

Biofertiliser Certification Scheme Operators' Forum

Minutes

5th May 2026

Attendees

- Jane Hall (JH) (Chair)
- Oliver Dunn (OD) (Biofertiliser Certification Scheme)
- Georgia Phetmanh (GP) (Biofertiliser Certification Scheme)
- Grace Egan (GE) (Research Hub)
- Jo Chapman (JC) (BCS Operators' Representative)
- Angela Cronje (AC) (Roots Organics and East London Biogas)
- Rebecca Taylor (RT) (Kanadevia Inova)
- Denise Devenny (DD) (Grissan)
- David Olwell (DO) (Grissan)
- Alison Inglis (AI) (BioteCH4)
- Mark Baker (MB) (ecoverde energy)
- Avril Banks (AB) (ab-en ltd)
- Donald Macmillan (DM) (Comhairle nan Eilean Siar)

Acronyms

ABP - Animal By-Product

AD - Anaerobic Digestion

ADRF - Anaerobic Digestate Resource Framework

APHA - Animal and Plant Health Agency

BCS - Biofertiliser Certification Scheme

CB - Certification Body

DDP - Digestate-Derived Product

EA - Environment Agency

EoW - End of Waste

EWG - European Waste Catalogue

MDD - Manure-Derived Digestate

NC - Non-Compliance

PAS 110 - Publicly Available Specification 110

PTE - Potentially Toxic Element

QMS - Quality Management System

REAL - Renewable Energy Assurance Limited

RBP - Residual Biogas Potential

RF - Resource Framework

RPS - Regulatory Position Statement

SEPA - Scottish Environment Protection Agency

TAC - Technical Advisory Committee

UK FPR - United Kingdom Fertiliser Product Regulations

1. Welcome

JH opened the meeting at 11:00, welcoming all attendees to the forum.

OD provided an introduction to REAL and the scope of the forum before outlining the programme for the day. JH requested that any additional issues operators wished to raise later in the meeting be noted for the allocated slots.

2. Previous Meeting Minutes

JH confirmed no amendments were proposed to the minutes of the previous meeting. The minutes were accepted as accurate.

3. Updates on the BCS

Updates on actions from the previous meeting

Note: actions in bold are actions from previous meetings, with updates provided during this meeting. Numbered actions are new or on-going actions that are still open.

JH provided an update on the progress of rolling actions from previous forums, detailing the specific action points and their corresponding updates:

- **Action: GE to continue overall Research Hub promotion and comms.**

GE updated the group that a dedicated promotional newsletter had been drafted to inform operators about the specific outcomes of the projects they have funded to date, though this material was currently awaiting final sign-off. GE noted that Research Hub activity continues to be actively promoted via LinkedIn, which had recently proved successful, resulting in the submission of a fresh project proposal in response to a specific post.

Furthermore, the Research Hub standalone annual report was highlighted as a primary piece of communication. In previous years this material was distributed as a subsection of a larger document, it has now been published as an independent, standalone report, which was successfully distributed at the ORG conference.

- Action 1 Hub to continue overall promotion and communications, including the annual report.

- **Action: GE to feedback outstanding annual feedback survey information.**

GE reported on the processing of data from both the 2024 and 2025 annual surveys. It was noted that twelve responses were received for 2024 and six responses for 2025.

While acknowledging that this small sample size is not statistically representative of the entire scheme membership, GE confirmed that a short report would be produced to aggregate the key findings. This anonymised document will be shared with participants to provide a helpful indicator of wider industry sentiment and guide the direction of future Hub work.

- Action 2: Hub to feedback outstanding annual feedback survey information from 2024 and 2025 through production of a short report with key findings.

- **Action: BCS to consider manure-based digestate and other potential Resource Framework changes.**

OD gave an update on digestate-derived products, noting that this has been an ongoing conversation with industry stakeholders, particularly in light of Simpler Recycling policies and an influx of digestate occurring alongside static landbank availability. It was also noted that there were conversations about developing alternative processing routes, such as digestate drying, pelletisation, alongside an expansion into horticultural market, representing an essential option for managing the expected extra material.

JC reported that these matters had been raised at the previous forum and subsequently escalated to the TAC. Operators have been awaiting formal feedback on the exact scope of the upcoming revision of the ADRF, which was scheduled for this autumn, though the Environment Agency's precise position remains unclear with no timeline or key dates given thus far.

