

ADVISORY COMMITTEE ON NOVEL FOODS AND PROCESSES

ACNFP OPEN MEETING FEEDBACK

1. Following the ACNFP open meeting on 24 November 2004 the Secretariat circulated an evaluation form to the 33 attendees (Annex 1).
2. Annex 2 provides members with information on the twelve responses received. Some respondents did not answer every question.
3. The comments submitted have been noted by the Secretariat and will be taken into consideration when planning future ACNFP open meetings.

**Secretariat
January 2005**

Annexes attached:

Annex 1: ACNFP open meeting: evaluation form

Annex 2: ACNFP open meeting feedback: summary of responses

ADVISORY COMMITTEE ON NOVEL FOODS AND PROCESSES

ACNFP open meeting: evaluation form.

**Secretariat
January 2005**

Advisory Committee on Novel Foods and Processes (ACNFP) Open Meeting 24 November 2004

Evaluation Form

Thank you for attending the ACNFP open meeting on 24 November 2004. In order to help us evaluate the structure and format of the meeting I would be grateful if you could take some time to answer a few short questions.

1. How did you find out about the meeting?

FSA email alert FSA website Letter to interested parties Other

2. Was the organisation of the meeting satisfactory?

Yes No

If no please specify areas in which improvements can be made:

3. How useful did you find the meeting?

Extremely useful 1 2 3 4 5 Of little use

4. Did you find the smaller group discussions useful?

Yes No

If no please specify any potential improvements:

5. Do you think the points raised at the open meeting will influence the Committee's future discussions?

A lot 1 2 3 4 5 very little

6. Would you consider attending another ACNFP open meeting?

Yes No

7. Please identify any additional improvements that could be made to the format of the meeting

Name:

Organisation:

Please return by email / post / fax to:

**ACNFP Secretariat
Food Standards Agency
515B Aviation House
125 Kingsway
WC2B 6NH**

Fax: 020 7276 8564
email: acnfp@foodstandards.gsi.gov.uk

ACNFP OPEN MEETING FEEDBACK: SUMMARY OF RESPONSES

Question 1: How did you find out about the meeting?


FSA email alert = 0
FSA website = 3
Letter to interested parties = 9
Other = 0

Question 2: Was the organisation of the meeting satisfactory?

Yes = 9
No = 3

Respondents considered that the meeting had been organised satisfactorily. Although the room contained spare seats and gave attendees the opportunity to move forward, two respondents commented that they were unable to hear some of the discussions and suggested using a microphone in future. Two respondents suggested that attendees might like to identify themselves before asking questions. One respondent commented that some Committee members seemed reluctant to participate in the discussion.

Question 3: How useful did you find the meeting?

Extremely useful		= 2
		= 3
		= 3
		= 2
Of little use		= 2


Question 4: Did you find the smaller group discussions useful?

Yes = 9
No = 3

The attendees welcomed the idea of smaller groups as it gave them the opportunity to hear the views of others.

Some respondents commented that in order to encourage discussion further in smaller groups consideration should be given to strengthening chairmanship of the sessions and in the delivery of presentations.

Question 5: Do you think the points raised at the open meeting will influence the Committee's future discussions?

A lot		= 0
		= 3
		= 3
		= 2
Very little		= 0

Question 6: Would you consider attending another ACNFP open meeting?

Yes = 8
No = 0

Question 7: Please identify any additional improvements that could be made to the format of the meeting.

A couple of respondents commented that they would find it helpful to have sight of suggested discussion topics and a list of attendees in advance of the meeting.

The timing of the session promoted a conflict of comments, some respondents commented that they would prefer more time for open discussion following the smaller group discussions others would prefer more time in the smaller discussion groups. One respondent commented that the timescale for the meeting as a whole needed to be revised as all the sessions overran.

One respondent commented that minutes of the meeting should be provided to attendees to further discussion among interested parties.