

---

**MINUTES OF THE FSA BOARD MEETING HELD ON 23 JULY 2014 AT AVIATION HOUSE, FROM 09:00-13:05**

**Present:**

Tim Bennett, Chair; Henrietta Campbell, Deputy Chair; Liz Breckenridge; Jeff Halliwell; Jim Wildgoose; Paul Wiles; Jim Smart; Heather Peck, Ram Gidoomal

**Officials attending:**

Catherine Brown, FSA Chief Executive  
Andrew Rhodes, Chief Operating Officer  
Steve Wearne, Director of Policy  
Chris Hitchen, Director of Finance and Strategic Planning  
Linden Jack, Head of Food Hygiene Policy  
Rod Ainsworth, Director of Regulatory and Legal Strategy  
Liz Olney, Head of Operations Assurance  
Chris Hitchen, Director of Finance and Strategic Planning  
Rebecca Merritt, Head of Private Office

**Apologies for absence:**

Roland Salmon

**WELCOME AND ANNOUNCEMENTS**

1. The Chair welcomed everyone to the meeting. In particular, he welcomed Dr Evangelia Gkiza, the Head of Food Enterprise Control in Greece, and Professor Guy Poppy, the FSA's new Chief Scientific Advisor, both seated in the audience.
2. The Chair reminded all Board members to declare any relevant conflicts of interest before discussions.
3. The Chair passed on apologies for absence from Board member, Roland Salmon, Chair Welsh Food Advisory Committee (WFAC) who was representing the FSA at the 2014 Royal Welsh Agricultural Show in Builth Wells. The Chair had attended the WFAC meeting last week and would ensure the WFAC's comments were taken into consideration throughout the meeting in Roland's absence.
4. No items for Any Other Business were raised.

**MINUTES OF MEETING HELD ON 11 JUNE 2014 (FSA 14/07/01)**

5. There were no amendments to the minutes and these were accepted as an accurate record of the 11 June 2014 meeting.

---

**ACTIONS ARISING (FSA 14/07/02)**

6. The Chair commented that an action from the minutes of the 11 June 2014 meeting did not appear on the list of Actions Arising. This was an update briefing for the Board on the work of the Transatlantic Trade and Investment Partnership (TTIP).

ACTION: Board Secretariat

7. Steve Wearne confirmed that the action from the TSE controls paper (14/06/04) to provide the Board with a short paper on controls used over imports of meat from non EU countries had been completed on 17 July 2014.
8. Steve Wearne also addressed the action to offer further clarification regarding the monitoring figures included in the TSE controls paper (14/06/04). Steve explained that a greater number of slaughtered cattle had been tested in Northern Ireland than in Great Britain between September 2013 and March 2014 because Great Britain had moved from 100% supervision of SRM controls to testing based on risk ahead of NI.

**CHAIR'S REPORT**

9. The Chair advised the Board of the list that had been published of the many useful engagements he had attended since the last Board meeting. He drew particular attention to the well-attended FSA Parliamentary Reception on 18 June 2014 and thanked the Public Health Minister, Jane Ellison MP, for speaking at it. Food Safety Week had been well supported by all political parties and industry.
10. The Chair advised that the Food and Feed Safety Report written at the request of the Minister of Health for Wales was due to be published that afternoon by the Welsh Government. Roland Salmon was representing the FSA at the event at which the Minister of Health for Wales was making a statement. The Chair had undertaken some embargoed pre-recorded media the previous day and once the Report was published it would be sent to the Board.

ACTION: Board Secretariat

**CHIEF EXECUTIVE'S REPORT (FSA 14/07/03)**

11. The Chief Executive advised that since her written report had been circulated, the FSA had published its fourth quarterly report of industry results from the testing of meat products for horsemeat or horse DNA and no positive samples had been identified. Further, the UK had taken part in the second round of EU-wide testing for undeclared horsemeat in processed beef products; none of the 150 samples taken by 24 Local Authorities on behalf of the FSA had found any traces of horsemeat. Catherine thanked the Local Authorities for their hard work.

12. In answer to a question Catherine confirmed that discussions were continuing with Rutland Council to encourage their take up of the Food Hygiene Rating Scheme (FHRS).

