

Action notes from the JAGDAG meeting on 21 November 2012

Attendees:

Stephen Robjohns (Health Protection Agency); Jonathan Smith (Shell representing SAGTA); Ian Davey (part), Helen Wilkinson, Clare Robertson, Naomi Gornall (Environment Agency); Fred Parsonage and Kevin Crane (Defra) Phil Chatfield (Welsh Government/Environment Agency),

By phone: Ashley Roberts (SEPA), Matt Craig (ROI)

Apologies: Howard Brett (Thames Water representing Water UK); Paul Whitehouse

Updates from 25/02/13 meeting added in blue

Item 1: Actions from last meeting	Status
AR/MC to consider improved text for JAGDAG website	To be dealt with under MRV/JAGDAG project
MC to discuss MRV/JAGDAG at the Groundwater Task Team (GWTT) meeting on 21/06/12	Completed; GWTT supportive
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ID to review references in consultation response document and recirculate to JAGDAG members AR to review SEPA sign-off for response document. 	Completed
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> AR and HW to agree how to proceed with future peer review 	Completed. Quicker consultation will limit the need for peer review. Consultation process to be dealt with under MRV/JAGDAG project
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> HW to liaise with SR on translating available data to meet CLP requirements ALL to ask operational colleagues for requirements on which substances need to be assessed under the project ID to seek legal view on whether substances be 'downgraded' from list 1 to non-hazardous. 	HPA has only limited capacity Completed This is compatible with the various directives' requirements
Status of interim determinations and consultation <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ID/AR/MC to consider needs for internal sign off and if there are issues for consulting for a limited period. AR to consider issues for publishing consultation on UKTAG site. HW to consider information that is needed to accompany consultation. ID to arrange telecon – ID/AR/MC/HW w/c 25/06 to discuss progress 	To be dealt with under MRV/JAGDAG project Ditto Ditto Completed
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ALL to propose suggestions to ID for other industry representatives on JAGDAG. ID to contact NIEA to seek representative 	Outstanding; on 25/03/13 agenda No NIEA representative available

	Actions from 21/11/12	Who	When
2	Hazardous Substances project overview This is split into two parts and the objectives are: Determination: <i>we will have an efficient and effective way of working for identifying hazardous substances as defined in the Groundwater Daughter Directive (GWDD). This will include co-operating with other environment agencies, scientists, business</i>		

	<p><i>and industry, where appropriate, and producing determinations that are accepted as reliable.</i></p> <p>This is the part of the project that is of most relevance to JAGDAG. The detail is contained in the technical specification circulated prior to the meeting i.e.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • collation of data to enable determination of further identified substances • development of a consultation process and running a consultation process for approx 20 substances • developing an approach for identifying substances for future consideration • a method for external organisations to supply information on these substances, and • an update of the UKTAG JAGDAG webpage. <p>Also noted this project has been tendered and is due to end at the end March 2013.</p> <p><i>'MRVs' (Minimum Recording Values):</i> <i>We will have a common approach for UK and Ireland on how we comply with the 'prevent' requirements of the GWD and to take account of any environmental and business implications. This means a common approach on how we use environmental standards to identify the need for preventative and restorative work, and how we identify what action is proportionate. This includes how the numerical values are derived and applied for both local-scale and water body-scale impacts.</i></p> <p>This part is expected to take up to 2.5 years</p>		
3	<p>List of substances for next assessment</p> <p>Discussed the 3 appendices identifying the substances to be considered under the proposed project on the determination of substances. Substances included in Appendix 3 are those that were assigned Hazardous/Non-hazardous based on the previous List 1 and 2 classification. This list is to be considered within the project to identify those that may need further consideration in light of the new methodology.</p> <p>JAGDAG members to consider the list of substances and identify any that they feel should be considered in the future. Will need to develop a more strategic approach to identifying substances for future determinations. Review of Appendix 3 is one step to achieving this along with input from operational staff as to substances of potential concern. As part of the contract for the substance determination we are able to ask for additional sets of 10 substances to be reviewed for a fixed price.</p>		
	<p>Agency colleagues to respond re relevance of substances on Appx 3 and identification of additional substances</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • 25/02/13 update - awaiting recommendations from EA colleagues 	Agency colleagues	30 Nov
	<p>Industry colleagues to review appendix 3 and provide comments re relevance, along with any indication of potential additional substances for consideration for determination</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • 25/02/13 update - no further suggestions but Jonathan Smith has offered to talk to prospective additional members to discuss the role 	Industry colleagues	11 Jan 2013 Done
4	Website		

