

Note of Meeting of Pig Meat Supply Chain Task Force: Environmental Sub-Group

Monday 2nd November 2009

Present: Barney Kay (BK), Nigel Penlington (NP), Jane James (JJ), Lizzie Press (LP), [REDACTED], Lee Hossain (LH) [REDACTED], Duncan Prior (DP/TF Secy),

Apologies: Diane Mitchell, Nick Green, [REDACTED] [REDACTED].

1. Action Points from last meeting

1.1 Action points from the last meeting held on 14 September had either been completed or were covered on the agenda of this meeting. The only exception was the lack of resolution on the issue of NVZs where proposed new legislation would – as drafted/interpreted – would impact adversely on outdoor pig producers. NP reported that he had a meeting with Defra planned later in the week. The Sub-Group noted that if the matter could not be resolved at the Defra meeting, it would be escalated – first with Defra officials, and second, if necessary, via the task Force meeting on 7 December.

2. Work Plan Progress Review

2.1 Anaerobic Digestion Proposal

2.1.1 Since the last meeting, time had not allowed a follow-up meeting of the AD focus group; but the new NNFFCC website was up and running. NP had had discussions with a number of people pursuing actual/possible AD projects, including Newcastle University. He was finding that many specific issues require addressing to accelerate take-up of AD, including technology appropriateness, processes, funding, 'feed-in-tariffs' and gas yield. It was noted that NP's involvement in certain projects could be credited as a Task Force contribution.

2.1.2 LH reported that Defra's proposed Action Plan to implement the recommendations of the AD Task Force (ie addressing all the barriers identified by the ADTF) should be published by the end of March 2010. A draft would be available by December. LH anticipated "Implementation Clusters" of practitioners driving different aspects of the Plan, and he would ensure that the pig sector was offered representation on those clusters as appropriate in due course. **Action: LH**

2.1.3 Meanwhile, Defra was preparing planning guidance to local authorities on AD, in recognition that that was an issue to be addressed urgently in order to help planning authorities deal with novel applications.

2.1.4 LH also said that he had access to a number of people and organisations of interest to the pig sector – including, possibly, as project collaborators (eg retailers, financiers, BiTC, EU 'Task 37', Defra's RDA conduit, Welsh AD centre of excellence,

the new AD Biogas [Trade] Assn, and so on). LH would send contact details to the TF Secy for distribution within the Sub-Group. **Action LH**

2.1.5 The Environment Agency's AD contact was [REDACTED].

2.1.6 After discussion, the Sub-Group agreed to arrange an urgent internal industry meeting to consider key issues and how best to engage with wider stakeholders. NP agreed to take that forward and, if possible, provide a paper which might be used to inform TF4 of progress being made. **Action NP**

2.2 *Shared Vision Statement*

2.2.1 The meeting noted that the Task Force (at TF3) had endorsed the draft Vision for adoption by relevant parties - namely public authorities and the pig industry. Other interested parties - such as retailers - could have their interests addressed via a wider supply chain dialogue mechanism that was being taken forward by EFPF (under a separate Task Force workstream led by Defra).

2.2.2 The Sub-Group made one amendment to the text of the draft Vision: in the first bullet point, the two original sentences were combined with the addition of the word "where". It now read, "...facilitate discussion and constructive challenge, where this will deliver the most efficient and effective environmental outcomes." **Action TFSecy**

2.2.3 Considering the merits of a formal launch/implementation of the Vision, the Sub-Group concluded that it should be included in the schedule of 'products' to be presented to the next TF meeting on 7 Dec for consideration under the heading of communications. **Action TF Secy** But, the Sub-Group also felt that the Vision was already being implemented via other Sub-Group projects (eg on IPPC) and would form a corner-stone of a yet to be launched *Pig Environment Partnership* (PEP) that brought together many stakeholders going forward after the TF had ceased to exist. NP and BK would prepare an outline of the proposed PEP for presentation to TF4. **Action BK & NP**

2.3 *IPPC Permit Mapping*

2.3.1 BK reported that the focus group comprising NPA, Environment Agency, BPEX and NFU had met again on 22 October to validate the challenges/problems areas, and to identify solutions. BK took the meeting through documents that the EA had provided which set out the detail of the focus group's work and its conclusions.

2.3.2 In discussion the follow points were made:

- Industry would be challenging the rationale of EA's insistence that non-statutory sites were included in the permitting process (at least for the time being until such sites were required formally to be taken into account and information about them was readily available);

- Many of the proposed solutions were merited in their own right, but when combined offered significant improvements to all involved in the application process – applicant and regulators alike;
- although there may be immediate resourcing issues (eg for the Environment Agency) in implementing some of the solutions, it should be noted that taken in the round the effort required should lead to enhanced efficiency and cost savings (including to the EA) overall; and would help to manage time, cost and risk factors more effectively too;
- NPA/BPEX were proposing to prepare a step-by-step guide for potential IPPC permit applicants that not only identified the steps in the process but also offered good practice guidance. **Action NPA/BPEX**

2.3.3 The Sub-Group decided that the work of the focus group and particularly the proposed solutions should be worked up into an action plan, to be submitted to TF4 for endorsement. The Sub-Group noted that EA had agreed to give a presentation of the mapping review project to TF4. BK agreed to ask the project leader at EA to prepare such a plan by the end of November for submission to TF4. **Action BK**

2.4 Statutory Consultees

2.4.1 BK noted that despite earlier advice to the contrary from Defra, the EA had claimed to hold a list of Statutory Consultees. The meeting agreed that it would be sensible to disseminate such a list (including in the proposed industry guide to IPPC, to help potential permit applicants identify which bodies may have an interest in their operations. The Task Force Secretary would seek a copy of the list from EA.