JC continued, saying historically, MDD was regulated, then withdrawn with the expectation it would be featured in the revised Resource Framework, and subsequently omitted. When asked at the TAC whether an interim RPS would be issued, the EA stated none would be required because MDDs are technically in scope, implying that manure must strictly follow the full ADRF.

JH observed that this strict regulatory interpretation does not align with industry realities.

JC explained that the EA representative on the TAC was new to the post and lacked historical context, which prompted concern that clearer communications are urgently required to prevent operators from being left exposed. GP confirmed she was unaware of any further updates but committed to checking the regulatory position thoroughly prior to the June TAC meeting. JH advised keeping the action open.

- Action 3 - BCS to consider manure-based digestate and other potential RF changes in relation to scheme operations and future PAS 110 review plans.

- **Action: BCS to reconsider holding an in-person Forum in 2026.**

OD reported that the BCS had evaluated the feasibility of hosting an in-person winter forum for 2026 once the recruitment process for the incoming Policy and Stakeholder Relations Manager was complete. However, feedback indicated a general lack of enthusiasm from members for an in-person commitment at this stage. It was decided to close the action for the current year and re-evaluate member interest in 2027. This action was declared closed.

Action 19 BCS to reconsider holding an in-person Forum in 2027.

- **Action: BCS to monitor progress on regulatory discussions around manure-based and non-waste AD to identify opportunities for non-waste digestate certification**

JC reported that SEPA is well advanced in bringing crop-based AD under environmental permitting in Scotland. SEPA's stated intent is to regulate the operational industry rather than increasing the regulation of outputs over and above voluntary PAS 110 compliance. JC suggested that while it is too early to know the EA's exact plans for England, the Scottish approach serves as a strong indicator of future regulatory direction. JH added that the EA has expressed an intent to bring these processes under permitting, meaning English environmental permitting regulations will likely follow the Scottish precedent.

AC argued that the industry should take the lead rather than waiting for regulators to impose rules. AC highlighted a successful model where operators implement a voluntary Digestate Management Plan. Structured like a PAS Quality Management System, it covers all steps from feedstock inputs to end-user deployment and incorporates formal quality assurance testing. This approach provides robust reassurance to end-users and demonstrates responsible management directly to the EA.

AC suggested reviving the historic, voluntary "Quality Assured" category of certification under the BCS, which previously allowed non-waste and manure-based plants to certify their material under the PAS framework without requiring a formal End of Waste position. GP recalled that this category was historically removed by the BCS following discussion with the Market Development Working Group for several reasons prior to the withdrawal of the EA's position, but acknowledged that alternative certification routes could be discussed.

DO noted that Grissan processes non-waste material in Scotland and would be very keen to contribute to these discussions, as navigating how PAS 110 fits around non-waste material can occasionally be ambiguous. JH noted that an operator had reported significant difficulties because farmers supplying feedstocks frequently struggle to distinguish between waste and non-waste material, meaning producers must exercise extreme caution to prove continuous non-waste compliance.

- Action 5 - BCS to monitor progress on regulatory discussions around manure-based and non-waste AD to identify opportunities for non-waste digestate certification.
- Action 20 - GP to check with colleagues whether any internal discussions have taken place around reintroducing the historic 'Quality Assured' category of certification for manure-based digestate and non-waste digestate, or alternative certification provisions
- Action 17 - RH to clarify the scope, existing data, and contribution mechanism for the RH project addressing digestate-derived products.

GE reported that this project has been extended slightly and is scheduled to conclude in July 2026. The project team is currently seeking UK-based producers of digestate-derived products and has expanded its scope to examine European producers. GE noted a rolling open invitation remains for any BCS plants involved in post-processing, confirming that details of several experimental producers had been shared with the research team.

- **Action: OD to ask the Test Method Working Group for reason as to why separate test methods/limits for compostable plastics are not being considered at this time.**

OD clarified that distinct limits for compostable plastics would require a formal revision of PAS 110 or the creation of a new British Standard, rather than a simple update to the test method. Consequently, establishing a separate test method without an accompanying threshold offers minimal practical benefit, as material would still be categorised as plastic. Furthermore, compostability testing is resource-intensive and slow, presenting significant costs with limited utility.

This action was declared closed.

- **Action: AC, JH, and GE to jointly explore a Research Hub proposal on the suitability of compostable plastics or biobags in AD, including the appropriate process for facilitating incubation and workshopping of the project idea.**

JH noted that while local authorities continue to utilise compostable bags for kerbside food waste collections, the material frequently fails to degrade effectively during anaerobic digestion. Following a discussion on pre-treatment and regional operational practices, the forum agreed that this issue is best addressed at a localized facility level rather than through a dedicated Research Hub initiative.