13. Further comments were made on FHRS, on the FSA's Diversity report and Campylobacter/Food Safety Week.

14. A Board member asked about the FSA's internal controls to ensure that its use of powers under the Regulation of Investigatory Powers Act 2000 was appropriate. Rod Ainsworth confirmed that such powers were only exercised when serious levels of criminality involved the potential for a risk to food safety.

15. The Chair highlighted the success of Food Safety Week, in particular the use of social media, and thanked everyone at the FSA and all our partners for their hard work.

**UPDATE ON FSA REVIEW OF CONTROLS FOR RAW DRINKING MILK (RDM) IN ENGLAND, WALES AND NORTHERN IRELAND AND PROPOSAL FOR FUTURE CONTROLS (FSA 14/07/04)**

16. The Chair welcomed Steve Wearne, Director of Policy, and Linden Jack, Head of Food Hygiene Policy, to the table.

17. The Chair clarified that, his register of interests included his past ownership of dairy cows up to 11 years ago and former chairmanship of a DEFRA body on statutory levies. He acknowledged that RDM was a sensitive and complicated issue which required considerations of public health to be balanced with considerations of consumer choice and said that it was therefore a good thing that it would be debated in open session as is FSA practice. Tim thanked all the many people who had contributed to the FSA consultation.

18. Steve Wearne introduced the paper as marking a significant point in the review of controls on RDM in England, Wales and Northern Ireland commissioned by the Board in late 2012. There were wider principles at play here which would inform the FSA's general approach to other "risky" foods, on which the FSA planned to revert to the Board in November 2014.

19. Steve thanked Linden Jack and her team for pulling together the wide body of evidence for the review. While the evidence was extensive, particularly in comparison to the evidence base relating to other "niche" foods, as is reflected in the consultation document, Steve acknowledged there were still gaps in knowledge. The Advisory Committee on the Microbiological Safety of Foods

(ACMSF) had agreed a method of ranking evidence and expressing uncertainty in relation to qualitative risk assessments so that people taking decisions on risk management understood the strength of the scientific evidence that would, along with other considerations, be informing their decision making. This system would indicate the scientific data in this case was of moderate quality and there was medium uncertainty associated with the risk assessment.

20. Steve advised the focus of the paper was securing the Board's agreement that the preferred option in the impact assessment should be refined to consider in more detail approaches to continued restricted sales of raw drinking milk with particular reference to considering the possible role of vending machines, which are favoured by raw drinking milk consumers and are used abroad.
21. The Chair introduced a short video of the FSA's RDM stakeholder engagement event designed to illustrate some of the range of views expressed at that event. Linden Jack then outlined some of the other consumer and producer engagement that had informed the development of the paper.
22. The Board noted that a lack of evidence of recent recorded illness did not mean there was a lack of risk from RDM and reflected that it was possible that harm was materialising that we were unaware of because of the relatively low level of current consumption, which could be increased if controls were materially liberalised. Linden Jack fed back that the advice from Public Health England was that the enhanced surveillance arrangements in place for VTEC (*E.coli*) and listeria were such as to make them relatively confident that if harm was occurring as a result of raw milk consumption cases of raw milk consumers falling ill would have emerged from that programme.
23. They agreed with the WFAC's suggestion that ACMSF be asked whether they had anything further to add to their opinion in 2011 on this issue, and whether there was any new evidence that they considered should be taken into account.
24. There was some discussion of the desirability of having better and more complete evidence as to the pathogens present in unpasteurised milk, and Steve said that one of the additional controls that would be considered if the recommendation in the paper was agreed was a requirement on producers to test for pathogens and publish their results, which could then inform future risk assessments by ACMSF. He clarified that up until now our controls have relied upon hygiene indicator organisms because they enable us to check that HACCP plans are in place and being applied, rather than pathogen counts, because they are so rare and low as to be less powerful in this context.
25. The Board pointed out that changes to distribution arrangements might have significant impact on both the number and the nature of producers and

consumers of unpasteurised milk, particularly given the significantly enhanced pricing of this product compared to pasteurised milk. The Chair said WFAC had discussed the potential for a change not just in levels of consumption but also in the pattern of consumption of RDM. An increase in the number of people consuming RDM could put vulnerable or less well informed consumers at risk. It is therefore important for any changes to current distribution arrangements to consider the likely impact in terms of potentially more vulnerable consumers being exposed to risk. Steve Wearne identified that one of the additional controls that could be considered if the paper was agreed was the possible application of a licencing scheme for producers to ensure that new entrants continue to sustain the high level of hygiene standards that the policy team had seen demonstrated on their visits to current producers.

