

BRITISH CROP PROTECTION COUNCIL
Expert Working Group – Application (EWG-A)

Minutes of the 87th Meeting held on 18th September 2003 at IPARC, Silwood Park, Berks.

87.1 EWG - PRESENT

R Bateman - Chairman	W Basford – Secretary
T Bals	C Butler- Ellis
H Dobson	S Gemmill
R Glass	M Ledson
G A Matthews	T Swan
J Tobbutt	

87.1.1 Apologies

The following offered apologies:

T Robinson (M Ledson deputising), G Walker, W Taylor, R Hartley,
R Makepeace, J Fisher, E Southcombe, C Knott

87.1.2 Membership

The chairman welcomed the meeting to IPARC and introduced himself to the meeting formally as he had recently taken over from A Gilbert.

87.1.3 Minutes of the last meeting

These were accepted.

87.1.4 Matters arising from the minutes

All matters are covered by the existing agenda.

87.2 INVITED PRESENTATION

P Goldsworthy, CPA was welcomed to the meeting and addressed the meeting on the overall position of the Voluntary Initiative.

Objectives of VI with were outlined and attention drawn to the web site

www.voluntaryinitiative.org.uk. The importance of VI involvement of agronomists/consultants etc was discussed alongside various schemes e.g. SAFFIE (Sustainable Arable Farming For an Improved Environment-www.saffie.info) and BETA (Biodiversity and Environmental Training for Advisers). Targets for NRSO – 15000 operators, NSTS -5000 sprayers tested and CPMP – 200,000 ha were outlined in chronological order. Of these the NSRO was suggested as the most challenging.

Members were encouraged to visit the web site and other links provided there and to encourage all within the industry to participate in the objectives.

87.3 CURRENT ISSUES

87.3.1 Response to Buffer Zones paper

GM initiated the discussed outlining developments from the public discussion within the open meeting of ACP. Wide ranging discussion followed initially highlighting frequency of problems relative to UK area sprayed. Registration procedures and clearance permitting chemical use was suggested as affording sound practice but the need for more informed public knowledge on pesticide use was stressed. Particular sensitisation issues were discussed alongside hazard, risk, awareness and perceptions which were all acknowledged. Notification issues within short application windows to all local neighbours highlighted several impracticalities. Sizes of buffer strips relative to LERAP and deposition / sedimentation / crop life were all discussed.

It was agreed that EWG members could review the paper further and re submit comments to J Fisher if they wished but that TB and C B-E would draft an overall EWG statement. This was prepared at the meeting but forwarded subsequently. It is repeated here:

"BCPC recognises the need for the public to feel safe when spraying operations take place close to, or around, their homes. However BCPC is unsure as to whether buffer zones are the best way to achieve this. There is little data on airborne drift profile of agricultural sprays, and relatively few incidents are reported to PIAP.

If it is decided that buffer zones should be introduced BCPC would consider that:

- a) if a fixed width buffer zone is introduced then farmers and growers should be compensated directly for lost production, for example as set-aside;
- b) if a scheme allowing buffer zone modification is introduced, then this should be based on risk (similar to LERAP) i.e. buffer zone modification allowed based on dose, application technique/equipment, and practical mitigating factors e.g. windbreaks, vegetation buffers.

Any buffer zone scheme must be underpinned by scientific data, with considerable research required. There may also be a post-application issue with volatilisation of deposits from some more volatile compounds and this should also be researched."

Note was made of a useful farming image web site – www.Ukagriculture.com which discussed a wide range of issues including pesticide application in farming practice. GM offered information on an open meeting of the ACP in York where alternatives to pesticide use were to be discussed.

87.4 BCPC SPRAY / NOZZLE CLASSIFICATION SCHEME

CB-E summarised the background to the present position. Essentially the classification system is still being challenged particularly with AI nozzles.

It was proposed that the 2003 position is that the classification scheme remains as it was prior to her AAB paper (2002) but with the addition of an "air included spray" class for sprays that contain a minimum of 10% air inclusion.

