

## Pigmeat Supply Chain Task Force – Environment Sub-Group

### Final note of fifth meeting held on Thursday 21 January 2010

#### Present:

Barney Kay, NPA (Chair)  
Nigel Penlington, BPEX  
Diane Mitchell, NFU  
[REDACTED], Env Agency  
[REDACTED], Defra  
[REDACTED], Natural England  
[REDACTED], Defra  
[REDACTED], Defra  
Duncan Prior, Task Force Secretary

#### Apologies for Absence:

Lizzie Press, BQP  
Nick Green, Alvis Bros  
[REDACTED], Defra  
[REDACTED], Defra

#### 1. Welcome and apologies

1.1 Barney Kay welcomed those present and noted apologies for absence.

#### 2. Review of minutes and matters arising

2.1 The Sub-Group agreed the minutes of the last meeting as a true and accurate record. Any outstanding actions and matters arising were covered by the meeting agenda. The Sub-Group noted the minutes of the last Task Force meeting held on 7 December.

#### 3. Sub-Group Workplan

3.1 In introducing agenda item 3, Barney Kay said that the principal aims of the meeting were to agree precisely what the Sub-Group will have delivered by the time of the final Task Force meeting on 1 February. It was equally important to be clear on what on-going work would be pursued, and who would be the principal 'owner' for each workstream.

3.2 In discussing the principal components of the Sub-Group's Workplan, the following main points were made, and actions agreed:

##### *3.3 Enhancing Environmental Benefits (Anaerobic Digestion)*

3.3(a) Defra had prepared a draft Anaerobic Digestion Implementation Plan (relating to the recommendations of the earlier AD Task Force), due for publication in March 2010.

**Action:** [REDACTED] to circulate copy to Sub-Group members now for the opportunity to comment.

3.3(b) Industry reaffirmed its keenness to participate in Defra's implementation 'clusters' when established in March. **Action:** [REDACTED] confirmed that Defra had noted that request from an earlier meeting, and reassured the Sub-Group that it would not be overlooked.

3.3(c) Industry had reviewed the NFCCC web-based information portal (which was to be used as the principal tool for providing AD information to stakeholders). **Action:** Nigel Penlington to take forward industry's feedback directly with NFCCC.

3.3(d) Industry had organised a very useful exploratory stakeholder meeting at the end of November, including representatives from NPA, BPEX, Industry, ADBA, Task 37, Env

Agency and retailers. (BiTC, WRAP and NFCCC had been invited but were unable to attend on the day.) The meeting had enabled various organisations to meet for the first time, share knowledge and build relationships for ongoing development of AD in the pig sector. **Action: Barney Kay** to circulate note of that meeting to the Sub-Group.

3.3(e) BPEX had prepared a draft introductory information note on AD – the latest version was tabled at the meeting. Its purpose was to provide sufficient information to allow the lay person to understand the fundamentals of AD, key technological terms, some of the stages in the process of introducing and managing AD projects on-farm, and investment/return factors. The Sub-group considered the document to be a very good service to farmers, and complemented BPEX for the initiative. A number of Sub-Group members registered a desire to suggest some important revisions to the draft. **Action: All** comments on the draft to be sent to Nigel Penlington at BPEX not later than 29 January. **Action: Nigel Penlington** to consult WRAP and the stakeholder organisations who met on 30 November (see 3.3(d) above) on the accuracy of the information note in its final version before publication. **Action: [REDACTED]** to provide Nigel Penlington with appropriate name and contact details at WRAP. **Action: Nigel Penlington** to also consult Digby Scott on effective methods of promulgation of the final product to intended audiences.

3.3(f) Although the NFCCC web-portal would be the main resource for disseminating AD information, it was agreed that BPEX should continue to provide a sector-specific focal point to help pig producers adopt AD projects where necessary. For example, BPEX would represent industry on Defra's Implementation Steering/Cluster Group, and on the NFCCC's Stakeholder Group. Also, BPEX's Knowledge Transfer Team would, in principle, be a source of support through their R&D and Innovation Funds in the process of assisting project take-up. There was potential for AHDB to coordinate effort across all the red meat sectors. **Action: Nigel Penlington** to pursue these points within BPEX to ensure modest resources were allocated appropriately

3.3(g) Industry would consider organising a follow-up meeting of stakeholder organisations. **Action: NPA and BPEX** to take forward jointly.

