

Minutes

Title of meeting:	Wales Land Management Forum (WLMF) Sub Group on Agricultural Pollution
Location:	Microsoft Teams Meeting
Date of meeting:	4 September
Members present:	Rhys A. Jones, NRW Board Member (Chair) Jon Goldsworthy, NRW Sarah Hetherington, NRW Dennis Matheson, TFA David Ball, AHDB Creighton Harvey, CFF Chris R. Thomas, NRW Einir Williams, Farming Connect Gareth Parry, FUW Rachel Lewis-Davies, NFU Cymru Katy Simmons, NRW Sarah Jones, Dwr Cymru Welsh Water Shane Thomas, CFF Matt Walters, Welsh Government Andrew Chambers, Welsh Government Delyth Lewis-Jones, AHDB Eleri Thomas, Hybu Cig Cymru
Additional attendees:	Polina Cowley, Welsh Government Donal Sheehan, The BRIDE Project
Apologies:	Bronwen Martin, NRW Nichola Salter, NRW Russ Thomas, Hybu Cig Cymru
Secretariat:	Ieuan S. Davies, NRW

Item 1. Introductions, Apologies and Declaration of Interest

1. Professor Rhys A. Jones (NRW Board Member and WLMF Sub Group Chair) welcomed all to the Microsoft Teams meeting and noted apologies. Rhys welcomed Jon Goldsworthy to the group. Jon is the new Sustainable Land Manager within NRW.
2. The meeting is being recorded for the purpose of capturing the minutes and the digital file will be deleted once the meeting minutes have been approved.
3. No declarations of interest were raised in respect of agenda items.

- NB: All members of the group have completed declaration of interest forms already but should also declare if they have an interest in anything on the agenda.

Item 2. Review of Minutes and actions

4. Rhys confirmed that once the meeting minutes have been reviewed and formally agreed by the group, they will be published on the NRW website for the public to access. Therefore, it is important that the minutes are an accurate record of the meetings.
5. The group reviewed the previous meeting minutes from 10th July. No comments or suggested amendments were received in respect of the July meeting minutes.
6. Ieuan shared the outstanding actions log and verbal updates were provided where possible. The following was of particular note:
 - AP July 05: Bronwen Martin, NRW to look into whether the group received a response from the letter to the Minister regarding concerns around the Tenancy Frequently Asked Questions (FAQ) document.
 - Matthew Walters, Welsh Government said Bronwen followed this up with himself and Andrew. Welsh Government sent an initial response back when the letter was originally received but it was still in the Judicial Review period. Subsequently, the letter was a bit generic and Welsh Government haven't sent a letter to follow-up on individual points in the letter. The letter was general recognition and an acknowledgement from the Minister of the issues raised.
 - Dennis Matheson, TFA mentioned that he had met with Matthew and Andrew. The meeting was very productive, and they have now sorted the problems. This is now resolved and TFA think that the revised FAQ document is now fit for purpose – the TFA are grateful for the meeting. Matthew reminded the group that the updated FAQ document has been published on the Welsh Government website - [GOV.Wales: The Water Resources \(Control of Agricultural Pollution\) \(Wales\) Regulations 2021: Tenanted Land - Frequently Asked Questions](#).

AP September 01: Ieuan S. Davies, NRW to include a link to the Welsh Government Tenancy Frequently Asked Questions (FAQ) document in the meeting minutes.

Item 3. Matters Arising

7. The group was encouraged to discuss any matters arising from the previous meeting minutes, relevant documents, or recent topics.
8. No matters arising were raised by the group.

Item 4. Ammonia Modelling Update

9. Polina Cowley, Welsh Government joined the meeting to provide an update on the air quality targets and results of the recent ammonia scenarios modelling.
10. Polina provided a summary of the legislative context – The Environment (Air Quality and Soundscapes) (Wales) Bill contributes to delivering our Programme for

Government objectives to make our cities, towns and villages even better and embed our response to the climate and nature emergency. The Bill will enable us to set national air quality targets, providing a strong mechanism to deliver the Welsh Government's long-term ambitions for clean air and associated public health and environmental outcomes.

