

MINUTES OF AN FSA OPEN BOARD MEETING HELD ON 15 SEPTEMBER 2010 AT THE DOUGLAS HOTEL, ABERDEEN, FROM 09.00 to 12:15

Present:

Jeff Rooker, Chair; Ian Reynolds, Deputy Chair; Sue Atkinson; Tim Bennett; David Cameron; Henrietta Campbell; Margaret Gilmore; Clive Grundy; Graeme Millar; Michael Parker; Chris Pomfret; Nancy Robson and John Spence.

Officials Attending:

Tim Smith, Chief Executive

Andrew Wadge, Chief Scientist

Veronica Martell, Interim Board Secretary

Andrew Rhodes, Director of Operations (Minutes 26 to 43)

Catherine Bowles, Head of Delivery, Enforcement and Local Authority Delivery (Minutes 26 to 43)

Sandy Lawrie, Head of Novel Foods (Minutes 44 to 59)

Guests Attending

Professor Hugh Pennington, attended the meeting for Minutes 26 to 43

Mr David Worthington, WAG, attended the meeting for Minutes 26 to 43

Professor Peter Gregory, Chair of the Advisory Committee on Novel Foods and Processes (ACNFP), attended the meeting for Minutes 44 to 59.

Apology for absence:

There were no apologies for absence.

INTRODUCTIONS

1. The Chair welcomed Henrietta Campbell to her first meeting, following her appointment as Board Member for Northern Ireland and Chair of the Northern Ireland Food Advisory Committee. He also welcomed Andrew Rhodes, the FSA's newly appointed Director of Operations, and Veronica Martell, Interim Board Secretary.

MINUTES OF THE MEETING HELD ON 20 JULY 2010

2. The Chief Executive asked if minute 62 could be amended to clarify that the review into the safety of raw milk applied only to raw milk for direct human consumption. Following a question from a Board member, this was further clarified to apply only to raw cow's milk for direct human consumption. This was agreed.
3. Further to minutes 67 and 68, the Chief Executive pointed out that in the discussion on implications for food safety of the rise in M.bovis infection in cattle and the review that the Advisory Committee on the Microbiological Safety of Food (ACMSF) would be conducting into risks associated with milk, he had asked that the review should look into new processes and technologies in dairy production, such as ultra filtration and pasteurisation methods for ensuring longer shelf life. It was agreed to amend the minutes accordingly.

4. Subject to these amendments, the Minutes of the meeting held on 20 July 2010 were agreed as an accurate record.

ACTION: Board Secretary

ACTIONS ARISING

5. Further to minute 2, in response to a question from a board member about the Chief Executive's meeting in August with the Health Protection Agency, the Chief Executive said that discussions were ongoing with regard to arms' length bodies reporting to the Department of Health and it was expected that the intentions of the Secretary of State would be clearer with the publication of the Public Bodies Bill, expected in the autumn.
6. The Board noted the Actions Arising report.

CHAIR'S REPORT

7. The Chair reported that in August he had visited one of the farms in Cumbria that was still under restriction following the Chernobyl nuclear incident in 1986.
8. He reminded Board members that details of their engagements and interests were available on the FSA website.

CHIEF EXECUTIVE'S REPORT

9. The Board received the written report of the Chief Executive. (FSA 10/09/03)

Visit by Anne Milton MP, Parliamentary Under Secretary of State for Health

10. The Chief Executive thanked the Deputy Chair for joining him for the visit to the FSA by Anne Milton on 28 July.

Meeting with British Retail Consortium (BRC)

11. The Chief Executive noted that relationships with key stakeholders, including trade bodies such as the BRC, would continue, but would need to adapt to reflect remit changes arising from Machinery of Government changes. In response to a Board member's question on whether the BRC had evidence to support their assertion that consumers had no appetite for food from cloned animals and their offspring, the Chief Executive said that although he had not asked BRC for evidence, he assumed that BRC would have taken soundings from its members.

