



Annual Audit Compliance Report Form

Environmental Protection Act 1986, Part V

Section A – Licence Details

Licence number:	L6001/1989/15	Licence file number:	DEF 2013/003631
Licence holder:	V&V WALSH PTY LTD		
Trading as:	V&V WALSH MEAT PROCESSORS & EXPORTERS		
ACN:	100 834 455		
Registered address:	Lot 5 on Diagram 50137, & Lot 1 on Diagram 12060, Rawling Road (Southwest Highway) Davenport, WA 6230		
Reporting period:	01 /01 / 2016 to 31 /01 / 2016		

Section B – Statement of Compliance with Licence Conditions

Did you comply with all of your licence conditions during the reporting period?
(please tick the appropriate box)

☐ Yes – please complete:

- section C;
- section D if required; and
- sign the declaration in Section F.

☒ No – please complete:

- section C;
- section D if required;
- section E; and
- sign the declaration at Section F.

Section C – Statement of Actual Production

Provide the actual production quantity for this reporting period. Supporting documentation is to be attached.

Prescribed Premises Category	Actual Production Quantity
15 - Abattoir premises on which animal are slaughtered	36,286 Tonnes <i>(See Annex A for Data)</i>
16 - Rendering Operations	9,888 Tonnes <i>(See Annex A for Data)</i>
55 - Livestock saleyard or holding:	903,016 Animal Numbers <i>(See Annex A for Data)</i>

Section D – Statement of Actual Part 2 Waste Discharge Quantity

Provide the actual Part 2 waste discharge quantity for this reporting period. Supporting documentation is to be attached.

Prescribed Premises Category	Actual Part 2 Waste Discharge Quantity
N/A	N/A

Section E – Details of Non-Compliance with Licence Condition			
Please use a separate page for each condition with which the licence holder was non-compliant at a time during the reporting period.			
Condition no:	2.2 Emission to Land	Date(s) of non-compliance:	December 2016
Details of non-compliance:			
Exceedance of the Total Nitrogen area L1 Turf Farm emission to land with the Limit of 600 kg/ha and the measure value of 681.97 kg/ha irrigated.			
What was the actual (or suspected) environmental impact of the non-compliance?			
NOTE – please attach maps or diagrams to provide insight into the precise location of where the non-compliance took place.			
No known environmental impact, Monitoring bores do not reveal any increase trend in nutrients - <u>(See Annex B for Irrigation Area L1)</u>			
Cause (or suspected cause) of non-compliance:			
It is believed that the marked increase in the levels can be directly related to commissioning of new anaerobic system and time it takes for the bacteria to build up adequate colony. Together with the poor performance of the existing DAF plant,			
Action taken to mitigate any adverse effects of non-compliance and prevent recurrence of the non-compliance:			
New waste water treatment system with a major expenditure of \$400,000 with a new DAF plant to replace the underperforming DAF plant. Confirmed order placed and delivery of the new system arriving March/April.			
Was this non-compliance previously reported to DER?			
✓ Yes, and			
<input type="checkbox"/> Reported to DER verbally		Date: / /	
✓ Reported to DER in writing		Date: 24 /01/2017	


Section E – Details of Non-Compliance with Licence Condition			
Please use a separate page for each condition with which the license holder was non-compliant at a time during the reporting period.			
Condition no:	2.2 Emission to Land	Date(s) of non-compliance:	December 2016
Details of non-compliance:			
Exceedance of the Total Phosphorus for area L1 Turf Farm emission to land with the Limit of 180 kg/ha and the measure value of 329.87 kg/ha irrigated.			
What was the actual (or suspected) environmental impact of the non-compliance?			
NOTE – please attach maps or diagrams to provide insight into the precise location of where the non-compliance took place.			
No known environmental impact, Monitoring bores do not reveal any increase trend in nutrients - <u>(See Annex B for Irrigation Area L1)</u>			
Cause (or suspected cause) of non-compliance:			
It is believed that the marked increase in the levels can be directly related to commissioning of new anaerobic system and time it takes for the bacteria to build up adequate colony. Together with the poor performance of the existing DAF plant,			
Action taken to mitigate any adverse effects of non-compliance and prevent recurrence of the non-compliance:			
New waste water treatment system with a major expenditure of \$400,000 with a new DAF plant to replace the underperforming DAF plant. Confirmed order placed and delivery of the new system arriving March/April.			
Was this non-compliance previously reported to DER?			
✓ Yes, and			
<input type="checkbox"/> Reported to DER verbally		Date: / /	
✓ Reported to DER in writing		Date: 24 /01/ 2017	