	<p>The revised methodology is hard to find on the JAGDAG page (sits within the consultation response document at the bottom of the page.) Ian has the contact who manages the webpage so Ian to ask that person for access to allow the methodology to be separated out and brought to prominence.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> 25/02/13 update – methodology moved to more prominent location; since then webpages have been revised considerably for better presentation 	ID	End Nov Done
	<p>The template (for interested parties to provide data for assessing substances) that is to be drafted to ensure that information is submitted in an efficient way is to be developed by the Project. Naomi to ensure it is produced and made available for use asap. Discussions suggested a slightly adapted version of the template used to document the determinations may be appropriate. Consideration of data collation for future substances is part of the proposed project.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> 25/02/13 update – completed; consultation began on 11/02/13 	NG	End Dec Done
5	JAGDAG review of and consultation on assessed substances: plan is to send out an initial 20 substances to trial the consultation approach.		
	<p>Question: is it ok to send the completed templates out for consultation as drafted? Agreed 'yes' subject to Helen</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Inserting the links to the references where possible Checking the sources in the SGV work led by Ian Martin and then inserting advice on what we will take account of (this relates primarily to the data collation aspect of the project) 'Borderline' - where this term is used we will take precautionary approach and say it is hazardous, flag this in the consultation as an area where data isn't so strong and await comments or data Where data conflicts this is currently noted on the datasheet however for the consultation JAGDAG noted that will need to propose a specific way forward and then address any comments raised. This issue arose for antimony where different organisations had interpreted the data on bioaccumulation in different ways. 25/02/13 update – completed; comments from JS taken into account on original list of 20; revised list accepted by JAGDAG members and put out to consultation 	HW	14 Dec Done
	<p>Question: Landguard – is there enough data to make the assessment. Helen to liaise with Paul Doherty and Alwyn Hart who have been providing the technical steer on this product. It is not yet in production or sold, and its use will be subject to a permit</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> 25/02/13 update – Landguard removed from list; further data now available for making assessment 	HW	14 Dec Done
	<p>Question: is this the right 20 to go out?</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Clare to liaise with Roger Hoare in the Protocols project 	CR	23 Nov

	<p>re the substances he requested were assessed (Magnesium, strontium and iron) and the implications for him of now sending them out.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Need to be aware of political and reputational issues given that they occur naturally in rocks and we may not have sufficient information. • Potentially need to consider the implications of the determination of arsenic as the determination is 'Hazardous' and need to be aware of the consequences of this • All to review current 20 proposed and provide comments to Helen, • Agreed that hydrotreated distillate would not be included in the consultation as it is a mixture and JAGDAG had agreed at the last meeting that mixtures would not be covered and that determinations would only be done on individual substances • Helen to send out a further five substances for consideration in case some of the 20 sent round are no longer included eg magnesium • Will need to consider some of the human health assessments in more detail particularly where CLP indicate not of concern. Helen to discuss with Stephen in more detail • The form of the substance assessed needs to be taken into consideration, particularly in relation to the metals, eg need to ensure the data relates to environmentally relevant forms, this is particularly relevant for metals. • 25/02/13 update – completed; comments from JS taken into account on original list of 20; revised list accepted by JAGDAG members and put out to consultation 	<p>ID/CR</p> <p>All</p> <p>All</p> <p>HW All</p> <p>HW/SR</p> <p>ID/HW</p>	<p>14 Dec</p> <p>14 Dec</p> <p>30 Nov</p> <p>30 Nov 14 Dec</p> <p>End Dec</p> <p>End Dec</p> <p>Done</p>
	<p>Consultation process: need to review stakeholder list (Boy Scouts Assoc are on it but not SAGTA) and how to prioritise to get to the right people.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Clare to find the list • All to provide comments or suggestions back to Naomi • 25/02/13 update – list finalised and used for consultation 	<p>CR All</p>	<p>23 Nov 14 Dec Done</p>
6	<p>AOB</p> <p>Membership of the Group: it was suggested that a relevant technical person from the following groups or sectors be approached by Clare asking her colleagues responsible for Landfill, Farming (looking for a Crop Protection Association rep?) and chemicals sector (chemical engineer who is a member of CIA?) to suggest someone.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • 25/02/13 update – awaiting further advice • Post-meeting note – potential member from Energy Association proposed 	<p>CR</p>	<p>23 Nov</p>
7	<p>Date and location of next meeting: agreed that Anita will set</p>	<p>NG/AK</p>	<p>End</p>

	up quarterly meetings, 3 telcons and one face to face per year. Other ad hoc meetings will be called as necessary		Nov
--	--	--	-----