Enforcement

12. A Board member noted that Orkney Meat Limited had been convicted for the 5th time for offences including failure to remove SRM and suggested that the fine was relatively low for a repeat offender. The Chief Executive said that the FSA's investigations had indicated the failures were not systemic, but related to human error. However, the FSA's Operations team would be examining the business's operations. The size of the fine was a matter for the courts.

Investigations into food from the offspring of cloned animals entering the UK food supply

13. Further to his written report, the Chief Executive noted that the incident had tested the FSA's resilience, coming as it had in the summer and lasting for nearly

20 days. He was satisfied that the incident had been well handled, despite its complexity and the reduced staffing levels owing to holidays. Key policy issues that needed to be examined were whether responsibilities across government were clear enough and appropriate as was highlighted during the incident and whether investigations of the sort required were best carried out by specialist FSA investigators or local authorities.

14. In the discussion of the incident that followed, a number of points were made by Board members:

- There had been 17 days of continuous press coverage and one newspaper had printed an apology following inaccurate reporting.
- One member questioned why authorisation for the production of food from the offspring of cloned animals had not been sought and whether the FSA should do more to ensure producers knew the requirements of the Novel Foods Regulations. The Chief Executive said that as the technology involved was new, understanding of the need for authorisation under the Novel Food Regulations would have been expected, but in developing policy in this area, communication regarding this requirement would be examined.
- Although the incident appeared to have been well handled on this occasion, there was a need to ensure, particularly at a time of budget reductions, that resilience was built into our incident handling, with staff across the UK being utilised. The Chief Executive acknowledged that, because of the timing, the FSA might have been under pressure had the incident lasted longer.

15. The Chief Executive provided an oral report on a number of issues:

16. **Machinery of Government**

The Chief Executive referred to the announcement by the Prime Minister on 20 July that nutrition would move to the Department of Health (DH) and non-nutritional labelling and food composition and standards would move to DEFRA. The transfer of policy staff to DEFRA had taken place with immediate effect on 20th July and staff had physically moved to DEFRA on 1st September. Relevant stakeholders were notified of the changes by the FSA and information was provided on the FSA website.

17. Responsibility for Nutrition was on track to transfer to DH by the end of September or early October when staff in the Nutrition team were expected to move to DH. Negotiations on staffing and budget issues with DH were almost complete.

18. The Chief Executive reported that the Welsh Assembly Government was expected to adopt the same approach as the Westminster government and that an announcement was expected the following day.

19. The Chair of SFAC noted that Scottish Ministers were considering their response to the changes.

20. Shetland Salmon Farm

21. The Chief Executive reported that the Environmental Protection Agency in Scotland was leading a multi-agency investigation into the causes of the deaths of around 5,000 salmon. The Food Standards Agency, local authorities and other organisations were also involved in the incident. Preliminary analysis had indicated that a health risk from salmon that had entered the food chain was unlikely. He would update the Board on developments.

ACTION: Chief Executive

22. Southampton Colours

The Chief Executive reminded Board members of the research that had led to the FSA and UK Ministers agreeing that there should be a voluntary withdrawal by industry by the end of 2009 of six food colours identified as having an adverse effect on some children's behaviour. Two targeted surveys, one of imported foods and the second of Scottish SMEs had been published by the FSA and had revealed that one third of imported foods contained one or more of the six colours and that only one third of SMEs surveyed were aware of the voluntary ban or of the EU requirement that use of the colours should be labelled. Although major retailers and manufacturers were complying with the requirements, further attention needed to be given to catering companies, imported food businesses and small manufacturers.

23. It was agreed that, following meetings with stakeholders during the next few months, a paper would be presented to the Board in Spring 2011 to allow the Board to take stock and give further consideration to whether any further interventions were warranted.

