
**MINUTES OF THE FSA BOARD MEETING HELD ON 18 NOVEMBER 2015 AT
AVIATION HOUSE, LONDON FROM 09:00-12:20**

Present:

Tim Bennett, Chair; Heather Hancock, Deputy Chairwoman; Henrietta Campbell; Jim Smart; Heather Peck; Ram Gidoomal; Paul Wiles; Roland Salmon, Jeff Halliwell

Officials attending:

Catherine Brown, FSA Chief Executive
Steve Wearne, FSA Director of Policy
Guy Poppy, FSA Chief Scientific Adviser
Penny Bramwell, FSA Director of Science, Evidence and Research
Patrick Miller, Head of Science Strategy and Governance
Will Creswell, Head of Consumer Protection
Rebecca Merritt, FSA Head of Private Office

Also in attendance:

Professor Colin Dennis, Expert member of the General Advisory Committee on Science (GACS)

WELCOME AND ANNOUNCEMENTS

1. The Chair welcomed everyone to the meeting and welcomed Heather Hancock as the new Deputy Chairwoman of the FSA Board. The Chair reminded all Board members to declare any relevant conflicts of interest before discussions.

MINUTES OF MEETING HELD ON 9 SEPTEMBER 2015 (FSA 15/011/01)

2. The Chair said the minutes had been circulated informally to Board members for comments before the papers were finalised and on the basis of those comments, the recording of the September meeting had been viewed again and some amendments made to the minutes. The Chair asked that the minutes now be accepted by the Board as accurate.
3. Roland Salmon and Etta Campbell asked that the minutes be amended to more fully reflect the views of the minority of Board members who voted against the proposal. The Chair said the minutes reflected that the vote had been taken on the basis of being for or against the proposal as put forward in the paper presented on rare burgers. The Chair said the recording of the discussion would be looked at again and the minutes could be amended to include a further reflection of what was recorded on the video.

ACTION: Board Secretariat

4. A Board member suggested that paragraph 47 of the minutes be re-worded to be clearer.

ACTION: Board Secretariat

ACTIONS ARISING (FSA 15/11/02)

5. The Director of Policy said the Board would be updated at their next meeting regarding the timescales for the work stream actions which came out of the September 2015 Board meeting discussion on the paper presented on Rare Burgers.

ACTION: Director of Policy

CHAIR'S REPORT

6. The Chair said the list of engagements he had undertaken since the last Board meeting had been published on the website. He congratulated everyone involved in the visits he had made to Norwich City Council and to Belfast for the launch of MenuCal.
7. The Chair said during the Board's annual retreat to Manchester they had been impressed to see the work of Fareshare in reducing food waste.
8. The Chair said the Chief Executive and he had met with the EU Commissioner for Health and Food Safety, Vytenis Andriukaitis, in Brussels and the Chair had spoken at a well-attended EU stakeholder seminar on food safety.
9. Finally, the Chair thanked the Westminster Public Health Minister, Jane Ellison MP, for speaking at the FSA's parliamentary reception which most Board members had attended.

CHIEF EXECUTIVE'S REPORT (FSA 15/11/03)

10. Catherine Brown said since her report had been written, the results of the 2015 Civil Service People Survey had been released and Catherine was grateful to the 92% of FSA staff who had responded. Catherine was delighted that the FSA's engagement score had increased from 53% to 60% over the year. This put us 2% above the Civil Service average and only 3% behind the benchmark of Civil Service high performers, which we had set ourselves the target of achieving next year.
11. In response to a question, Catherine said we had had a very good, close working relationship with Food Standards Scotland (FSS) since it had come into existence in April 2015. The Chairs of the two organisations were committed to meeting twice yearly. We would continue to refine the cross border incident management protocol which was working well and although there was still a risk relating to the outstanding financial settlement, Catherine was positive that it would be successfully resolved.
12. The Chair agreed a meeting of Board members might be useful, particularly for new Board members after their appointment who would have no experience of Scotland being part of the FSA; discussion of such a meeting with the FSS Chair was on the agenda for their next meeting in early 2016.

13. Regarding the timeline for completion of the review of the FSA's Scientific Advisory Committees, Catherine said we did not expect to get Cabinet Office clearance until spring 2016.
14. There was a discussion about the impact of the recently introduced 5p charge for carrier bags in shops in England in relation to the presence of Campylobacter on packaging. Steve Wearne said the 5p charge had been in existence in Wales since 2011 and the advice to consumers was: pack raw meat in a separate bag; keep a bag to use for raw meat only; and discard bags, rather than wash them, if any packaging leaked.
15. The Board pointed out that there were inconsistencies in the offer of free barrier bags for consumers purchasing packaged raw meat. Catherine said we would write to supermarkets with guidelines for good practice on the use of barrier bags for raw meat and ask them to let us know what practices they followed.