11. The Bill is currently going through Senedd, and the hope is for it to reach Royal Assent at the start of next year. The Bill will say that the air quality targets will have to be set within three years after passing Royal Assent. Therefore, January 2027 is when the air quality targets regulations will have to be published.
12. Polina summarised the target setting process. The first part of it is 'purpose' to determine why we're setting targets, while there are already some standards and targets determining the metrics in which those targets will be measured (e.g., do we measure emissions in kilotons or concentrations). There is currently a 16% target to decrease ammonia emissions by 2030. Most often, air quality targets are actually measured in concentrations.
13. Welsh Government are currently going through modelling with a contractor, Ricardo. They are just finishing the very final points of the emissions analysis. The concentrations will then be done. The whole concentrations work with Ricardo will take about a year with the potential of an extension of a further six months. Some organisations have contributed to the current emissions analysis and Polina thanked them for engaging.
14. Later stages will involve developing, monitoring and reporting processes, frameworks, impact assessments and public consultation. This will be tightly integrated with following up the legislation development.
15. Rachel Lewis-Davies, NFU Cymru asked about the consultation and the impact assessment and whether Polina could confirm if it will include an element of rural proofing. Polina said the consultation time scales and what will be included is under development. However, the consultation is not going to happen in the next six months. It is tied up in the current Bill and subsequently, the Bill will determine the timeline and ministerial preferences. The current Bill says that we will be setting targets for particulate matter (PM) 2.5. However, ammonia is a precursor of particulate matter 2.5, so we're still looking at that in emissions and the concentration analysis. As the Bill is now at stage two, there have been some additions to the Bill (this is all in the public domain) that we might have to add other pollutants and maybe ammonia might be set as a target for air quality. If we progress with just PM 2.5, the consultation will be only about PM 2.5. If other pollutants are added, we might be looking at two consultations. The consultations will be done in line with both of the assessments because we have to publish them. Regarding rural proofing, Polina said we can assure the farming community that we are having talks with the industry and with health professionals. All the targets have to be feasible, so we can't set a target which is not going to be achievable. Therefore, close liaison with stakeholders is essential for that. We are currently far from drafting the consultation or any of the impact assessments and are looking at 2024 onwards.
16. Regarding legislation development, we are being encouraged by the Minister and by the timeline, to set targets by 2027 which is an extremely tight position. The consultation will also depend on the process because the whole process takes about a

year. There are several options for example, we can consult on policy options, or we might even consult on a draft of the regulations, but we currently don't know what will be in the consultation at the moment.

17. The target setting process is a part of the framework and policy development. Legislation development includes policy instructions and framework. Liaising with NFU Cymru, Welsh Government officials and NRW is also a part of this process in building a strong framework to deliver the targets. However, it is not up to us to set them, it will be a Ministerial decision as to what the targets will be, how the framework is formed and who is responsible. Currently, we are just starting the process of establishing the purpose and metrics and we have a special Air Quality Advisory Panel which provides independent advice.
18. Polina provided an overview of the ammonia modelling as part of the targets setting process. We have engaged with over 150 stakeholders and have held two workshops. This is not just about ammonia but also includes other pollutants, primarily PM 2.5. Polina thanked those who have engaged with the process so far.
19. We have 3 scenarios, medium, high and speculative. Each scenario consists of 30 measures ranging from low protein diet through to coverage of slurry stores, to bacterial treatment. Each measure in the scenarios has a start and the end date and an estimated uptake rate. During those two workshops, Ricardo spoke to a range of stakeholders and had in depth conversations to clarify certain things. Ricardo finally created those uptakes, dates and measures for each scenario. This is a completely scientific approach. Polina showed some graphs, charts and tables and described the findings of each scenario.
20. David Ball, AHDB said it was a very interesting presentation. David recalled that Polina had mentioned that part of the Ricardo approach was to model what emissions may be, considering anticipated uptake rates. Have you got any information on what uptake rates were applied to those various measures listed. Polina yes, it is a very detailed spreadsheet with each uptake measure. Unfortunately, Polina said she was not able to share the presentation, although some stakeholders would already be aware of the details because they were involved in the process. Not all of the information has been published within the public domain yet. However, Polina shared her screen to demonstrate the vast spreadsheet of complex data which Ricardo has examined.

