[redacted]

From: [redacted]
Sent: 29 September 2014 08:47
To: [redacted] (Defra)
Subject: RE: Heads up!

Dear All,

Yes that date is good for me and I imagine the whole day will be needed.

Best wishes,

[redacted]

[redacted]

[redacted]

[redacted]

From: [redacted]
Sent: 27 September 2014 08:28
To: [redacted]
Subject: Re: Heads up!

Dear All,

Thanks [redacted]

I am restricting this email to those involved in the meeting plus [redacted], who has asked to attend if she can be of help. I have no doubt on that score and have said she is welcome.

30th October is most suitable for [redacted] and for me. Could everyone please confirm by return that you can devote a whole day (say 10.30 till 4) in London (venue to be confirmed). I know there is some doubt about [redacted] availability.

[redacted] (and others) please circulate comment/criticism/relevant material of any kind/evidence and references etc ASAP and certainly before the meeting so that we can all read and reflect in advance. The fewer surprises the better.

We should not regard ourselves as wedded to either the PERA draft (Risk register with scores 13 August) or [redacted] version (Risk register with scores [redacted] version 19 September). Both drafts are helpful and both open to criticism. Neither is sacred. Our small group will seek to reach consensus step by step amongst ourselves - or failing that reflect a spread of opinion - and work on from there.

We will however use 13 August version as our starting point for the left hand side and 19 September version for the right hand side. But everything has to be supported by clear reason supported by citable evidence. I have to be able to say in the final report: LAG took this step/made this judgment because … etc.

I hope and expect that we will surprise ourselves by how far we can get if we take one step at a time. But it may need the whole day.

As ever and in haste - many thanks.

[redacted]

On 26 Sep 2014, at 14:58, [redacted] > wrote:

Dear All,

Many thanks for this [redacted] and I shall keep those dates free (but shall assume the 30th is the most likely). I think a meeting to go through the risk register is the best course of action so I'll assume this replaces [redacted] deadline of Monday and instead we'll use the 'left hand side' that PERASG have provided and work up measures for the right hand side considering, alongside other inputs, those [redacted] has kindly provided.

Best wishes,

[redacted]

From: [redacted]
Sent: 26 September 2014 12:04
To: [redacted]
Subject: Heads up!

Dear Colleagues
This 'heads up' is to keep you informed. Hope it makes sense.
The end of September is approaching and I am continuing to work on a draft final report – and to get as far as I can pending settlement on an agreed Risk Register.
The position is that the PERA subgroup has developed some paperwork as requested (For reference: Risk register with scores 13 August).
In parallel however, [redacted] has produced another version (For reference: Risk register with scores [redacted] version 19 September).
[If you haven't seen either of these and wish to please let me know and I will send you a copy - but they are very much works in progress.]

These two offerings now need to be brought together and it requires a meeting of those most closely involved. I shan't comment on either version now but there are, at this point, some substantial differences to resolve. The good news is that I do not believe, having myself worked through all the evidence etc and formed my own view in the process of drafting a final report, that the differences are insurmountable. Hence having had contact from colleagues involved with both versions, I am arranging a small meeting in London on the soonest possible date which is 29th, 30th or 31st October. Of these 30th is preferred. I am trying to keep numbers as small as possible and my suggestions are: [redacted] (if you can make it?), [redacted] and [redacted] If anybody else feels passionate about joining in the please let me know.

That to one side and not having a Main Committee meeting in view, you may be interested in my take/update on the outstanding Action Points carried forward from June:

12.1 [redacted] *to recommend* ***changes to the Code of Good Shooting Practice****, which should include direct and specific recommendations on the use of non-lead shot.*

This has been overtaken and is wrapped up in the emerging proposals for awareness raising – and I am inclined to agree that it will be most productive for stakeholders to concentrate on the wider campaign and messaging. Amending COGSP can follow.

12.2 *Request* ***FSA to review their guidance*** *on consumption of game and venison in the light of the LAG risk assessments.*

I have not taken this up with [redacted] yet but will do so at the right time. There is an important job to do here but it should follow the meeting on 29/30/31 October when there will be greater clarity.

12.3 [redacted] *to seek advice on the possible* ***interaction between iron oxide and agricultural nitrates****.*

This was followed up and a perspective obtained that, in the absence of anything further, it does not amount to a significant risk. If anybody has any additional or conflicting view please let me know.

12.4 [redacted] *to distribute to the group a 1996 report on* ***ricochet of steel shot conducted by the Royal College of Military Science and commissioned by the Birmingham Proof House****.*

The RCMS report has not so far been made available (Barney, please if possible could it be sent to Matt/me for circulation: many thanks). This is additional to an expert report by Bill Harriman. Ricochet is a topic that needs to be covered under "factors to be taken into account" in the draft final report. Hence a reference such as this should be covered.

12.5 ***PERA Subgroup to establish a consistent approach to scoring risks before mitigation and complete that part of the Register for reporting back to the Group****.*

PERA subgroup, as requested by the June meeting, has been working hard on this and has produced a new working draft, completing the left hand side, and suggesting a basis for consistent scoring. This paperwork will be taken up in discussion at 29/30/31 October meeting.

12.6 **All to submit any further possible mitigation options to the Mitigation Subgroup.**

I know that a number of additional options and suggestions have come forward. They are being/will be incorporated as appropriate. They will be taken up in discussion at 29/30/31 meeting.

12.7 **Mitigation Subgroup to develop mitigation action plans for measures already discussed.**

The MSG as such has provided no mitigation action plans as yet, but we are beginning to see the shape of some countermeasures. These too can be covered in discussion at the 29/30/31 meeting.

12.8 **Chairman to circulate draft proposal for lead forum for comment.**

Following objections from [redacted] and [redacted] the proposal is parked for the time being. I am open to suggestions but the current priority is to settle the Risk Register.

I hope this is helpful and any comments or suggestions are very welcome.

Kind regards and best wishes as ever,

[redacted]

The information to hand is that the key factors to control the dissolution of Pb shot (or any other "mineral like component") in soils/sediments is pH/Eh, i.e., soil acidity/alkalinity and soil redox potential (reducing or oxic). Dissolution of the Pb will be fundamentally controlled by these 2 key factors at atmospheric pressure/normal temperatures. The presence of steel shot in the same soil/sediment is unlikely to have any significant effect on these "macro" soil properties. Whilst the mass/volume of steel "may" be high in some cases, the very surface of the steel shot is the only bit that is effectively "reactive" and this will degrade/dissolve/oxidise over long timescales, so it is difficult to see it giving the soil/sediment a "big" enough hit of free Fe/Fe oxides to affect the Pb dissolution rate in any significant way. Fe is in itself an extremely common element (4-5% of earth's crust), so in most soils/sediments there is a pretty large amount of it around anyway, even 100's of shot/m cubed would have little impact on the total mass of iron naturally ocurring.

This message is confidential and for the sole use of the individual or entity to whom it is addressed. It may not be disclosed, copied or distributed in any form unless it contains an express statement to the contrary.

[redacted] does not accept responsibility for changes made to this message after it was sent. Any personal opinions expressed do not necessarily reflect the policy of the organisation.

[redacted]

This message is confidential and for the sole use of the individual or entity to whom it is addressed. It may not be disclosed, copied or distributed in any form unless it contains an express statement to the contrary.