Action: Director of Policy

16. A Board member welcomed the implementation of the Welfare of Animals at the Time of Killing (England) Regulations (WATOK) 2015 but she asked why the British Veterinary Association (BVA) and others had expressed concern over the fact that there were differences between the Regulations in Wales and Northern Ireland, and England. She also asked whether there were circumstances in which an ineffective water bath stun was worse than no stun.
17. Catherine explained that the England Regulations exempted (or dis-applied) the stunning parameters contained in the EU Regulations for those conducting slaughter by religious rites, even where a pre slaughter stun was used. This was intended to protect the rights of religious communities and was in line with the commitment in the Conservative Party manifesto to protect the rights of religious communities to carry out religious slaughter.
18. Catherine acknowledged concerns on this issue. The stunning parameters had been set to ensure that stunning was effective and there was a risk that stunning outside the parameters could immobilise the bird without stunning it. The Farm Animal Welfare Committee (FAWC) had considered the impact of ineffective stunning and was of the view that it was unlikely to be worse than not stunning and that there were marginal benefits to the bird being immobilised.
19. Catherine confirmed in an answer to a question that meat marked with the Red Tractor assurance scheme label was always stunned and would be stunned in conformity with the parameters.
20. The Chair said Defra was the lead department on animal welfare policy and their decision to implement the WATOK regulations in England significantly improved our ability to take enforcement action on welfare issues where they arose. He said we were pleased that the new regulations had come into force and thanked the Defra Minister for bringing this forward before the end of the year.

21. There was a brief discussion of acrylamide and how consumers could reduce their level of exposure to it. Catherine said the Board would be receiving a paper on chemical contaminants in food including acrylamide at their March 2016 meeting.
22. The Board congratulated those involved in the work the FSA had submitted to a cross-government Data Science competition which had been awarded first and joint third place from 41 entries. It was noted that the development of these pieces of work exemplified the kind of working, with students and others, that the FSA needed to build in order to meet the appetite for innovation in the Strategy.

FSA SCIENCE, EVIDENCE AND INFORMATION STRATEGY 2015-20 DELIVERY PLAN (FSA 15/11/04)

23. The Chair welcomed Penny Bramwell, FSA Director of Science, Evidence and Research and Patrick Miller, Head of Science Strategy and Governance to the table. The Chair also thanked Professor Colin Dennis, expert member of the General Advisory Committee on Science (GACS) for joining the team at the table for the discussion. The Chair invited Guy Poppy, the FSA's Chief Scientific Adviser, to introduce the paper.
24. Guy said the FSA Strategy and Strategic Plan made clear that effective use of science would be crucial to achieving our ambitious goals protecting consumers' interests in relation to food. The Plan set a strategic objective that:

We will use science, evidence and information both to tackle the challenges of today, and to identify and contribute to addressing emerging risks for the future.

25. The Science, Evidence and Information (SEI) Strategy and its Delivery Plan set out how we would do this. In March 2015, the Board had agreed the framework for the SEI Strategy and that this should shape the development of activities that formed its Delivery Plan.
26. Since then we had developed the Delivery Plan, consulting across the FSA and with more than 200 external stakeholders, including government and other research funders, as well as reflecting the Board discussion and progress, and wider developments.
27. Penny Bramwell said that in early 2016 once we had the outcome of the Spending Review and had gone through our business planning and prioritisation processes, we would put a detailed programme of work into the public domain and ask for feedback from the Board and others. Penny said that one of the clear messages that emerged from the stakeholder engagement was that devolution presented opportunities to use Wales and Northern Ireland as places to develop and test innovative approaches for example, to evaluate the mandatory display of FHRS ratings.
28. There was some discussion about the importance of data and how to turn data into information and knowledge. The Board said we had to look for data beyond traditional scientific sources; for example to industry, as the private sector was investing significant amounts of money in researching consumer behaviour now and in the

future. This would allow us to combine our scientific data with commercial data on how consumers actually behaved at home. With regard to sharing data with us, Guy said it was easier to get industry to share safety information with us as it was pre-competitive, whereas information about consumers was competitive and so industry had more concerns about sharing it. However, the Turing Institute and the Data Catapult were two initiatives which could help to develop approaches to how commercial data could be shared in a restricted way to the benefit of everyone.

