



Minutes
from the
Bracken Control meeting
held at
The Park Inn by Radisson, York
on
Tuesday 26th February 2013

1 Welcome & Introduction

- 1.1 An attendance list is at Appendix 1.
- 1.2 In anticipation of a favourable outcome from the Emergency Authorisation (EA) application the objectives for the meeting were:
 - 1.2.1 Review arrangements for marketing, distributing, application and return / disposal of asulam within the EA & Use-up periods;
 - 1.2.2 Publicity & promotion;
 - 1.2.3 Technical details – draft label, hand-held application; and
 - 1.2.4 Plans for the preparation of the application for an EA in 2014.

2 UPL briefing

- 2.1 UPL provided an update on the preparation of the application to register asulam under the latest EU regulation: Plant Protection Products Regulation (EC) No. 1107/2009.
- 2.2 Submission had been delayed slightly to allow more time to assemble data but would be completed by the end of June 2013.
- 2.3 All the issues that had been raised during the review of asulam in the EU, which had led to non-registration, would be addressed in the application.
- 2.4 Bayer had submitted the original application for registration under this review and had selected the application on spinach as the representative use. Part of the reason for this was that to be eligible for Annex 1 registration the application had to be based on an edible use.

Newtonrigg, Holywood, DUMFRIES DG2 0RA

Coordinator: S P R Thorp BSc(Hons) CEnv MRICS

Email: info@brackencontrol.co.uk

Tel / Fax : 01387 723201

Web: www.brackencontrol.co.uk

3 Status of the Emergency Authorisation Application

- 3.1 The Chemicals Regulation Directorate (CRD) announced that the Advisory Committee on Pesticides (ACP) had agreed to CRD's recommendations in relation to the EA application for the use of 'Asulox' on bracken.
- 3.2 Ministerial consent was required before the decision could be announced formally.
- 3.3 After confirmation, the next steps would be to draft a Notification of Authorisation (to be issued at the start of the EA period) and the Product Label. These would confirm the dates of the various periods and provide details of other conditions.
- 3.4 It was noted that an EA had already been granted for bracken control in Belgium and the Netherlands. France was considering an application.
- 3.5 The application submitted by the Horticultural Development Corporation for horticultural use had been refused, as there were alternative products available.

4 Conditions attached to the EA approval and label details for 2013

- 4.1 The EA period was likely to start on 20 May 2013 and run for 120 days. The use-up period would continue until the end of October. Storage of asulam products would become illegal again on 1 November 2013.
- 4.2 The status of the 2012 Aerial Spraying Permits, which had been issued for a 5-year period, would be confirmed. It may be possible to amend these Permits.
Action: CRD
- 4.3 Applications for new Aerial Spraying Permits could be applied for before the start of the EA period on 20 May 2013.
- 4.4 Importation arrangements for stocks of asulam were to be agreed with CRD.
Action: UPL
- 4.5 The application of asulam on docks would not be included in the Emergency Authorisation.
- 4.6 There was some discussion about the definition of a water body. CRD would provide clarification so that a comparison could be made with the likely risk.
Action: CRD

5 Hand-held application

- 5.1 The importance of hand-held equipment was emphasised.
 - 5.1.1 This equipment provided a means to carry out secondary treatments to tackle regrowth after primary treatments. Follow up treatment was essential if a complete kill of bracken was to be achieved.

- 5.1.2 Hand-held equipment was also capable of providing primary treatment on small areas or where larger equipment could not gain access.
- 5.2 The risk assessment of the application techniques carried out by CRD as part of the review of asulam had identified that some of the techniques in common use had developed without formal review.
- 5.3 There was confusion about dilution rates and in the absence of other information CRD could not authorise use of some of the application techniques including: overall spray by knapsack sprayer, vehicle mounted sprayers and booms, hand-held lances and mist sprayers (Micron ULVA in placement or drift mode). This position would be reviewed. **Action: CRD**
- 5.4 Roderick Robinson had prepared a briefing paper that had been submitted to CRD. This briefing provided details of the common application techniques and these details would be considered by CRD as they drafted the Product Label. The Chairman thanked Roderick Robinson for his paper.
- 5.5 Application of asulam by spot gun passed the assessment and this technique would be covered by the EA.
- 5.6 Application of asulam by weed-wiper would not be an authorised use.
- 5.7 For forestry use, it was vital to have the ability to apply an overall spray from hand-held equipment (e.g. a knapsack sprayer). This allowed asulam to be used to release young trees from bracken.

