clarke</td>
<td>Julian Hasler</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Martin Johnston</td>
<td>Helen Bower*</td>
<td>Tom Bals</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>John Ford</td>
<td>Dave Thomas</td>
<td>Hugh van Cutsem</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Vicky Kindemba</td>
<td>Cecile Smith</td>
<td>Nick Mole*/**</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Rob Simpson**</td>
<td>Jon Allbutt**</td>
<td>Mark Ballingall</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mike Storey**</td>
<td>Ian Morrison</td>
<td>David Williams</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Alastair Leake</td>
<td>Barry Dent</td>
<td>Jo Oborn</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*Session 1 rapporteurs
**Session 2 rapporteurs
Annex C

CONSULTATION ON THE IMPLEMENTATION OF EU PESTICIDES LEGISLATION – QUESTIONS TO HELP INFORM THE PESTICIDE FORUM’S RESPONSE

Session 1 – minimising impact of pesticides

National Action Plans

1. Role of the National Action Plan – What should be the top three key areas to be addressed in the NAP and what would be relevant measures and targets for these?

2. What mechanisms are the most effective and appropriate way of changing behaviour to deliver the aims and objectives of the directive, and how can these be made accountable to ensure delivery?

Aerial Spraying

3. To what extent do aerial spraying operations produce specific risks to drinking water supplies and conservation areas, and therefore suggest a need for controls above and beyond those envisaged in the directive?

Water

4. What do you see as the major challenges associated with supporting the aims and objectives of the Water Framework Directive (e.g. greater reliance on hazard based measures (such as the drinking water standard), establishing the exact nature of the relationship between the two bits of legislation). How appropriate are regulatory and voluntary measures to address these?

5. What are the main challenges associated with developing catchment based approvals or incorporating considerations of features such as low drift technology within the regulatory risk assessment process?

6. The understanding of risk and appropriate mitigation measures, and levels of adoption of good and best practice varies widely amongst amenity users, particularly within local authority users and those contracted to provide services to local authorities. What measures would help ensure that the very best amenity use practice is taken up by all (e.g. threat of use reduction targets/prohibitions)?

Specific Areas

7. What are the risks in pesticide use in the specific areas listed in article 12 of the directive and what would be proportionate measures to address these?
Handling and storage

8. Are there any particular methods for storing, handling or disposing of pesticides which could make a significant contribution to reducing risk but have been overlooked?

9. What more could be done to minimise risks from old product still in farm stores or from handling, storage etc of products in use (eg container recycling, take-back/return schemes)?

Session 2 – best practice

Training

10. How should Government ensure the breadth/access to training needed and ensure training provided is current and fit for purpose?

11. Are shortened training requirements appropriate where users have acquired previous experience (e.g. to replace grandfather rights)?

Sales

12. We are keen to explore all practical possibilities for ensuring pesticide products for professional use are not purchased by uncertified users. What practical options are suggested to achieve this?

Integrated Pest Management

13. To what extent is IPM practiced across the spectrum of pesticide users, and what measures should be taken to ensure consistency of operation across all users?

Information and advance notification

14. What are the likely benefits of providing this information?

15. What sort of arrangements might be practicable?
Annex D

National Action Plans (Q1&2)

Group 1
Key areas to be addressed:
- Need to address monitoring and evidence base (need to standardise measures across UK where possible, commonality of approach needed, many measures etc already in place, need more recording of pesticide decision making processes etc)
- Infrequent users (issue for Wales and Scotland particularly) and wider engagement of operators eg with regard to boom sprayers and possible harmful effects
- Alternative approaches – non-chemical methods development

Targets – quantitative and qualitative needed, also need national training strategy. Baseline of regulation needed in key areas with voluntary measures on top. Accountability – need clear targets and benefits for those participating in voluntary approaches.

Group 3
- Existing strategy and plan structure is useful and shouldn’t be changed significantly.
- Need for use reduction targets for substances of particular concern eg to protect biodiversity or to protect specific sectors
- WFD refers to substances of concern – need to ensure definitions are clear.
- Need to take national measures and turn into ones appropriate at the local level
- National action plan needs to be a living document

Additional points from Forum members

Need to focus on risk and impact rather than use per se
The directive definition of IPM is not the same as the common definition (and is more IFM). The focus on IPM/ICM/IFM gives a range of targets which need to be understood.

Aerial spraying (Q3)

Group 1
Alternatives need to be considered, but are not always available. Need a proper assessment process – aerial spraying is not a big issue for the UK and is specialised and localised.

Group 3
Use of modern technology such as GPS should help reinforce controls through spray records etc

Additional points
Bracken control is a topographical issue, whereas spraying for potato blight requires alternative disease control solutions. There is a need for aerial application and for use of modern technology for record-keeping/compliance.

