



Minutes for the CCS & BCS winter 2025 TAC

Thursday 13th November 2025, Online

Attendees

| | | | |
|------------------------|-------------------------------|-------------------------|--------------------|
| Stephen Nortcliff (SN) | Chair | Lara Moggridge (LM) | NRW |
| Georgia Phetmanh (GP) | REAL BCS/CCS | Fiona Donaldson (FD) | SEPA |
| Oliver Dunn (OD) | REAL BCS/CCS | Dan Pursglove (DP) | Environment Agency |
| Duncan Craig (DC) | REAL BCS/CCS | Philippa Arnold (PA) | NFU |
| Grace Egan (GE) | REAL Research Hub | Roy Lawford (RL) | OF&G |
| Thomas Aspray (TA) | REAL Technical Advisor | Dave Roberts (DR) | NSF |
| Gregor Keenan (GK) | CCS Producers' Representative | Nicholas Johnn (NJ) | ACL |
| Jo Chapman (JC) | BCS Operators' Representative | Thelema Nethercott (TN) | ACL |

1. Welcome and Apologies

SN opened the meeting and welcomed attendees. TN was introduced as a new ACL representative, now joining the TAC and the monthly meetings between REAL and the Certification Bodies. Apologies were noted from several members. PA joined later.

2. Actions from Previous Meetings

SEPA to send new End of Waste (EoW) positions directly to CCS/BCS

FD completed this. Further discussion between FD and CCS/BCS was still needed about the email DC sent to FD earlier in the week. Website accessibility and presentation will be updated.

Action: SEPA and CCS/BCS to discuss the publication of new EoW positions and CCS/BCS queries on some sections

CCS/BCS to share safeguards introduced in response to the E. coli issue and investigation with producers at the winter forum meetings

Completed at the recent forum meetings before the TAC. No concerns were raised by producers.

CCS/BCS to provide an update to the Environment Agency on the next PAS reviews once a decision had been made

Not yet completed at the time of meeting. RF work took priority. REAL will be re-engaging with BSI and aim to start discussions before the end of the year.

AM to send KN the relevant QMS contact details or weblink relating to risk assessment guidance

GP followed up before the TAC but hadn't heard back. GP will check again whether AM has actioned this.

Action: GP to follow up AM to ascertain if the previous meeting action was taken forward ('AM to send KN the relevant QMS contact details/weblink relating to risk assessment guidance')

CCS/BCS to circulate final draft TAC minutes for comments and referencing as soon as possible

Completed. Final minutes were attached to the agenda email sent the previous week.

TAC members to read the information recorded in the minutes on nutrient management plans and raise any further queries with KN or CCS/BCS if expectations or requirements remained unclear (all TAC)

No further questions or comments were received by CCS/BCS.

TAC members to consider volunteering for steering groups assembled for new Research Hub projects

To be discussed later in the meeting with the Research Hub update.

TAC members to email GE or Jackie Robinson if interested in steering group roles for the digestate screening project, tendering opportunities, or if they wanted more information about the project

Update will also be provided later in the meeting.

TAC to read through information captured in minutes around interim storage and end-of-waste status and raise any further queries with KN and CCS/BCS by email if any expectations or requirements are still unclear

BCS reported that a large number of operator questions had been received in relation to the previous storage requirements. REAL raised these issues with the EA through meetings with the EA, REA, and ADBA. The published RFs now reflect and address the concerns raised.

CCS/BCS to discuss with approved laboratories the feasibility of sharing early indicators during PRT testing to help predict potential failures

Completed. Both labs said they can offer interim reporting. They noted EC readings and other parameters may provide early insight, though final pass/fail outcomes still depend on day 28 results. Ongoing Research Hub work may support future improvements.

Action: GK to share feedback with producers at the next forum meeting around early indicators to look for during PRT testing to help predict potential failures, and the option to request interim reports

SP to discuss effective communications within her team, highlighting the need to show operators the work being done behind the scenes to investigate and resolve issues

Completed. GP read out SP's feedback at the meeting: "My recollection of the action was that I discussed with our Customer Services team ensuring we always inform customers of internal investigation outcomes. I was reassured that this is part of the process."

I also said we would report back on wider improvements so the below is an up-date on this:

We ran a 'Kaizen' improvement event in July focusing on equipment downtime in the ICP lab (ICP-OES and ICP-MS instrumentation) where a lot of the elemental testing is carried out on PAS compost / digestate samples. A number of changes were identified to address some of the common causes of downtime and improvements made to our preventative maintenance plans. This should positively impact on time delivery of results.