David suggested uptake rates are speculative and can be influenced by external matters such as funding and legislation. Those parameters that have been used in that spreadsheet are flexible depending on the external forces, and therefore, would have a significant impact on the graphs. Polina said it is more than flexible, there are so many uncertainties and although we tried to engage with as many stakeholders as possible, there are some in other sectors that are still engaging even though the all the modelling has been done. This data is attached to the UK Air Quality Inventories and is part of the UK Inventories Review. We have also identified a very serious farm data gap which we're trying to address as a priority.

David said he has been working with the Environment Agency in England and they are up against the same problem with lack of reliable evidence and data. David said he didn't see the uptake rate that had been applied to covering slurry stores, but whatever it was, if that was made mandatory then that would affect that measure hugely. David said he was not suggesting that should be done but making the point that those uptake

rates could be affected hugely in the future. Polina said it was very interesting to see that slurry stores coverage wasn't in one of the top scoring measures. Polina said she was incredibly surprised because roughly three years ago it was shown as one of the top measures. David said it only contributes to 9% of total UK ammonia emissions. Polina said they understand through talks with Defra and the Environment Agency, that coverage of slurry stores is not one of the really viable options because there are a whole range of barriers (e.g., suppliers, access, infrastructure in Wales, supply and demand for the contractor etc.). All of this feeds into the Ricardo model. Polina said they also had discussions with Sustainable Farming Scheme colleagues and many other stakeholders where the argument was literally about 5% of uptake on a certain measure – it went into minute detail on each measure, but we were trying to be as realistic as possible. Polina emphasised the feasible targets and how the measures will be meaningless if farmers do not want to do them themselves. Polina said she is really interested in bacterial treatment because that is linked to the interest of farmers. This is also linked to a previous presentation received from Aled Davies, Pruex. Polina said they cannot encourage a particular business in Wales, and it must be a general approach.

21. Delyth Lewis-Jones, AHDB noted that improved genetics is one of the key areas and asked if that is because improving genetics will improve production and efficiency, and therefore there is less cattle. That specific practise is vastly different to reducing the ammonia from the cattle that's already on farms. Polina said improved genetics was a major surprise to us too and it did not feature in the previous modelling at all. We are trying to understand this ourselves. There are also some profoundly serious concerns about that from both the farming community and health professionals. It's not only ammonia they're hoping to address by improve genetics, but also to do with methane. Delyth said in terms of a reduction in methane, it is also linked to a reduction in animal numbers and that is a huge concern for the dairy and beef sector in Wales. Polina said this is new and we haven't really looked in detail into that yet. Health officials are also worried about it, for example how is the food chain going to be affected, there has not been much research into that either. Delyth said AHDB lead on the dairy genetics for the UK, and she is happy to discuss that with Polina, but would suspect it's down to productivity and efficiency in terms of the size of cow as well. That's one of the key environmental indicators going forward.
22. Gareth Parry, FUW suggested that as a group we need to keep a close eye on this Bill and how things develop in the coming years because we need to make sure that if any of these measures are made mandatory in the future that they don't consequently force farmers down a path where they have to change their business structure (e.g. change business plan, stock numbers etc.) in order to comply with the measures and targets. If certain things do become mandatory, then we also need to make sure the correct support is provided, and the potential unintended are consequences considered. Polina agreed, experience shows that if farmers don't want to implement things, then it is very hard. We are also trying to look into measures that will actually benefit farmers in the first place.
23. Rhys thanked Polina for the very interesting and thought-provoking presentation. The discussion around the nature of the modelling and the scenarios suggests the need for ongoing engagement with this group in order to refine the model and recognise what feasible measures can be put in place. It is also important there is engagement with the future consultation.