ACTION: Board Secretary and Chief Scientist/Director of Food Policy

24. Debt recovery

Following the decision by the FSA's Operations Group to seek to secure faster payment for its official controls, the Chief Executive reported that implementation of the decision to start debt recovery ten days after invoicing instead of the current 30 days had been temporarily halted. This followed meetings of the Operations Director, Andrew Rhodes, and Finance Director, Chris Hitchen, with food business operators and trade representatives. The Finance team had accepted that improvements first needed to be made to the FSA's invoicing procedures to give greater clarity to businesses about what they were being invoiced for. The FSA remained committed to swift recovery of debts and this would be revisited once invoicing problems had been addressed.

25. The Board welcomed this approach.

POST PENNINGTON – FOOD HYGIENE DELIVERY PROGRAMME (FSA 10/09/04)

26. The Chair welcomed to the meeting Professor Hugh Pennington, author of the Inquiry report into the 2005 South Wales outbreak of E Coli O157, and David Worthington of the Welsh Assembly Government. He also welcomed Andrew

Rhodes, FSA Operations Director, and Catherine Bowles, FSA's Head of Delivery, Enforcement and Local Authority Delivery, to the table.

27. The Chief Executive introduced the discussion by outlining that to be a successful organisation delivering consumer protection, the FSA had to be clear about its structure, strategy, delivery and culture. Each had changed since the E Coli incident and the Pennington report and would continue to develop, particularly with recent changes to the Operations group. He suggested that these internal changes would need to be mirrored in the external (non-FSA) food supply chain and within local authority owned enforcement bodies.
28. He informed Board members that the FSA was co-hosting a conference jointly with the Chartered Institute of Environmental Health on Friday 3 December on "The Future of Hygiene" to take forward actions arising from the Pennington report. He wished to thank CIEH President, Stephen Battersby, and Chief Executive, Graham Jukes for their support for the event. Around 100 delegates were expected, including international participants, and the conference would look in depth at how to avoid such incidents in the future.
29. Andrew Rhodes introduced the paper. He said that achieving consistency in inspection and enforcement standards across the food chain – without adopting a tick box approach - was a core priority.
30. Hugh Pennington welcomed the opportunity to participate in the meeting and thanked the FSA for its commitment to addressing his findings, not just those recommendations that directly referred to and were the responsibility of the FSA, but the wider aspects of his report. He noted that the incident itself had been handled well, but that it had been caused by the co-incidence of a multiplicity of failures.
31. In commenting on the FSA paper, he referred to the literature review by the Institute for Employment Studies in annex C of the FSA paper and the challenge for enforcement officers in coping with the range of behavioural patterns among FBOs, and the need for officers to have fast access to high quality advice. He also suggested that the pace of improvements needed to be faster. In addition, he called on the FSA to tackle E.Coli at source by reducing incidence in ruminants and to push for more fundamental research to resolve problems caused by supershedders getting into the food chain. He also said he was concerned that Environmental Health Officer training was potentially at risk from changes to Higher Education and made a plea for the FSA to use its political influence to prevent this.
32. David Worthington also thanked the Board for the invitation to attend the meeting. The E Coli outbreak had put food safety very high on the political and public agendas in Wales and he reminded the Board that the incident had affected 150 children, had resulted in the death of one child and ongoing health problems for many others. . Consumer Focus in Wales had taken on the assessment of the response to the Pennington inquiry recommendations. The Welsh Assembly Government (WAG) wanted the assessment to focus on outcomes for consumer

protection, rather than processes. WAG supported the FSA's general direction of travel, but as a result of largely anecdotal evidence, some concerns remained, particularly with regard to the variation of enforcement and the possibility that it had been under-resourced. WAG looked to the FSA and local authorities for food safety expertise. Following Consumer Focus's assessment, the First Minister in Wales had asked the FSA to conduct a thorough and independent review of food law enforcement in Wales, looking at resourcing, officer numbers, qualifications, training and guidance, but also exploring other models of delivery. Consumer Focus Wales had notified the WAG that food safety enforcement was underfunded by around £2.75mn, equating to around 67 food safety officers out of an existing complement of 150. WAG had found this difficult to understand, given the previous increases in the resource allocation to local authorities and the fact that under-resourcing of enforcement had not been identified in any of the FSA's local authority audits and had not previously been raised as an issue by local enforcement bodies.