26. Two Board members expressed contentment with the current control regime for unpasteurised milk and were unconvinced of the need for any changes. There was strong support for the proposal in the paper that the issue return to the Board for a decision on any possible changes to controls after EFSA has completed their review of raw drinking milk and informed by an updated view from ACMSF.
27. The Chief Executive said that in her view there was a need for changes to current arrangements, including for example in the area of labelling, given that currently consumers were drinking this product with no explicit information on pack about the associated risks, particularly those to the very young and other vulnerable groups. She emphasised the reference in the paper to considering who should pay for the costs of enhanced controls over raw drinking milk, given the importance of getting to a robust, sustainably resourced control system. A Board member also raised the issue of internet sales as being an area that required further consideration. A Board member also commented that given the high price attached to this higher risk product it was right that producers be expected to bear the costs of control.
28. There was some discussion about consumer perspectives on this issue. Existing consumers of raw milk have strong views well represented at the engagement event. The FSA had also carried out insight research with the wider population, of whom approximately 2% had consumed unpasteurised milk, and of whom a majority considered that people should have the choice of whether to purchase raw milk.
29. Dr Henrietta Campbell, Chair NIFAC, agreed and said the NIFAC did not see the issue as widening access to RDM rather it was about making the choice to drink RDM or not easier for consumers. She pointed out that no-one is saying that unpasteurised milk is as safe as pasteurised milk – pasteurisation has delivered great public health benefits and we would not wish to encourage more consumption. She referred to the video shown earlier and the assertion therein

that the benefits to children of drinking RDM outweighed the risks and emphasised the risks to infants of exposing them to the potential hazards of raw milk. This was an example of where consumers needed more and better information and clear consistent labelling was critical as part of that.

30. The Chair summarised that this was a difficult issue which needed to balance public health with consumer choice. The Board agreed the position outlined in the paper that there would be no immediate changes to the controls over raw drinking milk. They had expressed their concerns over potential wider access to a higher risk product and asked that further consideration be given in the final paper that will come to them to the likelihood of expansion in this market and the associated risks. They had also emphasised the importance of testing and sampling which should be reflected in the final paper. There had been much emphasis on the importance of labelling. The Chair emphasised that modernisation of controls did not necessarily equate to liberalisation. He asked that the final recommendations on this matter be brought forward to the Board after further work and further consultation, and in light of the outcome of the EFSA review. He also asked that ACMSF be given the opportunity to comment further in light of the Board's discussion.

31. He thanked Linden, Steve and the team for the effort they continue to invest in this complex area.

#### **UPDATE ON REVIEW OF AUDIT ARRANGEMENTS IN FSA APPROVED MEAT ESTABLISHMENTS WITHIN THE UK (FSA 14/07/05)**

32. The Chair welcomed Liz Olney (Head of Operations Assurance) and Rod Ainsworth (Director of Regulatory and Legal Strategy) to the table and asked Andrew Rhodes (Chief Operating Officer) to introduce the paper.

33. Andrew briefly thanked all of those involved in putting together the new proposals within the FSA and industry partners and mentioned Kenny Thoreson (Operations Change and Support Team Leader) in particular as having been key to their speedy and effective completion. He said that the new system represents a much more robust approach, with a fresh pair of specialist auditor's eyes brought in to challenge and assure compliance, and that this was excellent news for consumers, and he was very pleased that industry had been so supportive. He warned that in his view this is likely to lead to some re-baselining of compliance levels.