**Water protection (Q4-6)**

Group 3
Q4 – challenges? – More info/R&D needed on pathways to water. Also don’t know how complementary/opposite WFD and pesticides legislation is.
Need greater understanding on how buffer zones work eg effectiveness of vegetation
Importance of timing of application, threat from use on hard surfaces – ban blanket spraying on hard surfaces
Penalties needed for point source pollution (ie any pesticides not coming out of nozzles)

Need mix of voluntary/regulatory measures – can’t expect 100% compliance. Want more incentives – need to extend VI to amenity sector.

Q5 – lack of info on mechanisms in catchments
No adequate incentives to adopt low drift technology
Need most efficacious approach to application of pesticides – not necessarily low drifty
Number of sources of information on water protection

Q6 – amenity sector needs to be up to speed. Contract specification is critical as are high level messages through local authority Chief Executives

Additional points
More info needed on cause and effect in amenity sector. Local authorities difficult to grasp and lack drivers for change. Need more regulation in amenity sector. Potential for greater use of integrated approaches and to have targets for alternative control methods.

**Specific areas (Q7)**

Group 2

Q7 – data collection issues. Risk management plans needed for each area could be derived from LERAPs.
Need to have flexibility of buffer zones to suit chemicals

Group 3

Different approaches needed for vulnerable groups vs specific areas vs recently treated areas – latter is a notification issue
Handling and storage (Q8&9)

Group 2

Formulation of pesticides important in reducing risk – this for the ACP rather than the Forum.

Role of closed transfer systems important. Need for smaller containers. Need for joined up guidance on regulation and inspection between CRD/EA/HSE. Need to recognise Container Management Group points and impact of them. Technology could capture purchase information and trace stocks, and could alert users on expiry dates etc.

Additional points

Amateur disposal is an issue, particularly lack of facilities. Sensible use-up periods were needed following withdrawal of approval, or more flexibility on these. Take-back schemes/amnesties could be considered. More attention was needed to sprayer cleaning to prevent post-application pollution.

Training (Q10&11)

Group 1

Good system already in place with BASIS high level qualification being delivered through a number of routes, also BASIS foundation course. BASIS independently audited – need to extend awareness.

Need for contract specification training in amenity sector, particularly in Local Authority specifiers.

Additional comments

Supervisors in amenity not qualified – need to link specifiers, supervisor/manager and operator.

CPD important – awareness/knowledge gap in grassland/livestock sector suggests there could be a role for sector specific training.

BASIS qualifications are on a higher education framework, not a further education one. For those operating under letters of exemption issued in 1981, the exam is the same as for others, but the training period is different to take account of experience already gained.

Sales (Q12)

Group 3

Controls on sales to users not appropriate in UK, most pesticides are supplied direct to farm on the basis of a recommendation from a qualified advisor. Small proportion of sales over the counter. Use of PA1 certificate number or holding number might be appropriate. However holding numbers do not relate to competence, and the availability
of holding numbers to those with horse paddocks or lack of such numbers for the amenity sector cause difficulties with the use of holding numbers. Identification of agronomist/trained advisor and operator are key in ensuring sales are made to qualified users.

**Integrated Pest Management (IPM) (Q13)**

Group 2

Definition of IPM in Directive is more like ICM. Lots of R&D is needed, particularly development and Knowledge Transfer work. Need to consider the role of crop protocols – already exist under Assurance Schemes. Need to focus more on advisors and agronomists rather than users. BASIS have a list of all ICM trained agronomists.

Key building blocks in ICM are mentioned in Annex III of the Directive – ICM is site and season specific and is widely adopted and promoted in the UK. Addressing this part of the Directive may be more of how to show good practice in place and the impact of the building blocks through assurance schemes etc.

Amenity raises a question of integrated landscape management. IPM in amenity is employer driven and some areas haven’t heard of it at all.

Need also to take account of and develop work on decision support systems and economic thresholds.

**Information and advance notification (Q14&15)**

Group 2

Doubtful of benefits of advance notification, could be best practice to be promoted. See a PR benefit in informing public, how would public behaviour change? Frequency of providing information was an issue – would it have the same value with repetition? Costs of providing also an issue.

Alternative notification methods eg texting could be useful.
In amenity there were timing and logistical issues (eg numbers to be notified, what details to be provided). Managed turf uses warning notices. In agriculture there is the NFU Good Neighbour scheme.

Group 3

Need to work out how to get users to buy in to notification eg benefits for uses of dialogue between public and growers.
Amenity could use generic notices eg “spraying next week”, good practice in pesticide use and increases transparency.