Further work is needed to support this and should be included in the BCPC research needs document:

- Establishment of an appropriate threshold and to define 'air inclusion'
- Establish a boundary between 'small' and 'large' droplets in AI sprays
- Address the issue of reference boundary nozzles
- Publication of the above (open literature) – for use by those preparing standards.

TB stated that standards work tabled for 2003 would include AI droplet size measurement. GAM reminded the meeting of little funding available suggesting perhaps Defra or others to support such work. The chairman offered to summarise the position thus assisting any funding approaches.

Action Chairman

87.5 BCPC GUIDANCE

87.5.1 Arable Crops

No formal change since last report. For information C B-E reported on a project where a student at SRI is looking at DESSAC and products to indicate short list of appropriate nozzles.

87.5.2 Horticulture Crops

Cathy Knott was unable to be present to formally consider her 'poster' developments. Through the secretary she stated that the current draft was with a grower group for consideration but despite urgent chasing this had not produced comments to date. She indicated that HDC were interested in its production and possible funding.

Discussion covered use of air assistance and sparse canopy issues, dropleg use and nozzle choice. ESES through the secretary offered "The Nozzle Selection Chart for Veg. Is looking better and better but under Spray Drift Risk, should we rely on the 'manufacturer' to correctly specify the lowest boom height. If so which ones - sprayer or nozzle manufs. For example TeeJet have always specified 'ideal' boom heights that we considered too low and not allowing for boom roll.

Also, in the Acknowledgements, it should now be the 'BCPC Boom and Fruit Sprayers Handbook'."

87.6 BCPC PUBLICATIONS

87.6.1 Granule and Fertiliser Application Handbook.

ES reported that work continues at a slow pace on the proposed handbook. Not 'dead'

87.7 STANDARDS DEVELOPMENTS

TB reported on some standards activity (in italics) as below:

- WG 3 - Boom stability (opposed by UK) – *no longer being developed*
- WG 4 - Field measurement of spray drift (TB) –*final draft with TB*
- WG 5 - Knapsack sprayers (WT)–*almost finished, now includes mistblowers*
- WG 6 - Cleaning of sprayers
- WG 7 - Drift classification of sprayers and nozzles
- WG 8 - Deposit measurement in bush and tree crops
- WG 9 - Colour coding of nozzles

And ad-hoc working groups on :-

Buffer zones (spray accountancy)

Nozzle classification by droplet spectrum-*BBA involvement*

Laboratory methods of drift potential – *W Taylor has contact*

Deposit measurement in field crops - *IMAG*

Good practice in field crops and bush/tree crops.

Pesticide labelling

He further reported that ASAE might now work to within ISO standards

87.8 ANY OTHER BUSINESS

87.8.1 The secretary reminded members of an email he had sent seeking help from specialists with pesticide application knowledge to address students at Newcastle University. Individual action if interested.

87.8.2 A paper titled FUTURE DIRECTIONS IN CROP SCIENCE RESEARCH considering the role of BBSRC had been received for BCPC comment by J Fisher. It was agreed this would be circulated to all members following the meeting

Action Secretary

87.8.3 A possible BCPC Expert working group on soils was reported.

87.8.4 It was reported that the current 'Green book' was to undergo revision and that might include other C of P's as well. It is to be considered during Autumn.2003.

87.8.5 The forthcoming AAB conference in Jan 2004 'International Advances in Pesticide Application 2004' was noted by the meeting- R Glass, organiser stated that over 80 papers had been offered.

87.8.6 Future Speakers

It was suggested that a representative from the FSA be invited to the next meeting to discuss applications and residues issues.

87.9 Dates of Next Meetings

Wednesday 7 April 2004

Wednesday 22 September 2004

Venues to be offered by members. At date of minutes preparation AEA, Peterborough or NFU, London have been offered for the April meeting. **Members preference please ASAP to secretary.**