33. In response to a question from a Board member, he said that some local authorities might be too small to provide expert food safety enforcement. He stressed that WAG was not looking to take enforcement from local authorities, but believed it was reasonable to ask if the current model of delivery was a good one.
34. The Chair informed the Board that he had signed the FSA's response to the WAG accepting the commission to review food law enforcement in Wales with an initial report by Christmas and a final report by February.
35. In the wide-ranging discussion that followed, Board members made a number of points:
- 36. FSA review of food law enforcement in Wales**
 - Several Board members wondered if the findings of the review could have an application beyond Wales. It was noted that although the FSA would be reporting to Wales Ministers, the review could inform advice to Ministers across the UK.
 - It was noted that close working relationships between the FSA and local authorities could be achieved in Wales, Scotland and Northern Ireland but were difficult in England because of scale.
 - More than one model of delivery could be proposed – a range of models might work, depending on the situation and issues of leadership and resourcing.
 - The review could allow the FSA to consider radical alternative models of delivering enforcement.
 - Concern was also expressed, however, that re-organisation of enforcement might be a distraction and that it was more important for consumer safety to focus on implementing the food hygiene rating scheme and taking action to ensure separation of equipment for raw and cooked meats.

- Proposals contained in Lord Young’s review of Health and Safety might also impact on local enforcement arrangements.
- Foods safety enforcement needed to be seen in the context of wider public health delivery and not separated from it. In addition, in England, DH’s intention to create a national public health service would potentially affect local authorities. The FSA needed to keep abreast of how this developed.

37. Food business behaviours / culture

- It was noted that the high turnover of staff in SMEs meant that passing on advice and guidance within SMEs was challenging.
- One Board member said that the Institute for Employment Studies (IES) work had been the most powerful part of the paper – and had outlined a different way of looking at the problems of enforcement. He suggested that a seminar session at the food hygiene conference should pick up some of the themes within the IES study relating to culture, organisation and behaviour of SMEs.
ACTION: Director of Operations / Director of Communications
- The FSA’s LAEMs system had indicated that local authorities were increasingly acting on risk based judgements.
- Part of the culture for enforcement officers should be to follow up business that other regulators had identified as non-compliant to see if food safety rules were also being broken.

38. Cross-contamination

- It was argued that a clear separation of equipment for raw and cooked food was the easiest way of increasing food safety. Hugh Pennington supported this approach and hoped to see what he felt was a straightforward technical solution tackled. He pointed out that several LAs in Wales had gone beyond the guidance and had implemented separate equipment.
- It was noted that FSA was consulting on cross-contamination issues. The Chief Executive said that as a government body the FSA had a duty to assemble the science and evidence base and consult with businesses and others. However, the FSA leadership recognised that separation of equipment provided clarity and could eliminate a primary source of cross-contamination in the food supply chain.

39. Pace of change

- In response to Hugh Pennington’s comments on the speed of improvement, frustration at the pace of change was also mentioned by Board members. The Chair of SFAC noted this as one of the concerns of SFAC members.

40. Resource pressures

- There was a general perception that food safety was “fixed” and was, outside Wales, a low political priority. The challenge for the FSA and food enforcement officers was to persuade political leaders that food safety remained a priority for resourcing.