This action was declared closed

- **Action: GE to contact DM about volunteering as a BCS operator on the steering committee for the RH project “Evaluating quantified and visually assessed physical contaminants in delivered biowastes and biowastes after pre-treatment, and improving their assessment and pre-treatment management”**

GE confirmed that DM has been successfully appointed to the project steering group. It was noted that formal project management arrangements are currently being established prior to the official project kick-off.

This action was declared closed.

- **Action: Operators to send GE any suggestions for improvements to Hub comms or new comms ideas.**

GE invited forum members to submit feedback or proposals regarding Research Hub communications channels and content formats on an ongoing basis.

This action was declared closed.

- **Action: BCS to follow up on ABP pathogen testing reporting issues with the approved labs.**

OD reported that following discussions with the approved laboratories, both facilities confirmed that they no longer offer standalone pathogen testing or subcontracted testing arrangements. Pathogen results are now processed and reported alongside or prior to the standard test suite, resolving earlier reporting delays.

This action was declared closed.

- **Action: BCS to investigate the application renewal forms with the CBs to check if they need to be updated to include the option for certification to the ADRF.**

OD confirmed that discussions were held with all approved Certification Bodies, and application and renewal documentation has been updated across all certification bodies to reflect the new End of Waste options.

This action was declared closed.

- **Action: BCS to feedback experiences regarding lab communications and customer service issues at next Lab Quarterly meeting relating to miscommunication of SciTech closure while still accepting samples.**

OD noted that this operational concern was raised with the relevant laboratory, who confirmed that advance notices regarding the SciTech facility closure were distributed via direct correspondence, LinkedIn announcements, and website updates.

This action was declared closed.

- **Action: RH to consider producing webinar to demonstrate the deliverables of Project 7: Risk Assessment updates to scheme participants.**

GE noted that updates regarding the hazard group exposure scenarios under Project 7 will be delivered to align with the Environment Agency's upcoming Resource Framework revisions.

- **Action: Operators to contact GE if interested in participating in university presentation/webinar for 2026**

GE reported that due to limited overall operator availability and internal resource constraints following staff transitions, this initiative will be paused temporarily.

This action was declared closed.

- **Action: BCS to speak with DM regarding dry AD and blogpost contribution for the BCS**

OD reported that responsibility for this output has been transferred to the incoming Policy and Stakeholder Relations Manager role. Progress on this item is temporarily shelved pending the completion of recruitment.

- **Action: BCS and AC to verify that no Labs are incorrectly claiming BCS approval and for AC to forward the LinkedIn post concerning the Scottish Lab's potential misrepresentation to GP.**

GP confirmed that follow-up checks were conducted and no explicit misrepresentation was identified, noting the issue likely stemmed from third-party communication misunderstandings. It was suggested that listing approved laboratory statuses within routine newsletters could provide further clarity.

This action was declared closed.

4. Feedback from the Technical Advisory Committee

JC provided an update on the recent TAC meeting. An additional laboratory is on the verge of BCS approval; no update on its status had been received at the time of the meeting, but approval is hoped for in the near future.

On PTE testing, the T&Cs have recently been updated, alongside a number of changes to auditing arrangements, including closer oversight and involvement of the BCS in lab auditing and Proficiency Testing scheme data analysis. Conditions have also been rewritten regarding the tracking of complaints and investigations. It was noted that these changes do not assist those who experienced the earlier PTE issues, though some positive outcomes have resulted.

JC continued, adding that non-waste and on-farm AD matters are currently being discussed at TAC.

The main issue arising from the last TAC concerns internal auditing and who is suitably impartial to carry it out. GP provided an update on the internal auditing position. It was noted that concerns were raised regarding whether consultants could undertake internal audits of QMS' they authored. GP confirmed that REAL had been discussing the issue internally and would extend the TAC consultation period to ensure a workable consensus was reached.

5. Research Hub updates

GE presented an update on the Research Hub Annual Survey 2025 and the 2026 project proposals, GE noted that feedback remains vital to guide the direction of future Hub projects. A dedicated workshop will be held next Wednesday (13th May) for those wishing to discuss the proposals at greater length. Scheme participants were also requested to indicate whether they would find it beneficial to have future Hub project reports made available directly on the Hub's Research Library platform.

