Report EPMAN-4 meeting in Prague on 11 May 2010

Purpose of the meeting:
- Respond to the comments by WGSR
- Improve and complete the Guidance Document
- Initiation of the Framework Code of Good Agricultural Practices

Building the Agenda for the break-out groups
Shabtai Bittman discussed a summary sheet of the Annex IX of the Gothenborg Protocol, indicating for each provision of the Annex IX what needs to be done by EPMAN, also in response to the comments and queries of the WGSR-46. Please note that full understanding of the provisions in Annex IX is facilitated by reading the Report of the TFRN-3 meeting, as this report provides a lot of explanation to the Annex IX. The main requests of the WGSR to TFRN deal with
  ➢ Revise the Guidance Document
  ➢ Provide costs estimates of the three options A, B and C.

As regards to the provisions in the Annex IX
- Farm N budgets:
  o Need to define ‘large farms’
  o Need to revise the Guidance Document
- Low-protein animal feeding:
  o WGSR indicated that targets are more strict than BAT, which seems not probable; please clarify.
  o Further, what is the reference level of low-ammonia emission potential?
- Animal Housing:
  o Poultry: revise the Guidance Document, define references
  o Pigs: revise the Guidance Document, define references
  o Cattle: revise the Guidance Document, define references
- Slurry/FYM storages:
  o Slurry stores: Revise Guidance Document
  o Justify that slurry stores hold for all farms (and not only for large farms)
  o Provide clarification why FYM stores of FYM are not included, why they do not need to be covered. There are arguments that FYM heaps should be addressed too in the Annex IX (composter heaps, covering heaps). It was agreed that this issue should be addressed in the Guidance Document
- Land spreading of slurry and manure:
  o Revise the Guidance Document
- Urea and Ammonium fertilizers
  o Revise the Guidance Document

A question was raised whether the provisions of the Annex IX must be seen as additional provisions or is there a possibility to choose between provisions? For example, is there a possibility to choose for strict provisions of animal housing (strong removal of NH3) and than have no measures for animal feeding? Following the discussion, it was suggested that the Annex IX is formulated in such a way that all provisions have to be implemented.
Please note that there are three category of techniques. Only category 1 is well described and will need no further underpinning and justification by the Party. In contrast, using category 2 measure will require that parties have to provide further justification and underpinning.

**Report of the break-out group on animal feeding and animal housing.**


**Animal feeding**

Firstly, the group discussed ‘animal feeding’ as described now in the draft Guidance Document. The following comments were noted:

- needs to be shortened
- needs to be adjusted to the description of the provision 5 of the Annex IX
- proper (uniform) terminology needs to be used

The following (lead) authors were identified for making the first draft revision:

- Andre Aarnink, Harold Menzi, Oene Oenema

All other participants of the break-out Group offered to volunteer as reviewer.

Timing:
- First revised draft should be send around before the end of June
- Reviewers should submit their comments and suggestions within three weeks;
- Final revised draft should be send to the TFRN-participants and to the WGSR before the end of July.

**Housings of pigs, poultry and other livestock**

Secondly, the group discussed ‘Housings of pigs, poultry and other livestock’ as described now in the draft Guidance Document. The following comments were noted:

- The current versions of the Guidance Document dates from 1999 and needs to be updated;
- For the update, use can be made of text from the BREF of the IPPC
- Apart from pigs and poultry, other livestock need to be described as well

The following (lead) authors were identified for making the first draft revision:

- Helmut Dohler, Carlos Pineiro and Martin Dedina.

All other participants of the break-out Group offered to volunteer as reviewer.

Timing:
- First revised draft should be send around before the end of June
- Reviewers should submit their comments and suggestions within three weeks;
- Final revised draft should be send to the TFRN-participants and to the WGSR before the end of July.

**Housings of cattle**

Third, the group discussed ‘Housings of cattle’ as measure to decrease NH3 emissions. There is a description in the 2007 version of the Guidance Document, and it was postulated that not much news has appeared since than. Hence, that version will require a slight update. It was suggested to ask experts for revising this section. Possible external experts include Gert-Jan Monteny, Michel Smits. It was also suggested that possible funds for the update may be provided by the German and/or the Netherlands ministries of Environment. Needs to be checked. Further, Natalia
Kozlova suggested to include a short description on the Russian cattle housing systems and farms and the suggestions for transforming slurry-based systems in litter-based systems.

The following (lead) authors were identified for making the first draft revision: Harold Menzi, Gert-Jan Monteny, Michel Smits, Natalia Kozlova. All other participants of the break-out Group offered to volunteer as reviewer.

Timing:
- First revised draft should be send around before the end of June
- Reviewers should submit their comments and suggestions within three weeks;
- Final revised draft should be send to the TFRN-participants and to the WGSR before the end of July.

**Manure storage systems**

Fourth, the group briefly discussed ‘manure storage systems’ as measure to decrease NH3 emissions. There is a description of manure storage systems in the 2007 version of the Guidance Document, and it was postulated that not much news has appeared since then. Hence, that version will require a slight update.

The following (lead) authors were suggested/identified for making the first draft revision: Ken Smith, Barbara Amon, Laura Valli and Steen Gyldenkaerne. All other participants of the break-out Group offered to volunteer as reviewer.

Timing:
- First revised draft should be send around before the end of June
- Reviewers should submit their comments and suggestions within three weeks;
- Final revised draft should be send to the TFRN-participants and to the WGSR before the end of July.

**Nitrogen Budgets**

Fifth, the group briefly discussed ‘nitrogen input-output budgets and nitrogen use efficiency’ as measure to decrease NH3 emissions. There is a new, lengthy description in a draft version of the Guidance Document (version 2009/2010). The following comments were made on this description:

- too lengthy, too abstract and high level; should be more down to earth
- too complicated, too much detail (leave Table 1 out)
- Indicate which countries are using (have been using) the budgeting approach (CH, D, DK, NL)
- What are the inferred management measures?
- Do we need templates for making uniform budgets?
- What is the practical feasibility?

The following (lead) authors were suggested/identified for making the first draft revision: Steen Gyldenkaerne, Harold Menzi, Oene Oenema. All other participants of the break-out Group offered to volunteer as reviewer.

Timing:
- First revised draft should be send around before the end of June
- Reviewers should submit their comments and suggestions within three weeks;
- Final revised draft should be send to the TFRN-participants and to the WGSR before the end of July.

**Format of the Guidance Document**
Finally, the group discussed the format and purpose of the Guidance Document, following suggestions by Helmut Dohler. It was agreed that the Guidance Document should provide for each provision of the Annex IX:
- A brief description of available techniques and approaches
- A clear description of the effectiveness of the technique for decreasing NH3 emissions, including a clear description of the reference system/technique;
- Assessment of the practical applicability and the affordability by farmers (cost-effectiveness)
- Possible exemptions, limitations, constraints

**Joint session of Expert Panels on Nitrogen budgeting**
The Expert Panel on Nitrogen Budgets and Balances (EPNBB) reported the following to the plenary session:
- EPNBB mainly focuses on national budgets
- EPNBB has studied provision 4 of the Annex IX dealing with N budgeting.
- EPNBB suggested to using the OECD format for making farm-gate budgets at farm level;
- EPNBB is not able to provide indications for ‘high efficiency level’; they suggested to leaf that to the demonstration farms;
- EPNBB suggested to using also national N budgets for monitoring N budgets.
- The comment was made that somewhere in the Guidance Document a definition/description of a farm should be made.