- Tackling E Coli and implementing Pennington recommendations would have positive knock on effects on reducing other microbiological risks.
 - Under current financial pressures, there was a risk that food safety officers would be replaced by generalists.
41. At the conclusion of the discussion, David Worthington reminded the Board that on food safety, the interests of consumers, food industry, regulators, enforcement officers and the Government co-incided. He re-iterated his support for enforcement officers and hoped that the FSA would be able to help deliver the best food safety system for Wales.
42. Hugh Pennington thanked the Board again for his opportunity to comment on the FSA's work. He was impressed by the commitment of the environmental health profession and the FSA to take his report seriously in order to deliver the best food safety system possible.
43. The Chair thanked both David Worthington and Hugh Pennington for adding considerable value to the Board's discussion. He concluded by saying that there needed to be a mature and intelligent conversation with political leaders in local and central government to ensure the continuation of public confidence in food safety enforcement.

ANIMAL CLONING FOR FOOD PRODUCTION (FSA 10/09/05)

44. Tim Bennett declared an interest as the Chair of DairyCo, which had investments in cattle genetics. Although this interest was not directly related to cloning, he said that he would not participate in the discussion and left the table.
45. The Chair welcomed Professor Peter Gregory, Chair of the Advisory Committee on Novel Foods and Processes (ACNFP), to the meeting and welcomed Sandy Lawrie, Head of Novel Foods at the FSA, to the table.
46. The Chair explained that the Board had decided to discuss the issue of food production and animal cloning in the context of the Novel Food Regulations at its July meeting, prior to the incident that had occurred in August.
47. In introducing the discussion, the Chief Executive noted that the European Commission and European Parliaments had taken different positions on food derived from cloned animals with the Parliament calling for a ban on food from cloned animals and their progeny. The Commission would be producing a report in November for discussion within the EU institutions. The FSA's experience in handling the incident had revealed that the key issue was the ability to trace whether animals were the progeny of clones. As the UK incident involved a limited number of embryos from a pedigree source, traceability on this occasion had been relatively straightforward, but if it had involved the male line, it would have quickly broken down. In developing regulations, the practicalities of how they would be enforced were crucial. Local authorities would be responsible for taking action against any breach of regulations.

48. The FSA's Chief Scientist, Andrew Wadge summarised the current regulatory framework within the Novel Foods Regulation requiring approval prior to marketing of food from cloned animals and their offspring. Traceability was a key difficulty in enforcing the regulations. Cloning was a relatively new science, but experience of cloning was increasing and although there were ongoing concerns around animal health, these appeared to be decreasing. According to EFSA there was no evidence of concern regarding food safety. A further safety update was expected from EFSA. Consumers, however, had little appetite for food from cloned animals and there were ethical concerns around the production, health and welfare of cloned animals and their offspring. As this was a critical time for discussion in Brussels, a clear steer from the Board was required to help inform Ministers and the UK's negotiating position. He said the Board's views on points set out in the paper in 7.3 would be helpful.
49. Professor Peter Gregory outlined the ACNFP's role in assessing risks to health in applications made to the FSA for the marketing of novel foods and processes. Its membership included people from a range of backgrounds, including a consumer, ethicist, allergist and plant bio-chemist. The ACNFP's assessment was then passed back to the FSA. Although not its primary purpose, it occasionally addressed wider issues and had previously commented on the ethics and effects on cloned animals. The committee had also, more recently, discussed a number of more generic issues.
50. The Chairs of the Food Advisory Committees briefly summarised comments from their committees on the paper.
51. The Chair of SFAC reported that SFAC had focused on para 7.3 of the paper. SFAC generally agreed with the points, but called for clarity in the drafting of regulations to avoid ambiguity and said that the legislation should be framed to anticipate future technological developments.
52. The Chair of NIFAC said that NIFAC had agreed with the recommendations, but members were particularly disappointed that Northern Ireland's advanced systems of traceability would be of no use in tracking the offspring of clones. They had questioned how many generations of cloned offspring would need to be assessed to determine risk to consumers.
53. The Chair of WFAC reported that WFAC had noted the current position and recommendations. The committee had two areas of concern: traceability and the practicality of tracing and monitoring successive generations of offspring, and whether there was evidence from food safety perspective that suggested this was necessary.
54. A number of points were made by the Board during the discussion:
- Consumer research – both FSA's and EU studies – had indicated that consumers wanted choice and to know if their food had been produced from cloned animals.