GE provided an overview of the Research Library, reminding attendees that the library actively responds to technical searches submitted by users. Where an initial search yields no results, the team sources and adds new articles to fill the data gap.

GE updated the forum on BCS-relevant projects; starting with project 7, which focuses on risk assessments to inform the revision of the Compost Resource Framework and the Anaerobic Digestion Resource Framework respectively. The team is developing specific exposure scenarios for each hazard group identified by gap analysis, considering realistic, potential high-risk pathways for human, animal, and environmental contamination. Although the project had a target completion date of January 2026, updates will be given in time to inform the Environment Agency's 2026 revision of the Resource Frameworks, with more updates to come.

Project 8, which evaluates the impact of screening size on digestate quality, has progressed with the appointment of a new Steering Group member, providing an operator perspective familiar with the Scottish context. The Hub is currently revising the project brief in consultation with the Steering Group.

Project 9 addresses End-of-Waste case information for digestate-derived products, to coincide with the Anaerobic Digestion Resource Framework revision window. GE noted that digestate-derived products represent a known unknown due to a lack of baseline information regarding active developments across the UK. Consequently, the study is examining the properties of non-waste digestate-derived products, such as those from chicken manure. The project timeline has been extended slightly, and the project team has been extremely thorough and scientific in its execution. The team has completed a literature and policy review covering the UK, US, and EU, and is currently focused on identifying suitable non-waste comparators.

- Action 23 - Operators to get in touch with GE if involved in digestate post-processing and reach out to networks, to support the Hub's digestate-derived products project
- Action 24 - GE to introduce DM to the Hub project team for digestate-derived products
- Action 25 - DM to feed the outcome of discussions with SEPA re dewatered fibre back to GE and the Forum
- Action 26 - GE to contact MB about the project in Germany treating several thousand tonnes of digestate

Finally, GE outlined two new research projects selected in 2025 that are currently having their project management established.

Project 2502 will evaluate quantified and visually assessed physical contaminants in delivered biowastes and biowastes after pre-treatment, aiming to improve their assessment and pre-treatment management. The study will look at both compost and anaerobic digestion within the context of local authority kerbside food waste collections to provide evidence of contaminant levels and the subsequent impact on scheme participants.

Project 2505 will deliver a review of RBP potential test durations and the five-day gas evaluation. This work builds on the previous Hub Project 3 but utilises much larger, anonymised datasets drawn from RBP testing to evaluate whether a twenty-eight-day test result can be accurately predicted at the ten-day stage.

GE concluded by saying that the Hub is actively seeking Steering Group members for both new projects, and interested operators were requested to contact GE via email.

6. Issues Raised with the BCS Operators' Representative

GP introduced an update regarding the internal auditing position paper, noting that the draft previously presented to the Technical Advisory Committee aimed to provide clear guidance on whether external consultants are permitted to undertake internal Quality Management System audits. It was reported that certain Certification Bodies had begun issuing formal non-conformances to operators who had utilised consultants for internal auditing over many years, or who had established their QMS historically. A specific concern was raised that these non-conformances were being recorded even in instances where documents had merely been revised, or where one consultant had originally drafted the system and a separate consultant performed the subsequent audit. Attendees noted that this strict interpretation represents an unnecessary administrative burden that undermines the practical support required by operators. GP confirmed that a substantial volume of correspondence had already been received on the matter and that the issue was being actively addressed internally.

MB enquired whether a specific provision exists within the scheme rules for regional managers who perform internal audits across facilities under their own governance. JC observed that, from a logical perspective, standard auditing principles dictate that individuals should not be permitted to audit their own direct work. AB questioned whether these situations were routinely resulting in formal non-conformances, suggesting that the focus of the Certification Bodies should remain on significant structural non-conformances rather than minor, overly particular details. JH expressed the view that operators should be permitted to utilise external consultants for these duties, noting that the current application of the rules across audits appeared inconsistent. AC added that any final policy must realistically reflect the compact scale of the operational industry.

GP clarified the historical context of the discussion, explaining that the issue was initially raised in May 2025 following reports of widespread inconsistencies regarding whether this practice was being penalised as a non-conformance between the respective schemes and across the different Certification Bodies. The primary objective of the position paper is to align the regulatory approach across both certification schemes and all three approved Certification Bodies, in accordance with standard practice. GP explained that a unified position had been agreed across the three organisations before being submitted to the TAC for final feedback. However, since that consultation commenced, the Certification Bodies began implementing the draft requirements, prompting extensive feedback from the industry indicating that the proposed stance was unworkable and overly stringent.

