

# Conclusions

## of the three stakeholder workshops on STRUBIAS materials

### ESPP - EU Fertilisers Regulation, 5 September 2018, Brussels

V13/9/18

#### 1) Biochars, pyrolysis & gasification materials

- Municipal sewage sludge is currently excluded as an input material. Stakeholders will input scientific data to demonstrate:
  - o a) market value and the existence of a market for biochar from sewage sludge
  - o b) heavy metals in the output pyrolysis material are below fertilising limit values
  - o c) antibiotics and pharmaceuticals destroyed and fully degraded
- There are no longer any lower or upper temperature limits to distinguish between torrifaction, pyrolysis, gasification. The  $H/C_{org}$  criterion should be maintained (shows limited oxygen conditions) but temperature limits should be considered to exclude low or high temperature processes which are not pyrolysis or gasification
- Technologies should not be excluded (thus limiting the freedom to operate) because there is considered to be inadequate scientific data, if safety limit values and quality are in any case ensured by the Fertilisers Regulation PFC criteria (e.g. heavy metals, nutrient content)

#### 2) Ash materials

Ashes from Cat 1 ABP incineration (disposal):

- JRC should provide a technical opinion on safety (independently of legal interpretation)
- Use for applications allowed under current regulation (no grazing animals) should be included
- There are issues because Cat1 ABP can be co-incinerated with poultry litter incineration

Heavy metals:

- Questions around proposed TI and V limit values
- Questions on need for Cr-total limit, given that Cr-VI is limited in PFCs
- In general (as indicated by JRC) heavy metals limits should all be in PFCs not CMCs, but stakeholders underline that additional testing burdens should not be generated unnecessarily: unusual heavy metals (specific to some ashes) should only be required to test if such as is used as input material

Ash as CMC / PFC – clarifications

- Methods of bioavailability assessment
- Intermediates and derivatives – stakeholders are unclear when ash is a CMC, when PFC
- Distinction between wastes (excluded in “intermediates”) and by-products (accepted), e.g. spent sulphuric acid

Sewage sludge

- Exception in point 1(a) [line 612, page 11] is misleading, and unnecessary
- Question as to whether the exclusion of “hazardous” sludges is a problem
- In some wordings in the report, unclear what is meant by “raw” sludge

### **3) Phosphate salts:**

3% organic carbon limit is considered arbitrary, not justified, not proven that this brings significant safety benefits

Phosphate salt recovery from industrial waste waters is currently excluded. Stakeholders suggest that input materials should include industrial waste waters, subject to conditions of controlled process, limited risk. Stakeholders requested to provide examples.

Monitoring frequency should be risk based and based on volume of production (scale based, on output tonnages not input flow/tonnages). For phosphate salts 'input volume' must not be wastewater, but precipitated phosphate salts before e.g. drying, post-processing.

Need to clarify procedure for proposing and considering new CMC materials to respond to technical and scientific progress.

Intermediates and derivatives: ambiguous wording. Needs clarification.

Processes that might be used for sterilisation of input materials (of wastewaters / materials from which phosphate salts are precipitated): thermal hydrolysis is authorised (line 554) but not hydro-thermal carbonisation. Widen to include other sterilisation processes.

The Fertilisers Regulation only confers End-of-waste after PFC, labelling and conformity assessment are achieved, so not for the CMC itself, not for input materials, for which the Waste Shipment Regulation continues to apply. These input materials could have national End-of-Waste status. Stakeholders request clarification on this aspect.