

PEATLAND CODE TECHNICAL ADVISORY BOARD – MINUTES

Date: Thursday 10th September 2026

Time: 11am – 1pm

Venue: Online Meeting – Teams Meeting Invite

Attendees: Alex Hart, Andrew Moxey, Ben Dipper, Donald Nayer, Eimear Reeve, Hans Joosten, Helen Leach, Iain Detrey, Ian Dickie, Ian McKee, John Couwenberg, Mark Anderson, Pat Snowdon, Patrick Jean-Martel, Rebekka Artz, Steve Clarke, Tamarind Falk, Garance Wood- Moulin, Renée Kerkvliet-Hermans, Harriet Santon, Nadia Murphy

Apologies: Emma Hinchcliff, Judith Stuart, Rebecca Fairman, Steve Clarkson and Chris Evans (conflict of interest), Stephen Clarkson

Agenda

1. Minutes and actions from last TAB.
2. General updates.
3. External Methodology Presentation - Plant-e Groundwater Level SensorStick
4. External methodology evaluation - Sevaiya: UAV-Based Direct Greenhouse Gas Measurement for Peatland Monitoring and Verification
5. Mapping Queries from the Clarification Document
6. ReThink platform
7. AOB.

Peatland Programme

1. Minutes and actions from last TAB

Topic	Actions	Outcome
Financial additionality and income foregone <i>Should we look at including income foregone in our financial additionality test</i>	Secretariat to email interested TAB members to review and discuss including income forgone into the additionality test. The findings from the working group will be returned for further discussions at the next TAB meeting.	Not yet actioned

Peatland Programme

Agenda Item: 2. General update

Sent ahead of time for TAB to consider

Project Registrations & Validations

- 428 projects registered
- There were 28 projects that reached project plan validation and 23 reached restoration validation.
- 10 projects in the verification pilot
- 10,736,609 (tCO₂e)
- XX no of PIUS

TAB Member: Noted that the statistics tables would benefit from clear PIU and PCU indications.

ACTION: PC Team will update statistics tables to indicate PIU and PCU where appropriate.

TAB Member: Raised a concern regarding the implications of the PC's average project duration of approximately 80 years in relation to the UK and Scotland's climate-neutrality targets.

TAB Member: discussed considering whether additionality could become an issue beyond the relevant climate-neutrality dates, particularly where PIUs are sold in advance for periods extending towards the end of the project.

TAB Agrees that this was a topic that warranted further consideration

ACTION: PC Team to read through the two papers provided by a TAB member.
https://papers.ssrn.com/sol3/papers.cfm?abstract_id=7364138
<https://academic.oup.com/jel/article-pdf/38/2/222/68504815/eqag013.pdf>

UKAS

A major milestone was achieved this summer when Versions 2.1 and 2 of the Peatland Code were accepted by UKAS as the basis for the UKAS accreditation pilot. This marked a significant step forward in establishing a robust accreditation framework for the Peatland Code. We are now awaiting the accreditation of the three Validation and Verification Bodies, which we understand is imminent. We hope to be able to share positive news by the next TAB meeting in November, with accredited bodies in place and able to begin supporting Peatland Code validation and verification activities.

ICVCM

On the international accreditation front, we have applied to the Integrity Council for the Voluntary Carbon Market (ICVCM). A completeness check meeting to discuss

Peatland Programme

the application was scheduled for yesterday but unfortunately had to be postponed at short notice. We are currently awaiting a new meeting date and expect to hear more on the status of the application towards the end of September or early October. We remain hopeful of a positive outcome and look forward to progressing the application through the next stages of the assessment process.

CivTech

Carbon Price Index

The Peatland Code and Woodland Carbon Code have been working with Ecosystem Marketplace to collect and publish 2025 carbon price data, which is now available on the Peatland Code website. The reported average price has increased from £25 to £39 per tonne of carbon; however, this figure is likely influenced by a small number of high-value transactions. The data currently reflects information from only three project developers and 17 transactions, meaning the sample size remains relatively limited. A webinar is being held to explore the findings in more detail, and project developers are being encouraged to share pricing information to help build a more robust and representative dataset in future years.

TAB Member: Discussed whether price disclosure should become mandatory. It was noted that the Woodland Carbon Code is experiencing similar challenges and that greater transparency would provide a better understanding of the market.

ACTION: Consider arranging a joint consultation between the Peatland Code and Woodland Carbon Code

External Methodology Presentation- Plant-e Groundwater Level SensorStick

The Plant-e SensorStick is a telemetric groundwater-level monitoring device designed for long-term deployment in peatland environments presented to the TAB for consideration.

Water level is measured using a vented differential-pressure sensor positioned near the bottom of the stick. The sensor measures pressure at the measurement point relative to atmospheric pressure through a vent tube extending to the atmosphere. The resulting pressure difference represents the hydrostatic pressure exerted by the water column above the sensor and is converted into a water-level measurement. The result is the water level, relative to the surface level of the site. The above-ground structure is prominent and visually striking. It was asked whether it is also wild boar and bear resistant.

A. Yes, it has been improved and can now withstand bear attack and deer.

Q, Can the sensor withstand freezing temperatures?

