



CIWEM

The Chartered Institution of Water
and Environmental Management

7th March 2005

Water Division
Scottish Executive
Area 1-H Victoria Quay
EDINBURGH
EH6 6QQ

Dear Sir or Madam,

Diffuse Water Pollution from Rural Land Use

The Chartered Institution of Water and Environmental Management (CIWEM) is the leading professional and qualifying body for those who are responsible for the stewardship of environmental assets. The Institution provides independent comment, within a multi-disciplinary framework, on the wide range of issues related to water and environmental management and sustainable development.

CIWEM welcomes the opportunity to comment on the Consultation on Diffuse water pollution from rural land use. Our comments are set out in direct response to the questions raised in the consultation, and are based on the considered views of experts from this Institution's Scottish Branch.

Do you agree that we have accurately identified the water quality issues that need to be addressed? If not, why and what supports your view?

CIWEM agrees that the issues that need to be addressed have been correctly identified.

What aspects do you consider may require regulation or to be more rigorously controlled using existing powers of enforcement?

We suggest that pesticide and sheep dip misuse requires more rigorous control. Use of sewage sludge on agricultural and forestry land is also in need of further attention, with no progress having been made since the 1998 BRC Risk Matrix. The Scottish Executive published a consultation paper in late 2002 on agricultural use of sewage sludge and is still "discussing" the regulations to follow thereon!

Do you consider that advice on water pollution risks, within the PEPFAA Code and/or the Forest and Water Guidelines, is effective? If not, what else is required?

CIWEM does not consider the advice to be effective. Codes and Guidelines are often ignored unless they are demonstrably well enforced. We suggest that proper regulation, with criminal sanction, is needed.

Do you agree with the idea for self-audit/environmental checklist of the farm's environmental practice?

Again, there is a concern that initiatives which are reliant on an individual's goodwill will often fall short. In this instance, we consider that regulation is required to deliver the desired results.

We think it is important to help farmers/foresters/land managers understand the likelihood of water pollution from their enterprise. What is most likely to be effective?

We agree that it is important to enhance the understanding amongst farmers of their likelihood to cause water pollution through their activities. We suggest that linking farm payments to proper practice in reducing and limiting pollution is the best way to promote greater awareness.

- **Advice/guidance/training/codes of practice/voluntary initiative etc?**
We consider that without regulation many voluntary initiatives will be ignored.
- **Seminars/farm visits/catchment officers?**
There have been demonstrable successes with the use of farm visits, however, to be properly successful such an approach requires proper resourcing and is likely to be labour intensive.
- **Structured Auditing?**
We suggest that structured auditing of farms would be a successful approach if supported by regulation.

Do you agree that farming should be subject to a regulatory structure similar to that already planned for other activities under CAR?

Yes.

Do you agree that measures should be introduced as early as possible to enable use to meet WFD Targets?

Yes.

Are you content that there should be general binding rules (GBRs) for activities which contain potentially polluting practices?

Generally we consider that the GBR approach is too soft on a sector which is already very gently handled by government.

Do you agree that specific problems in "at risk" catchments should be dealt with through targeted GBRs to be developed in consultation with the industry?

Generally we consider that the GBR approach is too soft on a sector which is already very gently handled by government.

Do you agree with the proposed approach of combining regulations (GBRs) with the development of guidance, support and the promotion of voluntary action?

Generally we consider that the GBR approach is too soft on a sector which is already very gently handled by government.

Do you agree that the proposed GBRs and a suite of supportive measures is the right approach? What should they include?

Establishing a clean link between farm subsidies and proper environmental practice would be the best approach. The poorer the practice, the less the money paid.

We hope that our comments are of use to you. Should you wish us to expand upon or clarify any points we have raised, please do not hesitate to contact us.

Yours faithfully,

A handwritten signature in black ink, appearing to be 'Nick Reeves', with a stylized, sweeping flourish extending to the right.

Nick Reeves
Executive Director