24. Dennis mentioned that cost is a key thing which affects how much protein farmers use. If you are feeding cattle on red clover or rye grass lays which we are encouraged to do, then you reduce the amount of artificial nitrogen or slurry you put on the land, which in turn reduces the amount of ammonia that goes into the atmosphere. You also have to feed cattle a certain amount of protein, if it goes too low, regardless of what the feed is, then the rumen stops working which can be fatal. Cattle also need protein for other reasons such as their colostrum, low protein can impact the quality of colostrum which can be detrimental to calves. Therefore, other factors need to be considered which will affect the measures suggested to farmers. Polina said Dennis had pointed out that some measures can also be conflicting, and this is one of the uncertainties that Welsh Government and the contractor are also aware of. There are downsides for any kind of model and there are things that modelling does not quite account for, but this is part of the methodology that the contractor applies.
25. David suggested that another way of approaching this would be to look at the net cost of implementation for some of these measures. The presentation outlined the anticipated cost to these measures and that could be put against the benefit of the relative reduction in ammonia (e.g., cost per kilo tonne of ammonia abated, would be an interesting figure). Rhys said given that Polina left the meeting before David made that point, it would be good to convey that message to her.

AP September 02: leuan Stephen Davies, NRW to pass on David Ball's point to Polina Cowley, Welsh Government about a different approach to the modelling work.

AP September 03: leuan Stephen Davies, NRW to share Polina Cowley's contact details so that members can directly follow up with any further questions about the ammonia modelling work.

26. Rhys suggested the group could consider if there is a role in engaging with the consultation process.

Item 5. Presentation: The Biodiversity Regeneration in a Dairying Environment (BRIDE) Project

27. Donal Sheehan, The BRIDE Project joined the meeting to introduce the project which aimed to design and implement a results-based approach to conserve, enhance and restore habitats in lowland intensive farmland. Donal is a dairy farmer from County Cork in the South of Ireland and is also the Project Manager of the Bride Project. Bride refers to the Bride River, but it also stands for 'Biodiversity Regeneration in a Dairying Environment'. The project was set up to enhance biodiversity on intensive farmland. When you focus on biodiversity, everything comes into play including water quality, biodiversity and carbon sequestration. The Bride Project is applicable to the Bride Valley but farming with nature and the learnings from this work could be rolled out elsewhere.
28. It is European Innovation Partnership (EIP) Project and is co-funded by the EU and the Department of Agriculture, Food and the Marine in Ireland. It is a pilot project set up to improve biodiversity on intensive farmland. Funding was €1.1 million for six years and involved a very broad remit to improve biodiversity on intensive farmland. Donal was very grateful to the Department of Agriculture for allowing that level of flexibility. It is a landscape scale project and rather than picking out individuals, it focused on the whole

Bride River Valley and focused on environmental improvement at a landscape level. The Bride Valley area is about 40 kilometres by 15 kilometres.