3.3(h) There was a need to identify suitable AD demonstration projects from within the pig sector. **Action: Nigel Penlington** to provide Barney Kay with a description of what type of projects were sought so that Barney could discuss with Digby Scott how best to recruit candidate projects.

3.3(i) The NFU had formally responded to recent Env Agency consultation on the latter's charging proposals – in the context of waste management – suggesting an approach of consolidated permits. The NPA was also very supportive of that approach and would consider adding its weight to the proposal. **Action: Diane Mitchell** to provide Barney Kay with relevant extract from NFU's consultation response.

### *3.4 Improving Industry/Environmental Bodies Interface*

3.4(a) It was desirable for the agreed Vision Statement, which had been formally agreed by the Task Force, to be formally signed by the relevant signatories. Although the Statement was a step in the journey towards the effective outcome of enhanced collaboration, formal sign-off would signify the Statement being a useful output in its own right. It was also possible to use a signing ceremony to raise awareness through publicity. The Pig Fair in May would provide a good opportunity for such an event. **Action: Task Force Secretary** to alert relevant organisations to this proposal and liaise with Nigel Penlington about taking forward the practicalities.

3.4(b) BPEX was preparing to adopt an industry 'Carbon Road Map' [working title only] that would bring together current relevant activity, the two recent sector reports (assessing the life cycle impact of pork products to farm gate, and sustainability of pigmeat production), and create an industry agenda for advancing its environmental performance over time. It was intended that such an initiative would facilitate effective communications both within the industry and between the industry, regulators and other stakeholders. BPEX intended to publish the scope of this initiative at the May Pig Fair. **Action: Nigel Penlington** to provide Barney Kay with a short description – agreed by BPEX – to include in the latter's oral report on progress to the 1 February Task Force meeting.

3.4(c) Defra's sustainable products team lead on all general food and non-food roadmap work; but [REDACTED] was the Department's contact for the beef and lamb roadmap. Others might be undertaking work relevant to the pig sector, such as WRAP's research into the sources of waste in the processing part of food production. **Action: Barney Kay** to make contact with [REDACTED] to explore synergies between the pig sector's mapping work and the beef and lamb related work.

3.4(d) Debate was gathering pace, across Europe, on the issue of under-utilised food product as potential animal feed. Although an issue of evolving science, it was also politically contentious. The Sub-Group noted, however, that there was a difference (especially in management and security terms) between such material obtained from large-scale commercial and non-commercial sources. **Action: Barney Kay** to raise the issue at the Task Force meeting on 1 February to gauge initial reaction from members – especially retailers and the food service sector.

### 3.5 *Improving Business Efficiency within Environmental Regulations*

3.5(a) The work of the IPPC re-engineering focus group was presented to the last Task Force as having three key components: (i) the need for a step by step industry guide to the permitting process for green-field sites as well as subsequent variations; (ii) the schedule of specific actions that would provide some 'quick wins' in terms of changes to the way the current permitting regime operates; and (iii) an action plan for improvements based on practical experience, but which would take longer to implement. The Task Force had been impressed with the work, and agreed that the model had the potential to be effective in other areas too. [REDACTED] had said that the Environment Agency was very pleased with the outcome of the review, and regarded it important to see the approach imbedded into 'business as usual' with the Agency.

3.5(b) However, progress on implementing those three components of the action plan had been seriously and materially hampered from the recent distraction of resources (both with the Agency and industry) in dealing with a very significant but unexpected interruption of the Agency's current permit approval process. Particular permit qualifying conditions/factors relating to ammonia levels and how they are to be modelled had caused a complete hiatus in respect of one producer's business expansion and had similar implications for the industry as a whole. The industry was pursuing an urgent solution through a meeting next week to be chaired by the Minister, involving industry the Agency and Defra. Whatever the outcome of that meeting, Barney Kay would be making it clear to the next Task Force meeting the cost of the problem: not only to the industry immediately but also in terms of achieving lasting benefits (ironically that would help avoid such experiences in the future) derived from the Task Force initiative itself. **Action: Barney Kay** to raise at next Task Force meeting.