The other thing to up-date the TAC on is the new ICP-MS. We are currently waiting on UKAS approval of the validation data to be able to use the new instrument. The old one is still being used for accredited work (including PAS compost / digestate samples) but unfortunately it is more prone to breakdowns."

GP added that we're in discussion with NRM regarding the timeframes for when the new ICP-MS will be approved for use, and will share this feedback with the BCS Operators' Representative who wasn't available to attend the meeting.

CCS/BCS to consider producing an official letter for Local Authorities confirming that only two approved labs are required

No longer needed. The Local Authority/compost producer involved found an alternative solution and accepted that only two approved labs were needed. Action closed.

CCS/BCS to report back from the TMWG on whether compostable or biodegradable plastics will be distinguishable in testing

Completed. OD reported that the TMWG is revising the existing CCS and BCS PC&S methods but distinguishing bioplastics from conventional plastics would require a new analytical method. This is not part of the scope of the current project. A future Research Hub project could investigate potential methods. That could feed into another test method development project at some point in the future; but currently no such plans exist.

It was added that material compostability tests are very long and creating a workable test method would be complex; a burn test was suggested but not discussed at length.

CCS/BCS to confirm whether PAS 110 and PAS 100 test result datasets can be used for trend analysis where operators challenge individual test results

TA informed that REAL cannot use the database for single-site disputes, as it would be too resource intensive and outside the intended scope of the database, which is only suitable for wider scheme-level investigations, such as the past work on E. coli. REAL is also exploring a PT programme for PTEs, similar to the pathogen PT system, which will increase monitoring activities.

3. CCS & BCS Updates

a. Scheme statistics update

CCS currently certifies 173 processes across the UK and Ireland, handling around 4.2 million tonnes of input material and producing approximately 2.0 million tonnes of certified compost each year. There is

one applicant in England, no suspensions, and a single withdrawal relating to a Northern Ireland council site, with no new producers this period.

BCS certifies 109 processes across the UK, processing around 6 million tonnes of input material and producing approximately 5 million tonnes of certified digestate annually. There are two applicants in England and Northern Ireland, no suspensions or withdrawals, and two new operators in England.

b. Research Hub update

GE gave a full update on project selection and ongoing work.

Project 2502: Physical Contaminants in Delivered Biowastes

This project will look at contamination levels in LA kerbside collections and the effect on both CCS and BCS producers.

SN said it had been an expensive proposal, and the Research Panel had spent a long time reviewing it. He said they accepted the cost because they believed the project would deliver a stronger and more useful evidence base about what arrives at sites before composting or anaerobic digestion.

LM asked whether the project would include Wales, as Wales has separate food waste collections and there may be lessons to learn. GE said this was not written into the scope but agreed it was a useful point and could be explored separately. LM offered to speak to a contact at WRAP Cymru to support this comparison.

Action: LM to contact WRAP Cymru to explore potential input or collaboration on Hub project 2502 and report back to GE, aiming to introduce GE to WRAP Cymru to discuss this

The EA had a report on physical contaminant removal processes that could be shared.

Action: EA to send GE information on the EA's review of physical contaminant removal data obtained from industry

Project 2505: RBP test duration review

GE provided a summary of Project 2505, which reviewed the duration of the RBP test and built on a previous Hub project using a larger dataset of RBP test results with a specific focus on 10-day indicative results for the 28-day results.

SN noted that both projects had received strong support, although they had prompted extensive discussion.

DR mentioned that, during the Bioresources Conference in Manchester the previous week, a paper by Steve Bundy had been presented on modelling RBP testing and predicting 28-day results from 10-day data. DR offered to share the information and noted that seminar recordings would be available.

TA expressed interest in receiving the Bundy paper and noted that a previous project on predictive modelling had not been taken forward due to limited applicability across diverse processes and feedstocks. SN added that similar modelling work had only been effective when confined to a single feedstock but became challenging when scaled up.

DR advised that the Bundy work focused on biosolids and sewage treatment outputs, which might have variable relevance but drew on a broad dataset of more than 240 inputs. TA agreed that it would still be worthwhile to review.

Action: DR to forward digestate stability project paper from European Biosolids conference to GE and TA

Project 4: PRT analysis and comparison

GE introduced the project, which compares spring barley with tomato-based Plant Response Test (PRT) approaches to better understand the methodology.