29. Penny also highlighted the FSA's innovative use of social media to gather data to anticipate outbreaks of the Norovirus, and through working in partnership with NHS Choices and the Department for Education, facilitate interventions ahead of them.
30. The Chair of NIFAC pointed out the continuing importance of supporting the nutrition agenda in NI and ensuring it was underpinned by a strong evidence base. Guy said the human microbiome was an exciting new area of science in human health and with its focus on the importance of diet could be an area of work with big impact for the nutrition agenda in Northern Ireland.
31. Guy said prioritising work within the Delivery Plan would be a challenge and would need to focus on contribution to strategic objectives. Penny said we were piloting a new approach whereby we would publish our overall research programme annually for external consultation. This would help to identify new synergies, make the best use of public resources, avoid duplication of effort and test the robustness of our plans. The Board said this level of openness about the work we were doing and why would bring benefits in terms of supporting collaboration and was a model the rest of Government should look to emulate.
32. The Board highlighted the contribution SEI had made to the framework the Board used to take risk-based decisions and said we needed to go further and look at how to compare risks and detriments. Catherine agreed that this should include consideration of tools such as Quality Adjusted Life Years (QALYs) or Willingness to Pay, but these could be expensive and labour intensive to develop in the food area. Nevertheless, Catherine said we would continue to explore the potential of these and other tools.
33. The Chair of the Welsh Food Advisory Committee (WFAC) said the Committee were interested in references in the Delivery Plan to an affordable and healthy diet, which was highly pertinent to Wales, and in the scientific initiatives to understand and support it. Guy said there were a number of areas of research and collaboration that related to this area including work on the human microbiome, and on safe food waste reduction, and an affordable and healthy diet was also being addressed through the FSA's work on Food Futures. The FSA was contributing to a workshop on climate change and food in December 2015 and convening a Food Futures Conference in February 2016 to discuss how the FSA could work with others to understand and respond to these issues.
34. The Chair agreed with the Chair of WFAC that it was important not to appear English-centric and to properly reflect Welsh and NI food and farming initiatives on the same basis as Defra initiatives were reflected in the Plan.

35. A Board member said that a few years ago work had been done on how the FSA could safeguard its independence and the quality of its evidence when entering strategic partnerships, which could be worth reviewing. Another member said that the FSA should consider strategic data sharing partnerships with NHS Community Trusts.
36. Regarding the quality of our evidence and research, Guy said that we assured the quality of third party research through peer review. He said that we were most interested in strategic partnerships with third parties such as the Research Councils whose research was world-leading and improved the quality of our evidence, as opposed to partnerships with third parties where quality would be of concern.
37. Penny confirmed that a root and branch review of our Quality Assurance framework was ongoing. Patrick said this work would become even more important as the base from which we gathered our evidence broadened to include, for example, social media. It would also help us understand where more or different evidence might have a significant effect on a decision, or trigger a review, thus helping us to prioritise future needs
38. Professor Colin Dennis said the General Advisory Committee on Science (GACS) had welcomed the iterative and interactive approach taken over a period of time to the development of the Delivery Plan, and that the Plan had reflected GACS input.
39. In concluding the Chair said the Board agreed with the recommendations in the paper and would look forward to an annual update on how delivery of the Plan was progressing.

ANNUAL REPORT AND FORWARD LOOK FROM THE GENERAL ADVISORY COMMITTEE ON SCIENCE (GACS) (FSA 15/11/05)

40. The Chair welcomed Professor Colin Dennis, expert member of the General Advisory Committee on Science (GACS), who was joined at the table for the discussion by Penny Bramwell, FSA Director of Science, Evidence and Research and Patrick Miller, as GACS Secretary.
41. Roland Salmon declared an interest as a member of the Advisory Committee on Dangerous Pathogens. The Chair then invited Professor Dennis to take the Board through his presentation.
42. Professor Dennis said he was delighted to be presenting this report to the Board on behalf of the Chair of GACS, Professor Sir Colin Blakemore. On behalf of GACS, Professor Dennis paid tribute to the work of Professor Dave Coggon, former Chair of the Committee on Toxicity (COT), who had stepped down from the COT and hence from GACS in March 2015 and been replaced by Professor Alan Boobis.
43. Professor Dennis said that GACS believed the FSA's new science leadership model comprising a Chief Scientific Adviser and an FSA Director of Science, Evidence and Research was working well and paid tribute to the individuals currently in those roles, Guy Poppy and Penny Bramwell, and said that GACS would continue to monitor the science leadership model going forward.