Section E – Details of Non-Compliance with Licence Condition			
Please use a separate page for each condition with which the license holder was non-compliant at a time during the reporting period.			
Condition no:	2.2 Emission to Land	Date(s) of non-compliance:	September 2016
Details of non-compliance:			
Exceedance of the Total Inorganic Nitrogen for area L2 On site emission to land with the Limit of 180 kg/ha and the measure value of 188.53 kg/ha irrigated.			
What was the actual (or suspected) environmental impact of the non-compliance?			
NOTE – please attach maps or diagrams to provide insight into the precise location of where the non-compliance took place.			
No known environmental impact, Monitoring bores do not reveal any increase trend in nutrients - <u>(See Annex B for Irrigation Area L2)</u>			
Cause (or suspected cause) of non-compliance:			
It is believed that the marked increase in the levels can be directly related to commissioning of new anaerobic system and time it takes for the bacteria to build up adequate colony. Together with the poor performance of the existing DAF plant,			
Action taken to mitigate any adverse effects of non-compliance and prevent recurrence of the non-compliance:			
New waste water treatment system with a major expenditure of \$400,000 with a new DAF plant to replace the underperforming DAF plant. Confirmed order placed and delivery of the new system arriving March/April.			
Was this non-compliance previously reported to DER?			
✓ Yes, and			
<input type="checkbox"/> Reported to DER verbally		Date: / /	
✓ Reported to DER in writing		Date: 24 /01/ 2017	

Section E – Details of Non-Compliance with Licence Condition			
Please use a separate page for each condition with which the license holder was non-compliant at a time during the reporting period.			
Condition no:	2.2 Emission to Land	Date(s) of non-compliance:	September 2016
Details of non-compliance:			
Exceedance of the Reactive Phosphorous for area L2 On site emission to land with the Limit of 20 kg/ha and the measure value of 89.94 kg/ha irrigated.			
What was the actual (or suspected) environmental impact of the non-compliance?			
NOTE – please attach maps or diagrams to provide insight into the precise location of where the non-compliance took place.			
No known environmental impact, Monitoring bores do not reveal any increase trend in nutrients - <u>(See Annex B for Irrigation Area L2)</u>			
Cause (or suspected cause) of non-compliance:			
It is believed that the marked increase in the levels can be directly related to commissioning of new anaerobic system and time it takes for the bacteria to build up adequate colony. Together with the poor performance of the existing DAF plant,			
Action taken to mitigate any adverse effects of non-compliance and prevent recurrence of the non-compliance:			
New waste water treatment system with a major expenditure of \$400,000 with a new DAF plant to replace the underperforming DAF plant. Confirmed order placed and delivery of the new system arriving March/April.			
Was this non-compliance previously reported to DER?			
✓ Yes, and			
<input type="checkbox"/> Reported to DER verbally		Date: / /	
✓ Reported to DER in writing		Date: 24 /01/ 2017	

Section E – Details of Non-Compliance with Licence Condition			
Please use a separate page for each condition with which the license holder was non-compliant at a time during the reporting period.			
Condition no:	3.2.1. Monitoring of Emissions to Land	Date(s) of non-compliance:	September 2016
Details of non-compliance:			
Samples for September Quarter Emissions of Nitrite & Nitrate Not Tested from M2 sampling point. - <u>(See Annex B for Sampling Point M2).</u>			
What was the actual (or suspected) environmental impact of the non-compliance?			
NOTE – please attach maps or diagrams to provide insight into the precise location of where the non-compliance took place.			
No known environmental impact.			
Cause (or suspected cause) of non-compliance:			
Change of Contractor Ownership (<i>Independent Water Sampler contracted to take all samples to ensure sampling and analysis is in accordance with AS/NZS 5667</i>) thus sampling analysis done to requirement of previous years Licence and failure to double check results against licence parameters.			
Action taken to mitigate any adverse effects of non-compliance and prevent recurrence of the non-compliance:			
Ensuring Contractor has copy of the Current Licence each year with the parameters together and upon receipt of the results to double check results against parameters published in Licence. (Form designed for recording results thus ensuring double check will highlight any missed parameters).			
Was this non-compliance previously reported to DER?			
<input type="checkbox"/> Yes, and			
<input type="checkbox"/> Reported to DER verbally		Date: / /	
<input type="checkbox"/> Reported to DER in writing		Date: / /	

Section F – Declaration

I/We declare that the information in this Annual Audit Compliance Report is true and correct and is not false or misleading in a material particular ¹ . I/We consent to the Annual Audit Compliance Report being published on the Department of Environment Regulation's (DER) website.			
Signature ² :		Signature:	
Name: (printed)	Gregory Michael WALSH	Name: (printed)	
Position:	DIRECTOR		
Date:	4 April 2017	Date:	
Seal (if signing under seal):			

¹ It is an offence under section 112 of the *Environmental Protection Act 1986* for a person to give information on this form that to their knowledge is false or misleading in a material particular.

² AACRs can only be signed by the licence holder or an authorised person with the legal authority to sign on behalf of the licence holder.