This project specifically aims to compare the response of spring barley plants grown in CCS compost with the standard tomato PRT.

GE confirmed that Phase 3 (data analysis) is scheduled to begin in December 2025, with the contract awarded to Biomathematics and Statistics Scotland (BioSS). GE noted that the project is due for completion in Summer 2026.

Project 7: Risk Assessments for the Resource Frameworks

GE reminded the group of the project, which seeks to inform the development of evidence-based End-of-Waste positions for compost and digestate, specifically the CRF and ADRF.

GE explained that ‘exposure scenarios’ are being developed for each hazard group identified by the gap analysis, considering realistic, potential high-risk pathways for human, animal, and environmental contamination.

GE confirmed the Hub plans to host a webinar to summarise key deliverables and their significance for future developments.

GE stated the project is due to complete in January 2026, and that the Project Report will be available to inform the Environment Agency’s revision of the Resource Frameworks later in 2026.

Project 8: Screening size and digestate quality

GE presented preceding context, noting that some operators may respond to the reduced plastic limits in ADRF by reducing their screen aperture size(s), which the Certification Bodies currently consider a significant change requiring re-validation, according to PAS 110. Operators have expressed concern that this may be overly burdensome relative to the significance of the change.

GE explained that the original idea had come from JC (BCS operators’ representative), and it remains unclear how widespread the aperture issue is.

GE provided updates: no tenders were received in 2025 for this project, a new Steering Group member has been appointed with Scottish operator experience, and the Project Brief is being revised by the Hub in consultation with the Steering Group.

GE noted that the Plastic RPS exemptions may produce useful data to support further assessment.

Project 9: Digestate EoW case information

GE noted the work was ongoing, which is assessing the attributes of digestate-derived products and their potential viability in the UK market, aiming to compare these products with non-waste equivalents to inform the revision of the ADRF.

GE reported that the project team has completed a literature and policy review covering the UK, EU, and USA, identified suitable non-waste comparators, assessed best practices for beneficial use of digestate-derived products, and researched post-processing methods. Work is ongoing.

Project 10: PRT peat-free growing media

GE highlighted that progress had been delayed due to difficulty booking glasshouses. GE explained that the project team and Steering Group are shortlisting peat alternatives for physical property testing following the PRT methodology, with key considerations including similarity to peat, cost-effectiveness, and availability from multiple suppliers.

GE emphasised that experiments are scheduled to begin in winter 2025. SN reminded members that if they have ideas for new projects but need help turning them into proposals, he is willing to support that work.

c. Resource Framework update

Both Resource Frameworks for AD and compost are now published, together with RPS 317 and RPS 358.

DC confirmed that the point at which end-of-waste is achieved remains unchanged for England as long as the operator has a contract or sales history. Once the 10-month period allowed in the RFs expires, digestate or compost must be stored on permitted land. RPS 358 provides a 12-month transition period for operators to get the necessary permits in place.

The overall operator feedback on the new RFs had been positive and that most stakeholders appeared satisfied with the solution reached.

DC confirmed that REAL had discussed the implementation approach with NIEA and NRW. NRW confirmed its agreement that the Quality Protocol will remain the recognised end of waste position in Wales until an updated regulatory position is published. NIEA did not provide a substantive response to queries on this point and, in the absence of any indication to the contrary, REAL has proceeded on the basis that the Quality Protocol continues to be the applicable end of waste position in Northern Ireland while NIEA develops its updated position, which has not yet been finalised.

FD added that SEPA's position would be updated and published on their website in due course.

DC noted that REAL had held two webinars at the end of October to explain the changes, how the schemes had implemented them, and how operators should apply the new rules in practice. He said these had been well attended. Between now and next autumn, REAL will be collecting feedback, questions, operational issues, and user experience to support the next revision. This information will be used to assess whether any areas of the RFs require further clarification or amendment.

DC confirmed that the next major revision of the RFs is expected in autumn next year. He said the main topic for review will likely be the end point being at dispatch, which the EA indicated would need further consideration.

He also noted that NIEA and NRW will continue to recognise QP compliance until they confirm their formal positions and that REAL is working to ensure all scheme rules and audit checklists are aligned for smooth implementation.

d. Update from the Certification Bodies

OF&G

RL reported that two complaints had been received, involving the same compost product that had been sold online via a domestic horticulture supplier. The case involved two third parties and was delayed for several reasons but had now been resolved and signed off with corrective actions performed.

He also noted that Daisy Butters was training as a Certification Officer and would be shadowing him.