GP reported that the formal deadline for the TAC consultation was scheduled to close the following day. Given that a limited volume of correspondence had been received from the committee thus far, GP confirmed that the consultation period would be extended until the end of the week to ensure a robust consensus is achieved prior to publication.

In response to a query from AC regarding the exact scope of the stakeholders involved, GP confirmed that the consultation extended to all members of the TAC. AC further enquired whether technical feedback had been sought from BSI. GP responded that while UKAS had been formally approached for its professional view, BSI had not been consulted, noting that BSI did not author PAS 100 and that the specific authorship of PAS110 was not readily available information to the forum at this moment.

DD enquired whether the Certification Bodies had provided clear evidence indicating that internal audits performed by external consultants were not being conducted properly. GP replied that REAL had no knowledge of any such systemic auditing failures, though the Certification Bodies had not been questioned specifically on that point. The forum agreed that the position required further refinement, and it was resolved that an updated draft would be prepared for the subsequent TAC meeting.

Action 27 - BCS to consider whether BSI might want to comment on the internal QMS auditing query and whether to ask for their view.

7. Operator-Raised Issues and Open Discussion

JH opened the session, giving operators an opportunity to raise operational and technical issues.

Laboratory reporting on physical contaminants (RPS 317)

It was noted that although operators are currently working under the two-year grace period allowed by RPS 317, lab analysis reports still show a straightforward pass/fail result against the new thresholds, regardless of whether the site qualifies for the exemption. MB reported that this has not caused practical problems, as the operator writes to the auditors directly to confirm the exemption is in place. RT noted that the issue raised by JC would be helped by clearer wording on reissued reports, for example a statement that "this is an RPS lab," given how widely these reports are circulated. AB noted that when queried, lab staff could not provide the actual value against the limit, only confirmation that the sample was "nowhere near" it. JH commented that this is more of a commercial/business issue than an auditing one.

Action 28 - OD to provide test report feedback to labs and discuss the possibility of including text indicating reports have been amended in line with RPS 317.

ADRF wording on permitted waste types

AC raised a query regarding section 2 of the ADRF (item 2.15), which lists "waste from anaerobic treatment of solid wastes" under the 19-code headings. AC noted that the word "solid" does not appear in the corresponding EWC chapter heading, and queried whether its inclusion in the ADRF was deliberate or an oversight, given that some plants operate on liquids only.

AC also raised EWC code 19 06 06 (digestate), which was permitted under the previous QP and remains listed, though the wording has changed. Digestate taken under this code must now be pasteurised and stabilised material; material for seeding purposes, or taken from a non-pasteurised step, cannot be used, whereas manure can, as it is separately listed. AC queried whether this could be fed back to the EA, noting the same comments had also been passed to the REA.

JH raised a related inconsistency regarding glycerol classification. Under the ADRF, glycerol from non-waste vegetable oil in biodiesel manufacture is coded 07 01 08, while glycerol arising from a waste feedstock is coded 19 02 10 (physical/chemical treatment). JH suggested this implies the glycerol should sit under a type 16 code which does not align with how the ADRF is currently written. JH added that the EA needs to issue a single, clear position on glycerol given how much depends on it: achieving parity with Ofgem would mean treating it as a waste, potentially under the 07 code. JH's initial view had been that it is a by-product rather than a waste, but on reflection considered a 19 code more defensible given its origin from a waste facility, while acknowledging the ADRF is unclear either way. It was also noted that some consultation responses had suggested the material might be milk, though this was not considered specific enough. The autumn revision of the ADRF was noted as an opportunity to address this.

GP suggested raising both the feedstock-wording and seeding-material issues with DP at TAC. JC agreed to send the questions to DP and Kathy Nicholls (EA) in advance, to allow preparation time.

Action 29 - JC to work with GP to formulate a list of questions to give to DP and KN at the EA ahead of the next TAC meeting (re waste codes and the ADRF).

Any Other Business

OD informed the forum that active recruitment is continuing for the newly created position of Policy and Stakeholder Relations Manager at REAL.

OD provided a brief update on the upcoming consultation timelines for the UK FPR, offering to distribute the formal consultation materials to any interested operators.

AC raised a query regarding whether milk and whey are strictly classified as ABPs under the regulations, and whether processing facilities require formal APHA registration and approval to accept them.