29. We initially spoke with farmers at public meetings because we wanted to engage with all types of farmers including beef farmers, tillage farmers, equine farmers and sheep farmers. As far as the environment is concerned, we all needed to be singing off the same hymn sheet. Ultimately, if you're looking at water quality, biodiversity or carbon sequestration, it should be the same for everyone in the location. After talking with the individual farmers, we decided on a specific biodiversity improvement plan for each farm. The focus was geared towards getting a minimum of 10% space for nature on every farm, which is now seen across Europe as a target. However, the biggest problem is that there's no legal basis to improve biodiversity like the carbon sequestration targets and the water quality targets which are legally binding.
30. The 43 farmers were made up of 19 dairy farmers, 15 beef farmers and the remainder were equine, tillage and sheep farmers. We remotely mapped each farm based on the productive and non-productive areas. A second EIP funded us with €150,000 to design a web portal and an app. We needed some technology to help the process and we now have a web portal that we can map any farm in the world because it uses Google Maps. We then went out to each farm with the app and valued the habitats based on scorecards. These are individual habitat scorecards for different habitats (e.g., a scorecard for riparian buffer strips, a scorecard for hedge rows, a scorecard for wetlands, etc.). Donal explained that the higher the score, the higher the payment but initially, all of the farmers got €2000. The scorecards are designed to incentivise the farmers to manage their habitats positively for ecology. Based on those scorecards, we designed a farmland biodiversity index which is the quantity of space for nature (% SFN) on the farm and the quality. You can have a low space for nature, but you have high quality, and you can have a high space for nature and low quality.
31. Donal showed some maps and described the before and after situations in relation to the quantity of space for nature and quality and then showed the corresponding scorecard. It's about providing an incentive for farmers to change their management practices in order to improve biodiversity.
32. Donal described the reports, certificates and payment rates for the improvements. Rewards incentivise improvement, whether it's the quantity of space for nature or the quality of space for nature. The farmer gets a certificate at the end of the year. We take all the information that the farmer provided and record the data on the portal. There are different sections including target species, space for nature and habitats and the data can be compiled and displayed as reports.
33. Donal discussed the quality of the Bride River. When we did a citizen science sample test last October, at the very start of the Bride River there were very little nitrates in it. However, by the time it got to the black water, it was really dark pink indicating nitrates. That trend followed each of the tributaries but the Bride River was staying the same because of the dilution effect. This showed us that we should be focusing on the tributaries by encouraging the farmers to do things to improve water quality. Donal said a lot of the water quality problems are linked to high nitrates.
34. We now have a 'Farmed With Nature' certification whereby if you're farming with nature then 10% of your land is in space for nature and the quality of that is 'B' which is a really good standard. We are hoping to get that standard onto food product packaging

so that consumers can pay for a product, and it goes all the way back to the farmer. The whole project is finished at the end of this year.

AP September 04: Ieuan Stephen Davies, NRW to share a copy of Donal Sheehan's The BRIDE Project presentation.

35. Rhys asked how the farmers were encouraged to become part of the scheme and if there was a general appetite already. Donal said they used a social media post to advertise the first initial meeting and 120 farmers came along, they were hoping to get 20 people attend. It had been publicly mentioned that there was €1.1 million investment into the Bride Valley, which was huge because there are ten small villages in this area. There was this public perception that farmers were not going to do anything for biodiversity or for water quality, but the local farmers totally turned that on its head.
36. Sarah Hetherington, NRW recalled that Donal had mentioned that they did an aerial assessment through a portal and asked if that is available outside of the project. Donal said they want it to be available, but someone has to oversee that and measure these farms so that it's certifiable. We want the consumer to be able to recognise that this is not green washed, and the products are actually coming from a farm that has really good quality habitats and a minimum space for nature. There is so much green washing out there by the industry, it damages our reputation as farmers. We could actually map a farm in Wales, but you would need to verify it with the app by going out and walking that farm.
37. In terms of motivation for behavioural change, Ieuan said there's the scoring, certification on the end product and the financial incentive, but is it strong enough to really ensure behaviour change lasts into the future? Donal said in his opinion, agri-environment schemes will never be the solution. The problem with agri-environment schemes is that they are here today and gone tomorrow and farmers know that. Donal said we've put too much land into food production and we're struggling now with biodiversity, water quality and carbon sequestration. Donal said he would much prefer to see an incentive coming continuously from the consumer because everyone is benefiting – farmers are delivering public goods.
38. Creighton Harvey, CFF said he was very encouraged by Donal's comments regarding tributaries and water quality. Creighton said he is aware of the difficulties on the blackwater, but he had not heard of the Bride Project until now. Creighton discussed some of the issues he has witnessed at the start of the headwaters. Creighton recalled that there were 43 farmers which were a part of the scheme and asked how many farms are in the catchment. Donal said all of them, we were quite specific that if you were within the catchment boundary then you were eligible. Donal mentioned that all of the farmers were suppliers to the local milk processor and the meat processor in the Bride Valley and it was important that these businesses were also involved because it was in their interest as stakeholders.