GK asked what the complaint was about. RL said it related to contamination in compost sold via an online supplier who had bought the compost from another producer. GK asked whether the contamination was added or mixed later. RL said it was bulk compost that had been bought in and sold on with no mixing or rebagging.

NSF

No major updates. DR thanked the REAL team for the work involved in RF implementation, the new scheme rules, and ongoing amendments.

ACL

NJ said ACL had a complaint about material purchased in Wickes for use in domestic horticulture. ACL checked the certified producer and found no issues. ACL could not assess what the retailer who supplied Wickes may have mixed with the product after purchase.

NJ also noted the appointment of a new Quality and Operations Manager.

e. Update from the Approved Laboratories

GP shared the following written update from SK: “Since the summer TAC, Approved Laboratories have continued to maintain stable operational performance and turnaround times for PAS 100 and PAS 110 testing, despite seasonal fluctuations in sample volumes. Communication between labs and scheme participants has remained proactive, with ongoing efforts to ensure operators are kept informed of any delays or investigation outcomes where applicable.

Both labs continued to focus on instrument maintenance and process resilience to minimise downtime and improve result delivery consistency. This includes updates to preventative maintenance schedules and staff training to strengthen troubleshooting capacity. Method verification and UKAS compliance checks have also been ongoing to ensure continued conformance with scheme and accreditation requirements.

In addition, cross-lab collaboration through regular communication with REAL and feedback from the quarterly catch-up meetings has supported alignment on reporting expectations, data quality, and customer service improvements.”

f. Update from CCS Producers’ Representatives

Cross-border certification issues

GK explained that a Welsh producer selling compost into England had received conflicting advice. The EA had suggested the producer should meet the RF for England, while their CB had said they should certify in Wales. GK said clear guidance was needed.

GP said REAL had raised this with the CBs. All CBs agreed it should be possible for a producer to certify to both EoW positions. REAL is still checking whether any specific requirements conflict between the documents.

FD said the product would need to meet the rules of the country where it is used. She gave an example from Scotland, where plastic limits had previously been tighter, and said a product would need to meet the stricter criteria if deployed in Scotland. She said ADRF and ADQP waste codes might differ slightly and that Scotland had requirements about when something becomes a product.

DP agreed that material must meet the rules where it is deployed. He noted differences in England, including changes to wood waste entries.

GK said moving material from Scotland to England was easier because the Scottish standards tended to be tighter. He said it would be helpful to have a document clarifying what producers could and could not do. For material to move as product, it must meet EoW in both the location it is produced and where it is dispatched. He noted that a product could meet the RF but not the QP.

GP said REAL may come back to the TAC for consultation on how to resolve this.

Sharps classification

GK reported that a lab had been classifying all glass as sharps. Operators disagreed with this interpretation.

TA said the lab had corrected the issue after engaging with the operator, and that they were wrong to classify all glass as a sharp. TA will raise the matter with labs and the TMWG.

PRT testing for agricultural use

GK reported concerns from a large potato grower who sells seed potatoes worldwide. He felt the PRT was more sensitive than agricultural use would justify, as agricultural use involves much greater dilution. GK said the operator believed the PRT did not reflect real-world conditions. GK suggested this might be a good Research Hub project.

TA said the barley PRT project should generate useful information. The project uses two different mixing ratios, which may help compare growing media use with soil improver use.

GK asked whether anyone had studied compost when ploughed in at scale. TA said the barley project might shed light on this.

Delays with lab reporting

GK said operators were concerned about delays with pathogen reporting. Some pathogen results are used to validate ABP accreditations, and if a PAS test detects *E. coli*, operators must notify their Animal Health Officer. GK stressed the importance of timely reporting.

Storage requirement conflicts

GK reported some operator confusion regarding the CRF and PAS 100 requirements possibly being in conflict, because the CRF allows 10 months of storage while PAS 100 rules require reassessment at 6 months.

DP explained that the requirements came from different legislative drivers. Both remain valid, while the 6-month requirement covers the need to re-assess material so it can still be stored.

CB communication after regulatory issues

GK summarised a recent issue where an environmental regulator contacted the CB about one site due to a permitting issue which was then raised by the CB during an audit. GK noted that the communication between the regulator and the CB had not been shared with the producer and so they were unaware of the issue until the audit and said that interactions with regulators should always be relayed to participants by CBs.