34. Liz Olney reminded the Board that proposals for change were discussed in January and a public consultation then took place between February and May. No immediate issues had arisen from the consultation apart from some concerns regarding the positioning of auditors' reporting lines. Liz also advised that the

appointment of a dedicated trained and skilled audit team had now taken place and that the plan was that the intensity of any future audits would be based on risks, assessed as part of the audit process and underpinned by objective requirements. She also explained that there was a proposal to introduce a two-step external route of appeal, similar to the Local Authority one introduced earlier in the year.

35. Board members expressed their congratulations on the excellent work that had been achieved. Questions were raised regarding the reporting lines, the appeals mechanism, and the rate set for the costs of appeals.
36. Liz responded that the veterinary auditors go into Food Business Operators (FBO's) as part of the official controls function which is why the function is an integral part of Operations. Should auditors carrying out checks on the compliance of FBOs with regulations come across any cases of poor performance by FSA staff they would raise those concerns with the Head of Field Operations, who would take appropriate corrective measures. The Internal Audit function of the FSA, which reports to the Director of Regulatory Strategy, regularly independently reviews the effectiveness of FSA staff and will review whether any concerns raised by the veterinary auditors have been appropriately followed up. The results of Internal Audit reports on this area, in common with all others, will be reported to the Audit and Risk Committee. The Chief Executive said that the decision about the most effective structure and which Directorate this function should reside within was one for her, rather than Operations itself, and that she had given careful consideration to the options before deciding that the approach outlined in the paper was the correct one – largely on the basis that seeking to replicate expertise in the application of official controls elsewhere in the organisation would be expensive and represent poor value for money, and that the approach ensured regular independent challenge by the internal audit function.
37. Rod Ainsworth responded that the cost set for a Stage 2 appeal of £250 was based on industry proposals to have a sum which would be likely to deter frivolous complaints. The overall costs of the system including the basic administration of appeals make up part of the meat charging regime. It is expected that the volume of appeals will remain very small and this is therefore unlikely to be a material burden but this can be reviewed as part of the proposed 6 month review of the operation of the new system.
38. The Chair of SFAC welcomed the proposals and said that he noted the good collaboration that had produced them. He noted the break in the data that would be produced by the re-baselining but considered it to be a price worth paying for a more robust system.

39. The Board noted the feedback to the public consultation, agreed the arrangements for FBO Audits to be carried out by skilled auditors independent from the day to day official controls within plants and agreed the independent audit arrangements by the FSA Internal Audit Team. The Board also agreed the August 2014 system launch date and that the Board would be updated on the new arrangements six months after implementation. The Chair advised that the Board were very satisfied at the outcome of the paper and thanked everyone involved internally and externally for their hard work in the process.

#### **REDUCTION OF CAMPYLOBACTER FROM POULTRY: PUBLICATION OF THE RETAIL SURVEY RESULTS FSA (14/07/07)**

40. The Chair introduced the paper and apologised for its late publication but said that it was important to have the opportunity of the open Board Meeting to discuss it. He also advised that he had received a letter from Richard Lloyd, Executive Director of Which? concerning the publication of retail survey results and that it had been circulated to the Board and would be published shortly on food.gov. The Chair then asked Steve Wearne to introduce the paper.

41. Steve introduced the paper by saying the question for discussion was not whether we would publish the data from our study but when we publish it. He reminded the Board and others of the human health impacts of campylobacter, of the FSA's determination to tackle it and of the fact that it is the responsibility of the food industry to ensure that the food they sell is safe.

42. The survey of Campylobacter in retail chicken needed to be seen within the context of the overall strategic approach agreed by the Board in September 2013. In brief, the aim is to balance information to consumers on the risks and how they could manage them in the way they store and prepare poultry at home; and maintain the impetus for retailers, producers, and everyone else involved in the supply chain to tackle and reduce Campylobacter contamination.

43. Examples of interventions which have been made included:

- the Acting on Campylobacter Together Event (ACT event) last month, which brought retailers, producers and other stakeholders together to assess progress, restate their commitment, and prioritise new interventions to reduce Campylobacter contamination;
- the success of Food Safety Week, as described by the Chief Executive in her report earlier in the Board meeting.