44. In last year's GACS Annual Report to the Board, the GACS Chair had referred to concerns about the level of support available from the FSA for some of the Scientific Advisory Committees (SACs). Since then GACS had been presented with an analysis of a skills audit undertaken of FSA scientific staffing and its plans to develop science skills. GACS had welcomed this and underlined the importance of Continuous Professional Development and opportunities for engagement with the wider scientific, academic and commercial communities. A new GACS working group on Science Skills and Capabilities had also been set up and was due to meet for the first time the following week.
45. GACS had had input into the development of the FSA's Science, Evidence and Information (SEI) Strategy and Development Plan and, was supportive of them.
46. A GACS review of guidance for declaration and handling of interests of SAC members had been put on hold so that it could reflect the outcomes, expected in early 2016, of the Triennial Review 2015/16 of GACS and the other five SACs for which the FSA was sole or lead sponsor.
47. A new cross-SAC Group with members from GACS, SSRC (Social Science Research Committee), COT and ACMSF (Advisory Committee on the Microbiological Safety of Food) will be established to provide advice to the FSA in its further development of the framework for decisions on foods which presented a higher risk per serving. GACS had also set up a new working group to provide advice on the development of the FSA's wider programme of work on risk and decision, which was due to meet for the first time the following week.
48. GACS considered that the SACs' recommendations for research were broadly reflected in the work outlined in the FSA Evidence Portfolio as presented to GACS. GACS had underlined the importance of involving the SACs in the commissioning of new research that was relevant to their work and more widely of engaging suitable peer reviewers for FSA projects.
49. GACS had recognised the importance of maintaining close links with Food Standards Scotland (FSS) by inviting a representative from FSS to attend GACS; an offer which had been accepted.
50. A Board member said that following last year's Board discussion of the GACS Annual Report, Professor Sir Colin Blakemore had agreed to consider the tension between taking decisions using the best available evidence and taking decisions in emergencies, and she asked for feedback. Patrick Miller said GACS had discussed this issue as part of a Working Group in Use of Science in Emergencies which had been broadly satisfied with the procedures the FSA had in place. GACS had recommended that the FSA regularly review and refresh its needs and sources of key expertise in emergencies and this had been reflected in the SEI Delivery Plan.

51. In answer to a question, Professor Dennis commented that relationships between GACS and the Farm Animal Welfare Committee (FAWC) would be looked at as part of the Triennial Review of the FSA's SACs as part of its assessment of how the FSA SACs relate to other relevant bodies. The Review would also identify whether we still had the right structure of SACs in place to support delivery of the FSA's Strategy 2015-2020.
52. The Board acknowledged the valuable work GACS members did and that GACS members were often the route to getting advice from other experts.
53. The Chair thanked Professor Dennis for participating in the discussion on the previous Board paper on the FSA's SEI Delivery Plan, as well as presenting the GACS Annual Report and thanked all the GACS members for their valuable work.

**ADULTERATION OF FOOD – THRESHOLDS FOR ACTION AND FOR REPORTING
(FSA 15/11/06)**

54. The Chair welcomed Will Creswell, FSA Head of Consumer Protection and Penny Bramwell, FSA Director of Science, Evidence and Research to the table and invited Steve Wearne, FSA Director of Policy to introduce the paper.
55. Steve said while we all remembered horsemeat, it was not the only incidence of adulteration we had dealt with over recent years. Adulteration incidents were a significant proportion of the over 1000 incidents the FSA dealt with each year and covered foods as diverse as take away food and herbs and spices.
56. This paper sought to formalise the practice we had developed from our experience in dealing with those various incidents. Steve explained that the majority of adulteration cases arose as incidents and led to the need to make timely decisions based on limited levels of information. In the case of horsemeat the magnitude of the horsemeat incident had led us to make a significant investment to test our initial 1% threshold for adulteration through commissioning new work to develop analytical methodologies, exploring the role of good manufacturing process in guarding against carry-over, and exploring consumer acceptability. As a result of that work, we were able to robustly defend the 1% threshold. However, that magnitude of investment was likely to be the exception rather than the rule because of its costly and time consuming nature.
57. The FSA had agreed with colleagues in Food Standards Scotland (FSS) the importance for consumers and other stakeholders of a seamless and integrated approach to incident management across the UK. To that end, the FSS Executive team intended to present a parallel paper, with the same recommendations, to their Board at a forthcoming meeting. The aim was to reach a common position to translate into common thresholds that would apply across the UK in respect of any future food adulteration incident.
58. A Board member asked how many incidents involving adulteration levels between 0.1% and 1% had been dealt with using the principles-based approach as outlined in the paper. He also drew attention to section 7.1 of the Food Standards Act 1999 and