CB communication after test failure

GK reported that a scheme participant had received an email from a CB that made incorrect references to scheme requirements following a test failure. He noted that while he realised the email was incorrect, other scheme participants might not and assume they have to follow the process as described in the email not the Scheme Rules.

GP said REAL would issue new updated compliance notice templates and discuss this with CBs.

DR confirmed NSF was the CB that issued this email containing errors and divergences from the Scheme template, and that they contacted both the participant and REAL regarding the issue.

g. Update from BCS Operators' Representative

OD read notes from JC on their behalf as they were unable to attend the meeting.

The following were key areas of discussion to be fed back at the November 2025 TAC:

Test Method for Compostable Plastics

"There was a discussion about the need to develop a method for differentiating between compostable plastics and non-compostable plastics to allow this to be differentiated when assessing contaminants in digestate. This is not included in the scope of any current workstreams and as such may be an area to be put forward for a research project. There was also discussion about the use of biobags in AD and the impact of these on managing the process. Operators in the forum would value the opportunity for support to develop project proposals around these topic areas."

OD said operators wanted support to develop project proposals on these topics.

Non-Waste Digestate

"There was a discussion about the fact that there are current proposals for non-waste AD to be brought into permitting and whether there would be any implications for these operators to achieve PAS110 quality standards as part of the objective to achieve regulatory objectives."

FD said SEPA had already brought non-waste AD into the regulatory framework and sent material to REA for consultation. A webinar is scheduled for 26th November, and she agreed to share the invitation with PA and DC. She emphasised that SEPA has no desire to regulate non-waste digestate further, as the risks are lower and existing fertiliser rules already cover land application. Some distilleries choose to meet PAS110 standards for marketing reasons rather than regulatory necessity.

PA said NFU members were concerned that increased regulation could discourage small on-farm AD, particularly as GGSS support ends. FD agreed to share the webinar invitation with PA and DC.

RL said OF&G certify four Scottish plants that take no waste but still pay high fees for certification because Quality Meat Scotland requires it. He warned that mandating certification for non-waste AD would be a negative step, noting that treated slurry carries higher risk than non-waste digestate.

DP confirmed that in England, non-waste AD is also being brought into regulation. He noted that the future regulation of non-waste digestate remains uncertain and requested to be added to the webinar list. He emphasised that waste regulation is dynamic, and regulatory approaches may evolve as DEFRA sets the direction.

Action: SEPA to send invite to PA, DC, DP, and DR for non-waste digestate event being held on 26th November

GK asked whether the regulatory focus was on digestate quality or plant emissions. DP said it was both, noting that biogas emissions can be significant regardless of waste status, and that slurry-based digestates still carry nutrient risks.

DC asked whether a more targeted consultation was expected next year. DP said this was unknown until DEFRA sets the direction.

RL noted that emissions should be addressed through permitting rather than PAS110, which focuses solely on digestate quality.

Manure Based Digestates

“There was discussion about the fact that provision for manure based digestates has not been included in the current ADRF and that during Q&A at the ADRF release webinar, the EA was unclear about whether provision would be made in the next revision or before then via a different route. Producers of manure based digestates remain in a position of lack of clarity since withdrawal of the former RPS for manure based digestates in England, and statements at the start of the ADRF revision process that said that manure based digestates would be brought under the provision of the ADRF. This area needs to be kept on the agenda until clarity is reached and any subsequent implications for PAS110.”

Operators raised concerns that the removal of the previous RPS left MBD producers without clarity. They asked whether an interim RPS could be issued.

DP said manure and slurry are waste under the ADRF and an interim RPS was not required.

Labs

“There was some discussion about services from the labs. There was some confusion as to whether a new lab that has applied for approved status for PAS110 analyses has yet become approved.

There was also some discussion about disruption to pathogen sampling c. September 2025 at NRM/Sciantec that had impacted on a few operators. Some operators had received notification of the closure of Sciantec and others hadn't and had continued to send samples.

There was a discussion about the importance of the labs being aware of ABP regs/ABP requirements that operators must meet, ensuring that test timescales are in accordance with the required timeframes as operators thought that it appeared that this was not always understood.

There were also positive comments made about the lab services. Operators appreciated efforts made to notify them when samples were delayed in their delivery to the labs and operators given the choice as to whether to continue with analysis or not. The operator concerned was keen to stress how valuable this service was. One operator provided recommendations for possible labs that might want to become approved - to be followed up if they have not already been approached.”

TA confirmed operators may send samples directly to Sciantec without going via scheme approval, so this was not a scheme issue.