44. Steve's current assessment was that:

- the FSA had gained traction at a senior level in both retailers and producers;

- we have seen significant commitment of resource from a range of players in trialling interventions and a new willingness to share the costs of these across the industry;
- we now needed to support and recognise that investment, while looking to ensure that the momentum is sustained and that action leads to a reduction in human illness.

45. Against this background, there had been a considered approach to publishing the results of the retail survey. The FSA had recognised that:

- publishing the names of retailers and producers before we had the full results of the survey would not be unprecedented, but would be contrary to our published protocols on conducting and reporting surveys;
- to proceed in this way would require us to identify benefits that outweigh the risks and, given the traction with and commitment of industry, our judgement is that the risks we have set out in the paper outweigh the benefits.

46. The Board were therefore being asked to endorse the recommendations at section 4 of the paper which were that:

- on a quarterly basis we publish news stories showing the overall results from the retail survey, drawing such overall conclusions as we are able, but that we do not publish with those quarterly news stories details of individual samples and their provenance;
- we restate our commitment to publish the full results when the survey is complete early next summer, including information on the performance of each retailer and each producer.

47. There was universal commitment amongst Board and Executive members to do what was best for consumers.

48. A number of Board members felt that this required meeting the commitment made previously to publish details of samples quarterly. Their feeling was that, although it may be a challenge for the Comms and media teams, with the right levels of communication and caveats included, publishing the data would continue to keep the pressure on industry and give consumers access to data in which they have an interest.

49. Other Board members felt that it would not be in the interests of consumers to publish data which was not statistically significant. This might lead to confusion and could be misleading in informing their consumer choices.

50. It was acknowledged that the guidance of the UK Statistics Authority should be taken into account and as far as possible complied with in decisions relating to the publication of statistics.
51. Board members felt that it was highly desirable to arrive at a position where statistically robust data such as to provide useful information for consumers was available as quickly as possible, and there was a strong shared appetite to bring that forward to a date before the completion of the full year of testing.
52. The Chair concluded the discussions and called for a vote on the proposals in the paper, amended by a commitment to carry out immediate work to bring forward publication of robust comparative data. The Board voted 5-4 in favour of the amendment to carry out immediate work to bring forward the publication of robust comparative data as soon as possible and supported the proposals in the paper that:
- on a quarterly basis we publish news stories showing the overall results from the retail survey, drawing such overall conclusions as we are able, but that we do not publish with those quarterly news stories details of individual samples and their provenance;
  - we restate our commitment to publish the full results when the survey is complete early next summer, including information on the performance of each retailer and each producer.
53. It was also agreed to form a Board working group to facilitate agreement on the additional commitment. The group would give immediate focus to what could be done to bring forward the publication of robust comparative data as soon as possible.

ACTION: Director of Policy

#### **FOOD STANDARDS SCOTLAND – FSA (UK) PROJECT UPDATE (14/07/06)**

54. The Chair welcomed Rod Ainsworth and Chris Hitchen (Director of Finance and Strategic Planning) to the table. He advised the Board that he had consulted with Rod Ainsworth on whether there were any issues regarding the two Board Members, appointed by Scotland, being present. As the paper did not include any financial issues, there was no reason for them to exclude themselves. The Chair asked Chris to introduce the paper.
55. Chris briefly explained that, following the Scottish Government's announcement that it was their intention to create a new food body in April 2015, the FSA made a commitment to support the establishment of the new food body and the paper was seeking agreement to the proposed changes to the current Food Standards

Act via an order in council to continue to support Scottish Ministers. Chris was also looking for comments, especially on Para 3.6, on the arrangements as to how information could be shared and relationships built in the future.

56. The Chair of SFAC agreed with the proposals and advised that the final title of the new body (page 5, recommendation 9 – Food Standards Scotland) had not yet been decided. Further questions arose from Board members concerning the appointment of a shadow Chair and whether continuing collaboration on nutrition between Scotland and Northern Ireland was being considered.

57. Catherine advised that Scotland officials and Ministers are aware of the need for a shadow Chair and that Geoff Ogle and his Team were working on the design and recommendations of work-streams and structures, and that nutrition teams were involved in this and considering arrangements for future collaboration.

