

JAGDAG Meeting 1500 - 1700, 22 May 2013

Attendees

Marie-Jo Booth	Energy UK
Phil Chatfield	Welsh Assembly Government
Matt Craig	Environmental Protection Agency (EPA), Ireland
Ian Davey	Environment Agency
Olivia Downey	Scottish Environment Protection Agency (SEPA)
Gary Edwards	Environment Agency
Naomi Gornall	Environment Agency
Silke Hartman	Northern Ireland Environmental Protection Agency
Leslie Heasman	MJCA on behalf of Environmental Services Association (ESA)
Ashley Roberts	Scottish Environment Protection Agency (SEPA)
Stephen Robjohns	Public Health England
Helen Wilkinson	Environment Agency

Apologies received from

Jonathan Smith	Soil and Groundwater Technology Association (SAGTA)
Fred Parsonage	Defra

Draft notes

	Item	Action
1	<p>New members of JAGDAG were introduced:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Marie-Jo Booth - Energy UK • Olivia Downey - Scottish Environment Protection Agency (SEPA) • Leslie Heasman - Environmental Services Association (ESA) • Silke Hartman (Northern Ireland Environmental Protection Agency) 	
2	<p>Actions from last meeting</p> <p>JAGDAG members agreed to post the notes of the last meeting on the JAGDAG web pages.</p> <p>Notes from future meetings will be posted once agreed by JAGDAG members.</p>	ID
3	<p>Progress with recent work</p> <p>New assessments:</p> <p>HW noted that she was satisfied with the process that AMEC have used in making recommendations for new assessments and that this complies with the published methodology. She is still reviewing the 47 substances that AMEC assessed.</p> <p>HW also noted that there are about 60 further substances for which data have been collated to support assessments and that EA/SEPA are considering recommendations for determination. In total there will be more than 100 further substances that will require consultation.</p> <p>LH was surprised that potassium permanganate should be considered to be a hazardous substance as this is used in vegetable washing.</p>	

	<p>MJB asked how the level of hazard was assessed. ID will circulate the method used by AMEC</p> <p>Review of List I/II substances ID described AMEC's review of List I/II substances under the first Groundwater Directive (80/68/EEC). List I substances have been taken to be hazardous and List II substances as non-hazardous under the new Groundwater Directive (2006/118/EC). The aim was to check quickly whether any substances might be incorrectly assigned under the new Directive review. 115 were flagged by AMEC for more detailed review to confirm status.</p> <p>ID will circulate a summary of the substances reviewed.</p> <p>Results of consultation on proposed determinations ID presented the results and noted the lack of consensus on the proposed determinations. It was also apparent that although the methodology had been the subject of consultation there were concerns now about its practical application.</p> <p>LH asked if other Member States were going through this process, but it seems this is not the case. LH will look to her international contacts for information on how these matters are dealt with elsewhere in Europe.</p> <p>MJB suggested that not enough information was provided with the consultation to review the proposed determinations.</p> <p>It was requested that ID's summary on the consultation and other work by AMEC should be released for wider circulation. ID will consider how best to release information</p> <p>Updated website All were invited to review the information on the updated website and make recommendations for additional information to be posted.</p>	<p>ID</p> <p>ID</p> <p>ID</p> <p>ID</p> <p>ALL</p>
4	<p>MRV update</p> <p>Include date on MRV project update</p> <p>NG described progress. The project has 3 phases:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Phase 1 - Agree Concepts. This incorporates a review of EU approaches and has been planned to run to June 2013. Completion of this phase involves presentation of outline options to UK Administrations for approval at a policy level and selection of [a] preferred option[s]. • Phase 2 - Development of proposed new standards, in accordance with the options agreed in phase 1. This phase also includes internal consultation with colleagues and external critical friends. This is due to be completed in early 2014. • Phase 3 - Agreed way forward, produce values, external consultation and role out of new approach. This is due to be 	<p>NG</p>

	<p>completed in late 2014.</p> <p>There will be informal engagement with stakeholders and aim to have 'critical friends' from industry</p> <p>LH asked if other Member States are working on MRVs. It was apparent that little work was being done by other Member States.</p> <p>GE described progress with technical issues, including:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Definition and use of appropriate terminology such as 'prevent values' and 'minimum reporting values (MRVs) • Potential differences between design and compliance standards • How to take account of 'pollution' and 'serious pollution' • Practical limits on monitoring and analysis – limits of quantification in clean and dirty water samples. <p>LH suggested that an interim regulatory position was needed given the time that it would take before the MRV project was completed and the fact that we have substances already identified as hazardous.</p> <p>GE acknowledged use of interim standards may have been premature – and that metals cause particular problems; metal persistence problematic</p> <p>LH is pulling together paper on interim determination issues.</p> <p>MJB noted the energy sector's concerns about what interim standards should be applied e.g. for CrVI</p>	
5	<p>AOB</p> <p>ID noted that JAGDAG currently doesn't fit fully within the normal governance arrangements that the agencies have. As part of the JAGDAG/MRV project future governance is being considered e.g. would it be appropriate for JAGDAG to be part of UKTAG.</p> <p>MJB asked if there is a proposal for an MRV group similar to JAGDAG. NG noted that the MRV work will be supported by critical friends and other engagement with stakeholders.</p> <p>LS noted that JAGDAG does not have a high profile with industry.</p>	
6	<p>DONM</p> <p>The next meeting is scheduled for 21 August which may cause problems because of holidays. The group agreed that it would be appropriate to have a face to face meeting if there are substantive issues to discuss. ID will confirm date and arrangements with the group.</p>	ID
	Meeting close	