

## **BRITISH CROP PRODUCTION COUNCIL**

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

Minutes of the **96th meeting** held on **12th February 2008** at TAG, Silsoe

#### **EWG members present**

G. Matthews (Chairman)	T Bals
J. Fisher	R Glass
P. Miller	T. Swan
J. Tobbutt	

#### **96.1**

##### **96.1.1 Apologies**

Apologies for absence had been received from:

R. Bateman, W. Basford, H Dobsons, R Makepeace, T Robinson,  
W Taylor

##### **96.1.2 Minutes of the 95th meeting held on 2nd October 2007 at TAG, Silsoe.**

These were accepted.

##### **96.1.3 Matters arising from the minutes**

(1) Regarding potential restrictions on low volume spraying there was little new to report from either PSD or CPA while criticisms from AEA were yet to be answered. It remained for companies to amend their own labels. In practice it was widely believed that low volume applications were reported by ticking the 200l/ha box! It had not helped that cross-compliance inspectors were widely viewed as ill-informed and inadequately trained. Graham Matthews pointed out that regulatory data considered by the ACP was based on 400l/ha. This is an issue that the Pesticides Forum should be taking very seriously. AEA are well aware that BCPC would wish to be represented at any meeting with Paul Hamey.

**Action: T Bals to keep the EWG informed and report back at the next meeting.**

Further information was available from the PSD and VI websites, PAN UK was building a database on human exposure while ADAS has completed a report covering estimates of the cost of implementation.

Chris Todd responded on behalf of BCPC/BCPE to comments made at the last meeting regarding the Glasgow meeting beginning with:

- Reluctance of volunteers to manage a conference programme of the size it used to be.
- 2006 was run in seminar not conference format
- 2007 was an IPPC conference so their norms for 4 page papers and 2 page posters were applied
- Greater professional inputs are needed nowadays to ensure that poor quality submissions reach BCPC standards for publication in proceedings.
- There is a lack of time and/or will power on the part of those invited contributors
- There is still a programme committee of some 50 people trying to produce what people want.

BCPC was attempting to satisfy delegate aspirations (time span, costs, and format) through change but this has not been completely successful as yet. Since 2003 we had tried parallel specialist symposia alongside the vitally essential exhibition. These had not proved as successful as separate daily sessions even though the latter lost important opportunities for networking.

Major meetings now ask only for 2 page summaries but without any embargo on subsequent publication elsewhere. Availability of published proceedings on registration was still seen as advantageous but it placed a huge strain on the organisation.

BCPC remained open to ideas and constructive criticism.

For 2008 BCPC had returned to the ideas of separate technical symposia being conducted by other organisations with BCPE acting as a facilitator. There would be only one BCPC session.

Current thinking was for 2009 to be a full conference but the importance of the parallel international exhibition and all that this implied for accessibility and conference facilities plus accommodation could not be overstated. The conference had lost money for the past 10 years despite considerable volunteer input

and was entirely dependent on income from the exhibition for survival. BCPC could only contemplate a full conference every other year.

Papers published at BCPC Conferences had a certain status for the findings of applied science (as well as having legal status when new molecules were being described for the first time). This is now eroding in the same manner as applied versus pure science in the face of the RAE.

## **96.2 CURRENT ISSUES**

### **96.2.1 Web Pages**

There is an ongoing dialogue between Roy Batemen and John Fisher. In a nutshell the limitations on implementing on what is seen as desirable for all WGs is time and effort.

## **96.3 LINK PROJECT**

**LK0993** commenced on 1<sup>st</sup> September 2007 and will run for 30 months with delivery of outcomes in spring 2010. Current effort is focused on reviews, the organisation and analysis of available data, the development of experimental protocols. First lab work would begin in March. The overall nozzle classification scheme would, of necessity, become more complicated and extensive as it included a greater array of nozzle types. The challenge would then be to translate scientific advance into better practice.

## **96.4 BCPC PUBLICATIONS**

“Spreading Fertilisers and Applying Slug Pellets” was about to be launched as a new BCPC training guide aimed very much at operators. Drafts circulated in appropriate circles had won general approbation. Bayer had ordered 300 bespoke copies.

NFU members would now have access to the entire series of BCPC handbooks at member rates.

The UKPG had been launched as an on-line service (no CD-ROM) at [www.plant.protection.org.uk](http://www.plant.protection.org.uk) costing £70 +VAT with a 25% reduction for year one for existing users of the electronic UKPG CF. Liaison at £130 +VAT.

BCPC News now reaches over 3000 members of the BCPC community as a free email based service providing headlines

backed up by reference to websites. (Farming on Line has started a parallel service!!!). The route for BCPC WGs is via items posted on the BCPC site that can be referred to via BCPC News.

## **96.5 STANDARDS DEVELOPMENT**

BS is inactive in contrast to ISO.

It was decided that a list of ISO standards relevant to this WG should be posted on the Dropdata website and that Tom Bals should provide a listing to Roy Bateman for this purpose and for immediate circulation to WG members

**Action: T Bals and R Bateman**

## **96.7 DATE AND VENUE OF NEXT MEETING**

Tuesday 23<sup>rd</sup> September at IPARC, Silwood Park