58. A further question arose about vesting day (1<sup>st</sup> April 2015) and whether there were any identified risks if this was not achieved. Chris replied that a number of key staff had already been seconded across to support the Project Manager and that many of the key work-streams were progressing well. He also advised that the Memorandum of Understanding (MoU) was nearing completion.

59. The Chair summarised that the Board noted the progress, agreed the proposed changes to the Food Standards Act via the Order of Council and had commented favourably on the proposed arrangements to build relationships outlined in para.3.6

#### **UPDATE OF AUDIT AND RISK ASSURANCE COMMITTEE MEETING ON 22 JULY 2014**

60. Paul Wiles (Chair of Audit and Risk Assurance Committee – ARAC) reported that the first meeting of the Committee had agreed a work plan. He also explained that at the last Board meeting the Terms of Reference were discussed and changes proposed by Board members had now been incorporated. For the forward agenda for the year, the Committee had ensured that all issues had been considered so that the Board could be reassured that the audit arrangements and risk approach was sound and in line with the Treasury model. Finally, the previous Internal Audit plan was considered and endorsed by the new committee. Paul would aim to brief the Board in the same way following any future ARAC meetings.

61. The Chair thanked Paul and ARAC members for their work.

#### **REPORTS FROM THE CHAIRS OF THE FOOD ADVISORY COMMITTEES (INFO 14/07/01–03)**

62. Etta Campbell (NIFAC) had nothing to add to the report already provided.

63. Jim Wildgoose (SFAC) reported that the Scottish Government had issued a new consultation document called “Becoming a good food nation” and that there may be some implications on food safety issues in the future. He expected SFAC to consider this document once the consultation was finished but would pass on more information in the future.

64. Tim Bennett was picking up WFAC in Roland Salmon’s absence. Taking into account the aspects covered at the Board Meeting, he felt there were no additional items.

#### **ANY OTHER BUSINESS**

65. The Chair advised that there was no other business to report and closed the Board Meeting.

#### **DATE OF NEXT MEETING**

66. The next meeting of the FSA Board will take place on Wednesday 10 September 2014 in Belfast.

**ANNEXE 1**

**MINUTES OF THE FSA BOARD WORKING GROUP MEETING ON THE PUBLICATION OF THE RETAIL SURVEY RESULTS ON THE REDUCTION OF CAMPYLOBACTER FROM POULTRY HELD ON 19 AUGUST 2014 AT AVIATION HOUSE, FROM 13:00-14:45**

**Present:**

Tim Bennett, Chair; Henrietta Campbell, Deputy Chair; Liz Breckenridge; Jim Smart; Roland Salmon

**Officials attending:**

Catherine Brown, FSA Chief Executive  
Steve Wearne, Director of Policy  
Kevin Hargin, Head of Foodborne Disease  
Project Manager of the Retail Chicken Survey  
Cliff Gay, Head Statistician

1. Tim Bennett welcomed everyone to the meeting and said the group would look at the technical details of what was possible to bring forward publication of robust comparative data. This would inform discussion about what to do next and what to announce when.
2. A Board member raised four issues:
  - The possibility of increasing the sampling size to publish data on all retailers in Q2
  - The effect on statistical significance and on published data of increasing or decreasing the number of samples from 100
  - The options to publish processor data by name
  - The pros and cons of publishing the results as Official Statistics
3. On the possibility of increasing the sampling size to publish data on all retailers in Q2, bringing forward the whole survey to before Christmas was not recommended as seasonality would affect the results if a full year was not covered and it would make it difficult to do a year on year comparison going forward; also existing contracted lab capacity could not cope. To increase the number of retailers in a quarter would distort the statistics as we were still working to the original project design and sampling frame. The FSA could still publish earlier but we would still need to reach the statistically robust threshold of a sample size of 100 which had been suggested by the FSA Statistics Branch.
4. Regarding the effect on statistical significance and on publishing data of increasing or decreasing the number of samples from 100, it was explained that the rationale for a threshold of 100 samples was that this corresponded

to a 95% confidence interval of +/- 10% in our estimate of prevalence of Campylobacter for that retailer. To decrease the sample size to 50, for example, would give a confidence interval of +/- 15%.