suggested that, as there would be one or more areas of public interest in levels of adulteration between 0.1% and 1%, the FSA had an obligation to inform consumers of such instances. As this was a pre-consultation paper, we might want to think about which sections of the population would want to be informed of these instances and consult with them.

59. Will Creswell said during the horsemeat incident of the 664 Local Authority samples taken, only 2 reported levels of over 1% and of the nearly 51 000 samples taken by industry over a 15/16 month period, 47 were over 1%. We did not have data on the number of incidents involving adulteration levels between 0.1% and 1% as this was below the reporting threshold. We used the principles as outlined in the paper on a daily basis and they included engaging with consumers and industry as early as possible.
60. Steve said as a result of the considerations outlined in the paper, where we concluded there was a level of adulteration that would always be unacceptable to consumers in general, then that was the level at which we would set the threshold for reporting. We would expect the food industry to undertake intelligence-led testing to assure their supply chains and, where this identified products in which the adulterant was present above the reporting level, we would expect the product to be removed from sale and for the brand owner to inform us and the relevant local authority. We would publish the identity of that product, together with any information that would help consumers to identify affected batches, so they may make a decision on whether or not to use that product.
61. Steve continued where the adulterant had an allergenicity that was different from that of the product in which it was found, we would use our existing effective mechanisms for alerting allergic consumers, just as we did in the case of any of the many incidents we dealt with each year that related to mislabelling of allergens in food products.
62. Steve affirmed that we respected the range of values people had that informed their decisions on what they chose to eat. Where a food was certified as Halal, or alternatively as Fairtrade or as Freedom Food, just to give a few examples, and the presence or level of an adulterant would lead to that food not conforming to the certification standard, then we would see it as the responsibility of the relevant certifying body to work with suppliers and manufacturers to assure that food they had certified had been produced in accordance with their standard. It was our role to provide whatever advice and reasonable support we could to certifying bodies in that situation.
63. The Board member thanked Steve for the clarification and asked if that meant we were required to give information we had on levels of adulteration between 0.1% and 1% to the certifying bodies. Steve said it would be part of our preliminary considerations and we would engage early with the certifying bodies to work with them to articulate their concerns and enable them to protect their standard of certification. Section 7.1 of the Food Standards Act 1999 should be read in conjunction with 7.2 and as such the onus was on us to decide what constituted a material concern for consumers. We would look primarily to the certifying bodies as having the

responsibility of assuring that food they had certified had been produced in accordance with their standard.

64. Catherine said there should be a clear written protocol in place detailing how we would share information on adulteration incidents with the relevant certifying bodies to give them the maximum chance possible to step up to their responsibility.
65. In answer to a question, Steve said that a 1% level of adulteration in a discrete component, such as a piece of pork in lamb shish kebabs, would not be consistent with good manufacturing practice. However, incidents more generally occurred in comminuted products where the adulterants were so closely integrated that they could not be seen by looking at the product; then we had to rely on analytical methods.
66. Steve said it was important to remember, as outlined in the paper, that while 0.1% and 1% had been the threshold levels established for horsemeat, different adulterants would necessitate the identification of different levels as thresholds for action and reporting.
67. The Chair of WFAC said the Committee had been surprised that there appeared to be no received corpus of knowledge that could be drawn upon. Steve agreed that it would seem as if there should be one, but none had come to light in our discussions with industry or enforcement.
68. In response to a question from a Board member, Steve said where the FSA in combination with Local Authorities did targeted surveillance there was a robust sampling framework in place. However, the majority of incidents were not identified by us; rather the intelligence came from others increasingly the food industry themselves. We welcomed the more open stance with industry which allowed more sharing of intelligence on emerging incidents.
69. Steve clarified for the Board the distinction between contamination and adulteration. Contamination was when there was a pathogen or a chemical contaminant for example, salmonella on Betel leaves or dioxins in citrus peel, due to a break down in sourcing and manufacturing processes and there were often clear limits on contaminants in law set at the EU level. Adulteration however was the presence of a foreign material, such as olive and myrtle leaves in oregano. There were no legal limits for adulterants hence the proposed principles-based approach to adulteration incidents as outlined in the paper.
70. In answer to a question, Steve said while Defra did have the policy lead for labelling in England, the FSA had the policy lead in Wales and Northern Ireland, and the lead for operational delivery of that policy in all three nations. Given the links we had with Local Authorities and industry, it made sense for us to lead on this area of work, as it had during the horsemeat incident. Our Defra colleagues thought this work on our approach to adulteration incidents was useful in formalising our operational response within the framework set by national policy.
71. Steve agreed with the Board that in addition to action and reporting, we would include in the consultation our expectations relating to monitoring, through which we ensure