Creighton explained his concern where out of a small catchment of 10 farms, nine farms are doing the job properly, but one farm isn't so when something goes wrong, all the work done by the other nine farmers is lost. Creighton recalled that there were 43 farms in the project, but the catchment was delineated by the Inland Fisheries Board, so how many farms are within that delineation. Donal said he did not know for certain but there are at least 400 farms. Regarding the example of one person that does all the damage, Donal said they received criticism at the start of the project for not focusing on

perceived offenders who were generally large-scale dairy farmers that were getting a lot of bad publicity. The project never focused on bringing in anyone who didn't want to join, but instead the focus was on the people who wanted to make changes. Donal described how some farmers who initially declined to join the project later wanted to join after seeing the good work and positive public perception of the project.

39. Dennis agreed with Donal's comments about agri-environment schemes. Dennis said it seems like this project is a bit like the one in the Burra but adapted for lowland intensive farming. Dennis asked of the 43 farmers, how many are renting their land is tenants and how many are owner occupiers. If they're tenants, then they would be limited in what they can do by virtue of their tenancy agreement. Donal said that was a good question because you don't want to be planting trees for someone who's going to potentially take the land off you in a couple of years' time and that it is a problem. Most of the improvements were done on the farmer's own land. Donal explained that all of the farmers within the project owned land, as well as rented some land – none of them had 100% rented land only. All of the participating farmers received yearly results-based payments on their habitats but the amount depended on the biodiversity quality of that habitat (e.g. planting trees/hedges, putting in ponds etc.). All of the land was scored, including rented ground. From the management point of view, allowing your hedgerows to grow, which is one of the measures that we recommend, would have been carried out under the block in its entirety, including rented land. Donal explained one instance where one of the farmers was initially scored in 2018 but he bought a new farm in 2020. The farmer's space for nature was assessed and the farmer found his farmland biodiversity index had dropped from 12 down to six because the farm he had bought had virtually no space for nature, which subsequently dropped his whole average. Donal discussed the incentive of all farmers having a target of 10%, regardless of owning or renting. It all comes back to rewarding farmers that have space for nature as well as productive land, there has to be a value for land that is not productive otherwise you will keep seeing the decimation of biodiversity.
40. Rhys recalled that the project is coming to an end this year and asked about the next steps. Donal said he will be returning to farming, but he was not sure on what the next steps are following the completion of the project. The Department of Agriculture have got the learnings from the project, but the funding has finished. Rhys said it would be interesting to see whether there are further spin offs of this work in Ireland. There seems to be a move towards catchment level or landscape level approaches in order to ensure that positive change can be made both for water quality and biodiversity. Rhys thanked Donal for joining the meeting and providing such an interesting presentation and discussion.

Item 6. Agricultural Technical Group Report Update

41. Ieuan S. Davies, NRW and Delyth Lewis-Jones, AHDB gave a brief verbal update on the progress of the SAC Rivers Agricultural Technical Group. Delyth said we were hoping to bring something more substantial to the group today. One of the first steps was to improve our knowledge and understanding of the issue of phosphates in rivers. We have also been looking at the innovations that are already being carried out or developed to deal with slurry or with the digestates and there are some interesting projects going on not just in Wales but UK wide.
42. The audience for the report is quite broad which is an important consideration. The report itself needs to be informative for all sorts of people including the Nutrient

Management Boards, farmers and people from outside the agriculture industry. Delyth described the structure of the report. The report contents includes:

- An introduction
- Background
- The role of phosphorus (in soils, plant and crop requirement, freshwater impacts, legacy P, role of soil analysis and the limitations to sampling).
- Regulatory landscape
- Innovation
- Investment
- Challenges and gaps
- Recommendations