3.5(c) The Agency were reviewing their IPPC application guidance, including whether or not to continue with sector specific notes or adopt a single generic guidance document for all sectors. Industry was firmly of the view that sector specific guidance and application forms should be used. **Action: Barney Kay and [REDACTED]** to liaise over a joint letter to the Agency.

3.5(d) The Sub-Group considered further projects to review regulatory permitting regimes, noting that Tricia Henton had stated at the last Task Force meeting that the Agency would agree in principle (and subject to resources) participating in another such project. The Sub-Group agreed to propose a project relating to the permitting aspects of operating on-farm anaerobic digestion – principally planning permission for development and waste management considerations. Such a project would build on the positive experience of reviewing the IPPC permitting regime and take forward the Sub-Group's initial work on AD. Resources for such a project were an immediate issue (relative to other running priorities – including IPPC!), but the Sub-Group felt that it would be appropriate and helpful if, in the first instance, Defra would take the lead in facilitating a meeting with key stakeholders (ie Defra, DCLG, the Environment Agency, the Local Government Association, and others) to scope a project for the industry to adopt and manage. **Action: Barney Kay** to include this project proposal in his report to the next Task Force, with a direct request that, if agreed, Defra would facilitate the initial scoping stage.

### *3.6 Environmental Auditing/Mapping*

3.6 The Sub-Group noted that developing the sector's environmental performance over time remained important. It was therefore noted that industry had recently published a life cycle analysis, and the Sub-Group welcomed industry's proposal to develop an environmental road map (see 3.4(b) above) that would provide the mechanism for delivery of enhanced environmental performance. **Action: Nigel Penlington** to ensure that Barney Kay was directly involved (not least to provide consistency and continuity with the work started by the Task Force/Sub-Group) in key meetings and consultation generally in BPEX's development of this initiative.

## 4. Task Force Final Report

4.1 Barney Kay explained that the Task Force anticipated issuing a final report after their last meeting on 1 February. The Sub-Group agreed that Barney should draft and submit direct to the Task Force a short contribution covering the work of the Sub-Group. **Action: Barney Kay** to prepare contribution to the Task Force Secretary by the end of the week.

## 5. Communications and Publicity

5.1 Duncan Prior thanked the Sub-Group for its contributions towards a draft 'core script' of key messages which the Task Force considered at its last meeting. It was anticipated that the final Task Force meeting on 1 February would adopt a final 'core script' that identified the key achievements of the Task Force. That document would be circulated after 1 February to all Sub-Group participants to provide a useful aide memoir and consistency of messages when dealing with media interest. **Action: Task Force Secretary** to circulate 'core script' as soon as available from the Task Force.

## 6. Issues Log and Risk Register

6.1 The Sub-Group reviewed the latest issues log and risk register. It was agreed that no new issues had been identified, and the identified risks were all 'green' but should remain open.

**Action: Task Force Secretary** to up-date risk register accordingly.

## 7. NVZs

7.1 Barney Kay observed that he had not had a substantive response, nor confirmed arrangements for a meeting with Defra, since he raised the issue of NVZs at the last Task Force meeting. [REDACTED] said that he thought a submission on the issue had been sent to the Minister for a decision, though the meeting thought that odd given the lack of conclusive consultation with industry since the issue was raised at TF5. Admittedly, that may have reflected poor communications, but industry remained concerned about progress towards addressing the issue satisfactorily. **Actions: Barney Kay** to raise the matter as a substantive point at the next Task Force meeting on 1 February; meanwhile, **Task Force Secretary** to raise the matter at the Defra Project Board meeting later that day.

## 8. Conclusion

8.1 It was agreed that the Sub-Group had taken its work to a point where the formal group could be disbanded. It was anticipated that the industry's proposed 'environmental partnership forum' would provide the mechanism for taking forward continued collaboration with colleagues in relevant organisations, supplemented by the ongoing work of the Sub-Group having been assigned to individual project owners. However, it may be sensible to reconvene a meeting of the Sub-Group participants in, say, 6 months' time to take stock of progress.

8.2 In closing the meeting, the Chairman thanked all participants for their contributions during the past year.

Task Force Secretariat  
January 2010