Action TF Secy [Done – and appended to these minutes for ease of reference]

2.5 Environmental Auditing

2.5.1 NP said that BPEX was working on a project to provide a life cycle analysis of the environmental impacts of the pig production process. The Sub-Group asked to be allowed the opportunity to see the first draft and offer comments. Additionally, it was agreed that, as a minimum, the main Task Force should be informed of the content and timing of any publication in advance. NP would consult Mick Sloyan at BPEX accordingly and report back to the Sub-Group in due course; and would provide a timeline of critical points of the preparation of the analysis relative to the timetable of the Task Force. **Action NP**

2.6 Compendium of Best Practice

2.6.1 The Sub-Group agreed that the original idea of developing a compendium of best practice for the way industry and regulators interacted had been overtaken by the work of the Sub-Group in other key areas. It was agreed that the operation of the Sub-Group itself and the projects it had pursued had displayed best practice that should be imbedded in future collaborative working. It was agreed that the

anticipated *Pig Environment Partnership* offered the mechanism necessary to achieve that, using the shared Vision Statement as PEP's guiding principles.

2.7 Future Priorities/Projects

2.7.1 Given that the work of the Sub-Group to date had developed a sound working relationship amongst the various parties (as anticipated in the Vision Statement) and had validated effective ways of working towards improving regulatory efficiency and reducing costs, the Sub-group was invited to consider further areas where such an approach could be beneficial. Proposals could then be prioritised and possibly put forward as a package of projects to be recommended by the Task Force as future initiatives beyond the life of the Task Force itself. Sub-Group members were asked to consider ideas and bring them to a future meeting of the Sub-Group. **Action All SG Members**

3. Communications

3.1 The Task Force Secretary explained that TF4 on 7 December would be invited to consider how best to brand, message and publicise the outputs (the 'products') of the sub-groups to ensure a consistent and managed communications strategy. He tabled a template that was designed to capture the key components from each sub-group. The Sub-Group considered the approach to be generally good, and asked TF Secretary to provide a first draft of the completed template for their anticipated outputs. That would then be considered/refined by SG members. However, before submission the TF4, the Sub-Group asked that the input of a communications expert (such as Digby Scott) should be sought. **Action TF Secy**

4. Date of Next Meeting

2.9.1 Given the amount of work that was required before TF4 on 7 December, BK proposed that another Sub-Group meeting (possibly via teleconf) would be necessary towards the end of November. That would allow the Sub-Group to take stock of progress and agree their inputs to TF4. **Action Sub-Group members to stand ready to participate in another meeting to be confirmed**

5. Action Points

5.1 BK asked the TF Secretary to issue an advance note of agreed follow-up actions the following day, ahead of the full meeting minutes, to assist in maintaining momentum. **Action TF Secy** [Done – and appended to these minutes for ease of reference]

Environment Agency's List of Statutory Consultees:

- Primary care trust or local health board
- Food Standards Agency
- Local authority
- Sewerage undertaker
- Natural England
- Countryside Council for Wales
- Harbour authority
- Local fisheries committee
- Health and Safety Executive (only if installation is located on a nuclear site or is covered by COMAH Regulations)
- Planning authority
- Secretary of State for Wales

Actions from Environment Sub-Group Meeting, 2 November 2009

1. Anaerobic Digestion:

- **Nigel Penlington** to arrange quick internal industry mtg to scope issues/agenda for wider stakeholder meeting (Done)
- **Nigel Penlington** to arrange meeting of industry and wider stakeholders/possible collaborators (ahead of TF4 on 7 Dec if possible)
- **Lee Hossain** to provide TF Secy with contact details of key people (retailers, financial community, BITC, EU 'Task 37', Defra's RDA conduit, Welsh AD centre of excellence, etc) asap
- **Lee Hossain** to invite pig industry reps onto relevant AD Action Plan 'Implementation Clusters' in due course

2. Draft Vision:

- **TF Secy** to amend 1st bullet of draft Vision by inserting "where" between its sentences, creating a single sentence.
- Immediate signatories/adoption to be considered as part of wider communications/publicity strategy (advice to TF4), action **TF Secy**; but full implementation via proposed *Pig Environment Partnership*. Proposal for PEP (at least in outline) needs working up for presentation to TF4, action **Nigel Penlington/Barney Kay**.

3. IPPC Mapping

- Sub-Group endorsed work of focus group so far and recommendations for adoption/implementation (both specific to IPPC regime, and the validity of the review process for other sectors/areas). **Barney Kay** to ask EA to work up project outputs to date into a draft action plan for endorsement by TF4 (combined with an EA presentation of the project at TF4).
- **TF Secy** to seek list of statutory consultees from EA (Alison Holdsworth).
- Industry (**NPA/BPEX**) to prepare step-by-step practical farmer's guide to the IPPC regime and how best to apply for a permit.

4. Environmental Auditing

- **Nigel Penlington** to speak to Mick Sloyan and prepare a timeline of critical points towards BPEX's life cycle analysis, relative to the Task Force timetable, to ensure the Sub-Group was

able to comment on the analysis before publication, and that the Task Force was given advance notice of content/publication.

5. Communications

- **TF Secy** to prepare draft 'comms grid' to Sub-Group asap. SG to consider/input. Separate meeting involving Digby Scott to consider advice to TF4 on communications strategy/implementation plan.

6. Future priorities/projects

- **All Sub-Group members** to consider priority areas to be addressed that could form TF recommendations for future action beyond the life of the TF. Suggestions/priorities to be considered at a later SG meeting.

7. Next Sub-Group Meeting

- Another SG meeting (possibly via teleconf) was anticipated being required before TF4 on 7 December. **SG members** stand ready to participate as necessary.