A. Yes, cairngorms for example the temperature normally stays above 0, so we can continue powering it as well as.

Tab Member: Highlighted the importance of establishing what level of accuracy is actually required for the intended purpose.

TAB Member: Suggested that the PC should avoid endorsing a particular company or product.

TAB: Discussed whether the PC should establish minimum technical requirements that companies. would need adhere too.

TAB: Voiced concern that formally endorsing or vetting individual technologies or companies could create difficulties as technology develops.

TAB Agrees that establishing clear minimum requirements which technologies would need to be demonstrated, supported by scientifically published research.

ACTION: PC Team to discuss not endorsing or vetting individual technology with the Executive Board.

ACTION: PC Team to establish clear minimum performance requirements for technologies used under the code.

Agenda Item: 4. External Methodology Evaluation- Sevaiya: UAV-Based Direct Greenhouse Gas Measurement for Peatland Monitoring and Verification

Sevaiya were not yet invited to come to the TAB, this was a discussion within the TAB to see if this is something that should be adopted.

TAB Member: Some of these measurement methods currently provide only snapshots in time unless they are applied at a very high spatial and temporal resolution, which would likely make them prohibitively expensive for routine monitoring purposes. While snapshot measurements could be valuable as a verification tool, particularly for identifying significant deviations from expected outcomes, they are not currently seen as a practical approach for ongoing project-level monitoring. Instead, they may have greater value as an independent verification instrument for the Peatland Code than as a monitoring tool used directly by project proponents.

TAB Member: A single survey cannot determine annual emissions, but it can help identify areas on a rewetted site where emissions are higher than expected, highlighting locations that may require further investigation or management intervention.

TAB Member: I could see it as a potential tool to develop against, for example, Earth observations based, water table depth models verifying process-based emissions model outputs. However, its application for estimating aggregate emissions reductions across an entire project site would require further development before it could be considered a practical monitoring or reporting tool.

TAB Agrees that the technology is not currently going to be adopted.

ACTION: PC Team to re-engage with Sevaiya once the technology has progressed further in its development.

Agenda Item: 5. Mapping- Clarification Document

TAB Member: This seems like it's an interpolation issue.

- A. RK: We don't currently interpolate between survey points and perhaps this is something we should explore. Areas with peat depths greater than 50 cm are considered eligible, while shallow areas below this threshold require additional evidence through a 50 m × 50 m grid assessment. As a result, eligibility can only be confirmed within the defined distance of each survey point, and areas between points may remain uncertain where measurements are close to or below the eligibility threshold.

TAB Member: I think firstly, we can't necessarily ask for a lot of serving to be done outside the assessment unit, because quite often that's going to be the edge of the land ownership.

TAB: Discussed the balance between ensuring sufficient evidence to justify AU boundaries and avoiding disproportionately burdensome additional surveying requirements.

TAB: Discussed whether an algorithmic or statistical/interpolation approach could be developed. Suggested that an algorithm could potentially provide a statistically defensible basis for determining boundaries.

PC Member: Noted that interpolation has not previously been used for this purpose and that further consideration would be required.

ACTION: PC Team to investigate whether statistical interpolation or an alternative algorithmic approach could provide a robust and consistent method for assessing peat-depth data and AU boundaries.

Agenda Item: 6. Rethink Codes platform

Rethink Carbon was founded in 2022 following participation in the Scottish Government CivTech programme and they are currently part of the CivTech Challenge 10.6 programme.

They are currently building a platform to support both the Woodland Carbon Code and Peatland Code the aim is that the rethink platform will

- Make the process more efficient by simplifying workflows for validation
- Automate documentation
- Reporting functionality
- Mapping and monitoring tools
- In addition to the main core platform being built, Rethink have continued to develop additional features and functionality for project developers and validators

More details can be found here [Rethink Codes | Rethink Carbon](#)

TAB Member: Supports the principle of automating the process to enable to code to scale, however, questioned why a higher levy would be required if the platform should ultimately make the process cheaper for Project Developers.

PC Member: Although the platform should generate efficiencies and cost savings, there would still be costs associated with developing and maintaining the platform.

TAB: discussed the importance of ensuring that any increase in the levy does not become a barrier to participation in the code.

TAB Member: highlighted the importance of developing a sustainable long-term charging model. Suggested that the costs for the code functions should be based on cost recovery rather than profit and that the timing of charges should take account of when PDs receive revenue.

PC Member: Confirmed that consultation with Project Developers is planned to understand their views on the platform and their willingness to adopt it.

TAB Member: Raised a question concerning subsidy control considerations, particularly if government funding supported the development of a platform which subsequently become mandatory and generated financial benefit for a particular company.

PC Member: Noted that the platform had gone through the CivTech procurement process but agrees that the implications should be checked.

Peatland Programme

TAB Agrees to revisit this once feedback has been received by project developers
as clearer position will be presented at TAB.

ACTIONS: PC Team to consult Project Developers on their willingness to adopt the platform

ACTIONS: Check potential subsidy-control implications of making the platform mandatory.

ACTIONS: PC Team to raise further information to the TAB in the future