Next Year's ADRF Update

“There was much discussion about next steps following the publication of the ADRF. It was noted that PAS110 is likely to require updating and that further changes to the ADRF are expected next autumn. Operators who had attended the ADRF launch webinar were pleased to hear that the EA intends to consider additional digestate products in the next revision, and they expressed willingness to support this work as needed. There was also discussion about the importance of operators providing feedback over any implementation issues during the coming year so that comments can be taken into consideration in the next revision.”

Additional questions from BCS representative

OD asked the question from JC: “We are pleased to hear that the EA are considering including additional digestate products in the next update to the ADRF. Are the EA able to provide more info on the process to assess this?”

DP responded, not at this point in time. This will begin during the next review.

OD asked the question from JC: “General question about the next update to the ADRF - scope of update and expected timelines (I think next autumn is when the process will start rather than when an updated version will be published? How long will the review take and when can we expect a second update of the ADRF to be published).”

DP confessed he was entirely unsure.

DC added that from his conversations with the EA, while the revision process may start in the autumn, the Task & Finish Group may not meet until 2027.

OD asked the question from JC: “Usual question about manure based digestates. These producers are still waiting clarification on the position with respect to status of manure based digestates. Can an interim RPS be issued to provide them with some clarity since no provision made in the ADRF?”

DP confirmed manures and slurries are considered waste within the ADRF, so there is no need for an interim RPS.

Action: BCS to monitor progress on regulatory discussions around manure-based and non-waste AD and bring any issues or developments to the attention of the TAC

Action: CCS/BCS to share written update from JC with the Approved Laboratories due to meeting absence

Action: CCS/BCS to share TAC feedback with JC in response to the queries raised during the meeting

4. Technical issues

a. Test Method Working Group Consultation

TA provided an update on the consultation regarding Project 1, revision of the PC&S test methods. While the consultation had officially closed, it was extended up until the date of the TAC.

TA noted that the first meeting took place in June, the second in September, and the next meeting is scheduled for next week. The project is designed to update existing methods or develop new methods.

TA summarised the identified issues, including the cleaning of plastics and the use of a 5-decimal-place balance. Proposed changes were highlighted, including dry cleaning of plastics, moving to 4-decimal-place balance reporting rounded to 3 decimals, and implementing double or triple verification for “sharp” decisions. TA also presented revised wording for “sharps” to be included in the test method.

GK queried the proposed changes to sharps, are the labs in a position to take photos and retain them? TA noted the group have received a comment along those lines and will discuss it at next week’s meeting. As part of the Test Method Working Group, we have also discussed standardising these sharps pictures to improve intra- and inter-lab consistency and certainty.

TA invited the TAC to submit any further comments regarding the consultation via email.

TA concluded by noting that the plan is to finalise these methods next year and to begin discussions on other potential projects for the group.

SN closed the meeting, commenting that in both previous meetings the conversation was fascinating, with many detailed points considered and strong consensus achieved.

Actions

- SEPA and CCS/BCS to discuss the publication of new EoW positions and CCS/BCS queries on some sections
- GP to follow up AM to ascertain if the previous meeting action was taken forward ('AM to send KN the relevant QMS contact details/weblink relating to risk assessment guidance')
- GK to share feedback with producers at the next forum meeting around early indicators to look for during PRT testing to help predict potential failures, and the option to request interim reports
- GP to share update provided by SP on the previous meeting action ('SP to discuss effective communications with the team, highlighting to operators the work being undertaken in the background to investigate and rectify issues') with JC after the TAC meeting
- DR to forward digestate stability project paper from European Biosolids conference to GE and TA
- LM to contact WRAP Cymru to explore potential input or collaboration on Hub project 2502 and report back to GE, aiming to introduce GE to WRAP Cymru to discuss this
- GE to consider LM's suggestion for the Hub to look at findings of WRAP Cymru's contaminants project, in relation to project 2502 concerning the evaluation of physical contaminants
- EA to send GE information on the EA's review of physical contaminant removal data obtained from industry
- SEPA to send invite to PA, DC, DP, and DR for non-waste digestate event being held on 26th November
- CCS/BCS to share written update from JC with the Approved Laboratories due to meeting absence
- CCS/BCS to share TAC feedback with JC in response to the queries raised during the meeting
- TA to discuss the glass classification approach with approved laboratories and present issue to the TMWG
- BCS to monitor progress on regulatory discussions around manure-based and non-waste AD and bring any issues or developments to the attention of the TAC