6 Distribution arrangements

- 6.1 Some minor changes might be made to the distribution network but generally the arrangements for distributing asulam would be unchanged.
- 6.2 As asulam was produced for an international market there would be no problem with meeting UK demand for bracken control.
- 6.3 Pack sizes had not yet been agreed.
- 6.4 To allow UPL to assess demand, end-users should be asked to contact their contractors or distributors as soon as possible. **Action: Coordinator**
- 6.5 In the Netherlands, Agrichem had produced Formule 1, an alternative asulam product that had accounted for 4-5% of the UK market. UPL had purchased Agrichem in September and it was likely that the brand Formule 1 would disappear.

7 Press & Publicity

- 7.1 A press release would be issued when the Emergency Authorisation had been confirmed. This would be made available on the Bracken Control Group website so that everyone would have access to the same information.

- 7.2 It would be important to emphasise that the EA was for bracken control only and that there were some changes to the use of hand-held equipment.
- 7.3 The Notice of Authorisation would provide details of the conditions attached to the approval and the Product Label would provide further details. Details would be made public as soon as they had been finalised. **Action: Coordinator**
- 7.4 The link between the amount of grant available and the amount of bracken control carried out was discussed. A letter would be drafted to feed into the Rural Development Programme review processes that are underway in all the administrations of the UK. **Action: Coordinator**
- 7.5 The Welsh Government's Rural Newspaper, Gwlad, was recommended as an outlet for the press briefing.

8 Actions required at the end of the 2013 EA and use-up periods

- 8.1 During the use-up period, end-users should be encouraged to use up all stocks they had purchased.
- 8.2 It would be possible to return unused stock still in sealed containers to distributors, who might make a small charge for the service.
- 8.3 Surplus stock would be returned to UPL, before the end of the use-up period. UPL would make no charge for returns.

9 Preparations for the 2014 application

- 9.1 The aim would be to submit the application for an EA in 2014 in time for it to be considered at the November meeting of the ACP. The target for submission of the application would be mid-September. **Action: Coordinator**
- 9.2 A pre-application meeting would be held with CRD to consider the detail required in the application and the availability of data to support the use of hand-held application techniques. **Action: Coordinator**
- 9.3 Additional information would be made available, if it existed, particular those data covering skin sensitisation, with a view to providing CRD with sufficient information to include all viable hand-held equipment in the EA approval. **Action: UPL**
- 9.4 Data collected in support of the EA application would also be required for the registration application.

10 Any other business

- 10.1 The Coordinator was giving a presentation 'Bracken Control with & without asulam' at the Robson Meeting that covered invasive species management in St Ives, Cambridgeshire, on 7 March 2013.

11 Date of Next Meeting

11.1 A meeting in late August / early September would be considered to gather experience gained during the 2013 season. Alternatively, a questionnaire could be circulated. **Action: Coordinator**

11.1.1 If it is decided to hold a meeting topics could include:

- Briefing the agencies about bracken control
- Transitional arrangements under the rural development programmes as part of the CAP review and the importance of maintaining funding for bracken control.
- Estimation of the area of bracken. There is a generally accepted view that the area of bracken is under-estimated.
- Possible support for the water quality work at Sourhope in the Cheviot Hills.

11.2 In the margins of the meeting it was agreed that a meeting with CRD & UPL would be held in April / May to review the data that were available to support hand-held application. **Action: Coordinator**

Attendance List

Name		Organisation
Richard	Allen	UPL - Chairman
Mark	Ballingall	SRUC
Duncan	Bogie	CRD
Roy	Brown	IBG
Alastair	Burn	Natural England
Steve	Clarke	Natural England
Louise	Dalgliesh	UPL
Darren	East	Landmarc
Wendy	Fox	BADA-UK
Gill	Gallagher	Ulster Farmers Union
Duncan	Glen	Landmarc
Nicholas	Hawkings-Byass	MFH Helicopters
Dafydd	Jarrett	NFU Cymru
Seamus	Maginn	Ulster Farmers Union
Luciano	Pinto	UPL
Roderick	Robinson	Landward
Paul	Savage	Uniphos
Grant	Stark	CRD
Belinda	Steward	Environment Agency
Simon	Thorp	Heather Trust
Karen	Trott	CRD
Ian	Willoughby	Forestry Commission
George	Winn-Darley	Moorland Association
(22)		