

## **BRITISH CROP PRODUCTION COUNCIL**

### **EXPERT WORKING GROUP – APPLICATION (EWG-A)**

Minutes of the **92<sup>nd</sup> meeting** held on **22<sup>nd</sup> February 2006** at the offices of Pesticide Action Network UK, Leonard Street, LONDON.

#### **92.1 EWG members present**

R. Bateman (Chairman – but delayed arrival)	P. Miller – Acting Secretary
C. Butler Ellis (Acting Chair at start of meeting)	
R. Glass	R. Hadway
R. Makepeace	T. Robinson
J. Tobbutt	T. Swan

At the start of the meeting Clare Butler Ellis welcomed all to the offices of PAN. She had received an e-mail from the secretary Bill Basford indicating that he was ill and would not be able to attend the meeting. It was assumed the Chairman had been delayed. The meeting commenced with Clare Butler Ellis in the chair and Paul Miller taking notes as acting secretary.

##### **92.1.1 Apologies**

Apologies for absence had been received from:  
Graham Matthews, Bill Taylor, John Fisher, Tom Bals and Hans Dobson.

##### **92.1.2 Minutes of the meeting held on 21<sup>st</sup> October at Silsoe Research Institute**

These were accepted.

##### **92.1.3 Matters arising from the minutes**

Minute 90.1.2 referred to the possibility of Mr David Inseal of Sprays International Ltd joining the Expert Working Group. In response to a question from John Tobbutt Roy Bateman [later in the meeting] said that DI and Sprays International had decided not to participate.

**92.1.4** All other matters would be covered as agenda items.

#### **92.2 CURRENT ISSUES**

##### **92.2.1 (a) Royal Commission Report on Bystander Exposure**

It was confirmed that a BCPC workshop on this topic had been held in conjunction with the International Conference in Glasgow during the first week of November 2005. Paul Miller indicated that he thought that BCPC were planning to produce:

- (i) some proceedings from the meeting – both he (belatedly!) and Clare Butler Ellis had been in contact with James Gilmore who is co-ordinating this work: it was not known what form these proceedings would take;

- (ii) a BCPC response to the Royal Commission report.

The Advisory Committee on Pesticides had now published a response to the Royal Commission report in which they had not accepted the need for buffer zones to provide further protection for residents and bystanders.

[Chairman arrived at this point]

### **92.2.1 (b) LINK proposal**

The secretary had circulated information relating to LINK projects and this had been discussed by some Group members prior to the meeting.

There were some discussions as to whether or not BCPC, as an umbrella organisation, were an appropriate body to lead and co-ordinate a LINK project. It was noted that both the technical and administrative aspects of running such a project did require substantial efforts. It was agreed that BCPC had a strong platform from which to disseminate results from LINK-type projects having already established the spray/nozzle classification scheme and authored a range of handbooks. Both Tom Robinson and Trevor Swan felt that the involvement of their respective companies in previous LINK projects had been beneficial and were supportive of a further proposal(s). It was agreed that the technical direction of any project would be dictated by contributing participants in a consortium but that the Expert Working Group would provide a good sounding board for the discussion of project ideas. The concept that BCPC could co-ordinate a LINK project proposal was therefore supported.

A first draft of a possible project proposal submission had been circulated prior to the meeting. In discussions it was agreed that this had two main components with the following features:

- (1) an extension to the existing nozzle/spray classification scheme to encompass all nozzle types including the air induction designs: this would need a definition of the scientific components but it was agreed that this was possible: obtaining a financially balanced project would be challenging: strong commercial inputs would only come when competing companies were not in the same consortium: the need was strongly related to label statements and the facilitation of the use of nozzles that would reduce drift but direct relevance to the RCEP report was not strong: there would be a defined role for BCPC;
- (2) an exploration of the issues relating to improved timeliness but without increasing the risk of drift: recognised as practically important and building on some existing information: financially viable consortium likely to be formed with strong linkage to RCEP recommendations: the role of BCPC would be less strong here.

It was agreed that:

- (a) the time for defining both a technical project and obtaining the agreement of an appropriate consortium was very tight;
- (b) a LINK project needed a strong science component;
- (c) balancing nozzle/spray classification issues, timeliness and efficacy into a single project proposal was unrealistic.

The Chairman stated that he had arranged to meet John Fisher and others later in the day to agree a strategy with regard to a LINK project proposal and invited Paul Miller and Richard Glass to join the meeting. He would take the discussion from the Expert Working Group to the meeting and feedback the outcomes appropriately.

### **92.2.2 Code of Practice**

It was noted that the new Code had been published and would be available at a charge of £15. It could be downloaded from the web but was a substantial document. It would also be available as a CD but was currently out of stock.

### **92.2.3 Waste Regulations**

In the absence of the secretary there was little to report on this topic.

### **92.2.4 VI Progress**

Clare Butler Ellis reported that signatories to the Voluntary Initiative had prepared proposals for a continuation of the scheme that involved “more of the same”. Non-signatory bodies had not supported this approach. A report had been collated from the Voluntary Initiative Steering Group and this was currently being considered by the Minister. A response was expected within the next two weeks.

## **92.3 BCPC spray/nozzle classification scheme**

The current status of the scheme and the need to extend it to cover a wide range of nozzle types had been fully discussed under agenda 92.2.1 (b) above.

## **92.4 BCPC Publications**

In his e-mail to Clare Butler Ellis, the secretary had indicated that booklet revision was making good progress and was likely to have a title “small scale spraying” so as to broaden the potential audience. A draft of the booklet would be sent so that a mock-up version could be produced for comment.

The Expert Working Group extended its sincere thanks to Bill Basford as secretary for the work he was doing in relation to the booklets.

## **92.5 Standards Development**

In the absence of Tom Bals there was little new information to discuss on this topic.

In response to a question from Trevor Swan, it was agreed that the discussion held during the AAB meeting in Cambridge was leading towards a standard for droplet size measurement only and was unlikely to conflict with planned work to extend the BCPC classification scheme.

## **92.6 Any Other Business**

Clare Butler Ellis reported that as part of the National Strategy for Pesticide Use, it was now tentatively planned to have Groups considering the following areas:

Water  
Biodiversity  
Amenity  
Availability  
Amateur use.

PAN was likely to be involved in three of these. Progress was being co-ordinated by Adrian Dixon of the Pesticides Safety Directorate.

On behalf of the Expert Working Group, the Chairman:

- thanked Clare Butler Ellis for hosting the meeting and Paul Miller for standing-in as Secretary;
- sent good wishes for a speedy recovery to the Secretary Bill Basford.

## **92.7 Date and Venue for the next meeting**

This was fixed for Thursday 5<sup>th</sup> October at 10:30. Tom Robinson offered to host the meeting at Whittlesford and was thanked for the kind offer.

P.C.H. Miller  
pp. Secretary