JC noted that whilst specific exemptions exist for certain category materials, the rules regarding the exact geographical source and collection arrangements remain ambiguous. Because the material undergoes pasteurisation during the standard AD process, it presents no genuine biohazard, making the approval path feel like a bureaucratic paperwork exercise. The forum agreed that obtaining a clear steer from the APHA is essential due to the numerous compliance nuances involved.

JC reported that at least one operational site had recently been informed that while they did not require specialised approval for their pasteurisation unit, they were legally required to hold a formal storage and handling licence for the feedstocks before they could enter the digestion process.

JC enquired whether the Environment Agency had indicated when they would confirm their formal follow-up actions and long-term position regarding the expiration of RPS 317. It was agreed to track this closely via the TAC.

JH thanked all operators for their contributions and closed the meeting.

Actions Summary

Action 1 - Hub to continue overall promotion and communications, including the annual report.

Action 2 - Hub to feedback outstanding annual feedback survey information from 2024 and 2025 through production of a short report with key findings.

Action 3 - BCS to consider manure-based digestate and other potential RF changes in relation to Scheme operations and future PAS 110 review plans.

Action 5 - BCS to monitor progress on regulatory discussions around manure-based and non-waste AD to identify opportunities for non-waste digestate certification.

Action 19 - BCS to reconsider holding an in-person Forum in 2027.

Action 20 - GP to check with colleagues whether any internal discussions have taken place around reintroducing the historic 'Quality Assured' category of certification for manure-based digestate and non-waste digestate, or alternative certification provisions.

Action 17 - RH to clarify the scope, existing data, and contribution mechanism for the RH project addressing digestate-derived products.

Action 15 - RH to consider producing webinar to demonstrate the deliverables of Project 7: Risk Assessment updates to scheme participants.

Action 18 - BCS to speak with DM regarding dry AD and blogpost contribution for the BCS

Action 23 - Operators to get in touch with GE if involved in digestate post-processing and reach out to networks, to support the Hub's digestate-derived products project.

Action 24 - GE to introduce DM to the Hub project team for digestate-derived products.

Action 25 - DM to feed the outcome of discussions with SEPA re dewatered fibre back to GE and the Forum.

Action 26 - GE to contact MB about the project in Germany treating several thousand tonnes of digestate.

Action 27 - BCS to consider whether BSI might want to comment on the internal QMS auditing query and whether to ask for their view.

Action 28 - OD to provide test report feedback to labs and discuss the possibility of including text indicating reports have been amended in line with RPS 317.

Action 29 - JC to work with GP to formulate a list of questions to give to DP and KN at the EA ahead of the next TAC meeting (re waste codes and the ADRF).

Closed Actions

- GE to continue overall Research Hub (RH) promotion and comms (e.g., newsletter or pamphlet covering the work of the Hub, with a focus on outcomes of projects, to inform operators what they've funded to date).
- GE to feedback outstanding annual feedback survey information (data from both the 2024 and 2025 surveys).
- BCS to reconsider holding an in-person Forum in 2026.
- OD to ask the Test Method Working Group for reason as to why separate test methods/limits for compostable plastics are not being considered at this time.
- AC, JH, and GE to jointly explore a Research Hub proposal on the suitability of compostable plastics or biobags in AD, including the appropriate process for facilitating incubation and workshopping of the project idea.
- GE to investigate Hub process for helping facilitate 'incubation'/'workshopping' of this compostable plastic/biobag project idea.
- GE to contact DM about volunteering as a BCS operator on the steering committee for the RH project *"Evaluating quantified and visually assessed physical contaminants in delivered biowastes and biowastes after pre-treatment, and improving their assessment and pre-treatment management"*
- Operators to send GE any suggestions for improvements to Hub comms or new comms ideas.
- BCS to follow up on ABP pathogen testing reporting issues with the approved labs.
- BCS to investigate the application renewal forms with the CBs to check if they need to be updated to include the option for certification to the ADRF.

- BCS to feedback experiences regarding lab communications and customer service issues at next Lab Quarterly meeting relating to miscommunication of SciTech closure while still accepting samples.
- BCS to check if Rothamsted or Cranfield have been asked about testing compost or AD, and to consider contacting them when next prospecting if not.
- Operators to contact GE if interested in participating in university presentation/webinar for 2026
- BCS and AC to verify that no Labs are incorrectly claiming BCS approval and for AC to forward the LinkedIn post concerning the Scottish Lab's potential misrepresentation to GP.