43. Delyth said the group has structured the recommendations into 6 main headings: advice and guidance, investment support, tools, rules and regulation, innovation and research. These are pretty broad recommendations, for example, the advice and guidance would be to hopefully get Farming Connect as the main advisory service within Wales to focus more on phosphates, including the direct impact of phosphates on rivers, what farmers can do and also share the best practise that's happening in catchment areas. Delyth said there's a huge number of projects which are similar to what we've heard today about the Bride Project now, but within Welsh catchment areas. It is really important to share learnings from these projects on a broader scale.
44. The majority of the report is complete, but we are looking at the gaps. There will probably be some things that have been missed because this is a very small group, but hopefully it will provide a guide going forward with the recommendations. There will be a need to look into those recommendations to see whether they are feasible because some of them would be industry led and some of them will have to be Government.
45. Ieuan said one of the challenges of bringing this report together has been the level of information and detail needed. The report has got a broad reach for its target audience, and it has been a challenge to appropriately present it in a way which is suitable for all whilst also including more detailed information for those who require it. The remit of the report is around evidence on phosphorus and its effect on our water courses and that in itself has provided some challenges because there's quite a lot of innovation and technology that is directly relevant, which can divert us away from some of the more holistic land management opportunities that are available to farmers and land managers to mitigate the phosphorus issue. Getting the balance right between those two areas has been quite an interesting part of the process. Throughout this, there has been really good engagement from all members of the group. Part of the recommendations includes allocating actions to different groups going forward for further research and investigation, for example.
46. Gareth asked when the report will be published and shared with this group. Delyth said they are still working on it for the next fortnight. The report will then need to go back to the individuals or organisations involved in the steering group for sign off and that could perhaps take another fortnight. As a group, we feel that it is really important to get it right because this is our one chance of getting the messages across to a broader audience and suggesting recommendations that will ultimately help the agriculture industry.
47. Rhys asked about the process of drafting, redrafting, confirming the final changes and then publishing the report. Rhys also asked if there is an ask of this group and if so, at

what stage can we provide additional feedback. Delyth said the working group was set up as a Sub Group of this group, so the full report will come back to this group and would be open to comments. However, members should take into consideration the length of time has taken to get to this point. We have had initial discussions with Welsh Government about who takes responsibility for making sure the recommendations are taken forward, however, that question remains unanswered (e.g., whether that's the role of this group or whether the Agricultural Technical Group continues). Rhys asked if anyone from Welsh Government is on the technical group. Delyth said no, but there are links to individuals. It seems like they might be keen to continue with the Agri Tech Group because the role of the group now sits within the structure of the SAC Rivers Project. Ieuan said it remains unclear and the discussions with Welsh Government are ongoing. Ieuan mentioned that this is not an NRW report, but he is the secretariat and Marc Williams sits on the group as the NRW Agriculture lead and together, they have made sure the discussions are within the remit and policy and regulatory boundaries. They are not inputting into the report as the report itself is led and written by the industry. Rhys said we need to ensure this report lands as well as it can with the wide audience. The report needs to be as effective as possible so that the messages within it have the most chance of being taken forward by the relevant bodies. Rhys said he would be keen to explore how best to help the report land well when it is published and suggested that he would follow up directly with Delyth and Ieuan.

AP September 05: Rhys Jones to follow up with Delyth Lewis-Jones, AHDB and Ieuan S. Davies, NRW to discuss how best to ensure the Agriculture Technical Group report has the best reception possible when it is actually published.

48. Delyth said she would follow up with Welsh Government to see whether there is a decision about the next steps. Rhys said it would be good to align everything similar to a comms plan and said it would be useful to have somebody from Welsh Government be a part of that discussion.

AP September 06: Delyth Lewis-Jones, AHDB and Ieuan S. Davies, NRW to discuss next steps with Welsh Government and to see if there is a decision about who ensures the report recommendations are taken forward.

49. Dennis mentioned that more and more groups are getting set up without being properly integrated. About 10 years ago, there was a major phosphate reduction project run by the Environment Agency under Richard Dearing, who's now with the NRW North East Area Statement Team. That involved free soil sampling, free manure sampling and then a free consultation with an ADAS consultant to try and reduce phosphates in these two rivers. Dennis said he didn't know what happened to that, but it would be a very interesting report to be taken into consideration.

Item 7. Any other business

50. Rhys said Bronwen is looking into another site visit over the next few months before the weather deteriorates so watch this space for more information.

51. No other business was raised.