that recall action has taken place. Steve said we worked with our enforcement partners and discussed with industry in many incidents the timeliness and prominent positioning of recall notices.

72. The Board said now that technology was able to test for and detect minute levels of adulterants, a complex dialogue was required with the public about current background levels of foreign materials in products. Consumers had to understand the extent to which products were impure prior to incidents occurring otherwise they would only accept a 0% level of adulteration which would be costly to industry, if not impractical to deliver.
73. Steve agreed that it was important to understand current background levels of adulterants consistent with good agricultural or manufacturing practices, subject to the appropriate controls, that were not damaging to human health and so would not prompt recall alerts. The consumer deliberative work we had undertaken when we had looked at levels of carryover during our work on the horsemeat incident had demonstrated that consumers were quite capable of understanding and appreciating these issues.
74. The Chair said it had been right that the Board discussed the pre-consultation document so that the consultation could incorporate the Board's comments. The Chair said rather than looking to the Food Standards Act to define our obligations we should refer to how we articulated our ambitions for consumers in the Strategy and Strategic Plan which we had developed based on our purpose and responsibilities laid out in our founding regulation.
75. The Chair said the Board agreed with the recommendations in the paper and would be interested to see what we learned from the consultation.

AUDIT AND RISK ASSURANCE COMMITTEE – ORAL REPORT

76. The Chair invited the Chair of the Audit and Risk Assurance Committee (ARAC), Paul Wiles, to present his report.
77. Paul said at their meeting the day before the Committee had discussed three main areas in addition to their routine look at internal audit reports:
 - FSA controls against the threat of cyber-attacks;
 - Future plans for external and internal audits;
 - Two linked papers on work mapping risks to the Agency in various areas and the controls against those risks.
78. Regarding the third area, Paul said the mapping of official food and feed controls was complex partly due to the legislative control framework itself and partly from the way those legal responsibilities had been allocated in the UK across a number of different bodies. This resulted in a complex process of audit to ensure those controls were in place.
79. There was currently no single body in charge of the audit system or for planning audits across it. Internal auditors from all the organisations involved were working together

to report back to ARAC to confirm the existence of the audit processes and to confirm that audits had taken place and when; ARAC would then be able to report back and give assurance to the Board.

80. The Chair thanked Paul for his report.

REPORTS FROM THE CHAIRS OF THE FOOD ADVISORY COMMITTEES (INFO 15/11/01–02)

81. Henrietta Campbell, Chair of the Northern Ireland Food Advisory Committee (NIFAC), drew attention to the visit the Committee had undertaken to Fane Valley's Feed Mill in Omagh. Fane Valley was one of the largest feed manufacturers in Northern Ireland and Henrietta suggested that the Board might like to undertake a visit there the next time it met in Belfast in order to see first-hand a good example of the industry self-regulating.
82. Roland Salmon, Chair of the Welsh Food Advisory Committee (WFAC), reiterated that the Committee had disagreed with the outcome of the Board's discussion on burgers served rare in catering establishments in September 2015. WFAC were concerned that the message to consumers that they could eat rare burgers in suitable restaurants but not prepare them at home would be difficult to communicate and that it would be difficult to police the new advice at a time when resource for regulations was becoming more constrained.
83. The Chair noted WFAC's views on the Board's decision.
84. The Chair asked about the update on animal feed controls in Wales which had featured in WFAC's report from the Director of Wales. Catherine agreed that the Board would receive a brief note updating on animal feed controls in Wales.

ACTION: Director of Wales

ANY OTHER BUSINESS

85. The Chair advised that there was no other business and closed the Board meeting.

DATE OF NEXT MEETING

86. The next meeting of the FSA Board would take place on Thursday 28 January 2016 in Aviation House, London.