5. The question was raised of how much imprecision the FSA would be happy discussing with the retailers and the press. This could decide the number of samples required before publication.
6. The Chief Executive confirmed that we would have data over the 100 sample size threshold for the largest retailers and aggregated groupings for smaller retailers in November 2014. This would represent 70-80% of retail whole fresh chickens by volume.
7. If we decided to publish those retailers results with less than 100 samples this would increase the level of uncertainty with regards to Confidence Intervals. Nevertheless, using this approach, we could then additionally publish two of the smaller retailers' results in the next quarter. There was a discussion about whether we could publish results for further retailers whose market share might have increased in the interim period since the survey design. Because they had not been specified as named groups with their own samples in the design of the survey (because of their relatively lower market share in fresh chicken at the time the survey was designed and commissioned) the samples from these retailers had not been designed to be representative of their total chicken supply. So on balance it was agreed that such samples could not be properly and robustly compared to those of the groups who had been specified and for whom the samples were designed to be representative.
8. **After further discussion, the group agreed to increase the confidence interval to +/- 14% for Q2 data. This would bring forward to Q2 results for the main 7 Supermarket retailers. The group agreed the names of retailers within the aggregated groupings would not be published in detail until the end of the 12 month survey.**
9. Board members said it would be important that the information was communicated to consumers in as straightforward a form as possible. We would need to give retailers the chance to explain what action they were taking in light of the results. It was noted that, given the relatively large confidence intervals relating to the data and Q2, and also the fact that the data would be historical and different groups would be taking different steps to address the problem, we would need to advise consumers that the relativities may change significantly in future quarters, and therefore reinforcing the importance of handling chicken correctly would be more appropriate than changing retailer on the basis of the first comparative data.

---

**The group agreed with the publication date of November 2014 for Q2 data.**

10. With regard to the options to publish processor data by name, the Chief Executive explained the original survey was designed to look at retailers rather than processors so the samples would not necessarily be representative by processor; the FSA had already published information on processors; and given the change in the presence of campylobacter between the end of the production line and the retail shelf, data on processors was better gathered at the end of the production line rather than on the retail shelf. Consumers were also unlikely to be able to readily identify the producer of a supermarket chicken - for them the retailer was the most relevant differentiator. Summary data on processor by plant which would be of interest to retailers would be available at the end of the survey year.
11. **After further discussion, the group agreed not to publish the results by processor until the end of the survey.**
12. The group discussed the pros and cons of publishing the results as official statistics. Tim Bennett said he would want to follow the normal process with regard to publishing FSA statistics. Cliff Gay assured the group that each case would be considered on its merits but that in discussion with the Deputy Head of the National Statistics Office, he had expressed the view that it would be appropriate in this case.
13. The Chief Executive noted that under ONS protocols we would only be able to give retailers one day's notice of the results as opposed to three. **The group agreed that the results for Q3 and Q4 should be released as official statistics.**
14. Finally, Tim Bennett said that when we announce in the Chair's report and the Chief Executive's report at the September Board meeting that we will publish Q2 results in November, we should also **announce a timeline for what is going to happen and when for the remainder of the survey to address questions about Q3 and Q4.**
15. In summary the Working Group agreed:
  - To publish data on prevalence of Campylobacter which had 95% confidence intervals of up to +/- 15%. This would allow publication of data for the main 7 retailers from Q2, as sufficient samples would have been taken and the survey design should ensure that samples from

these retailers were representative of the fresh whole chickens they sell to consumers. Although similar numbers of samples may have been taken from other retailers, the survey design included these in the category of 'other retailers' according to previous market share. This meant we would not have the same confidence that samples would be representative and so we should continue to report them aggregated in the 'other retailers' category. The provenance of all samples tested would be identified at the end of Q4, and the Working Group agreed that we would help consumers and other readers interpret these data on publication

- To publish Q2 data in November 2014
- To publish the results by processor at the end of the survey
- The results for Q3 and Q4 should be released as official statistics
- To announce a timeline for what is going to happen when for the remainder of the survey to address questions about Q3 and Q4