- Ethical concerns regarding cloning, although not the responsibility of the FSA, remained.
- There was no test or practical traceability mechanism to identify progeny of cloned animals to provide consumers with the information they wanted.
- The development of cloning technology and growth of a global market in breeding materials (semen and embryos) had outstripped the development of a regulatory framework and traceability systems, the latter being the responsibility of Agriculture departments. However, such situations could not simply be dismissed because if a risk later emerged, regulators might have to find a way to apply controls.
- Evidence was still emerging and a further update was due from EFSA, but there appeared to be no current concern regarding food safety.
- No application had been made for the marketing of food produced from cloned animals or their progeny that would have allowed the safety of food from cloned animals to have been assessed by the ACNPF and which would also have tested the authorisation process and labelling issues.
- The European Parliament was calling for a ban on the production of food produced from cloned animals and their progeny and the Parliament had called for separate legislation.
- Ministers should be advised of the practical and delivery difficulties in the enforcement of regulations restricting the marketing of food from the offspring of cloned animals.
- The FSA should be clear, in advising Ministers, of what we did and did not know.

55. In response to questions from Board members, Sandy Lawrie clarified that bullet two under 7.3 was intended to ensure that the regulatory framework encompassed not only the product of food from the offspring of cloned animals, but was able to apply to food produced via other non-traditional techniques that we currently knew little about.

56. It was agreed that the Board's advice to Ministers would be restricted within the context of novel foods to cloning and the progeny of cloned animals.

57. The Board noted that it did not have all the information required to provide final advice to Ministers. A paper from the Commission due in November could provide some additional information for the FSA to consider and to develop its advice further. It was agreed that the Commission paper should be sent to Board Members as soon as it was published and that it would be considered, if published in time, at the December board meeting, along with the EFSA update paper.

ACTION: Board Secretary / Director of Food Policy

58. It was agreed that the Board would provide interim advice to Ministers across the UK. Rather than use the framework provided by paragraph 7.3 in the paper, the Board agreed to the summary points outlined by the Chief Executive:

- The FSA's primary objective in responding to this challenge is to ensure that food safety is not compromised by any novel food or process. The available evidence is that food (milk and meat) derived from the progeny of cloned cattle and pigs represents no different risk to food safety to that which is from traditionally-bred animals.
- As always, if that evidence changes, the FSA's advice to consumers and government would change as necessary. The Board is keen to maintain a high level of scrutiny of the science and evidence as it emerges.
- The FSA should not attempt to regulate any process or practice which cannot be traced or measured to an acceptable level of confidence. In this case it would be disproportionate to try to establish a monitoring process (whose purpose would be to ensure the safest possible food), where there is no discernible risk and with the knowledge that it would only be feasible for a very small proportion of the market. In the absence of traceability, the only other option would be a ban which would be entirely inappropriate given the current evidence of risk to human health.
- The Board will advise agriculture ministers that they should commission the appropriate bodies to investigate further the ethical and welfare concerns that have been an important feature of consumer concerns. The FSA would be keen to be involved in any consumer dialogue.
- Legislation should be consistent and harmonised across the EU and any uncertainties in interpretation should be rapidly resolved.
- In the absence of an actual application for authorisation of meat or milk derived from the progeny of cloned cattle, the Board requested that the Executive should commission the ACNFP to conduct a hypothetical assessment.

ACTION: Director of Food Policy

59. It was agreed that a summary of this advice would be sent to Board Members in that week's regular mail-out.

ACTION: Board Secretary

AGENDA

60. The Chair pointed out that because of his decision to extend the length of discussion on food produced from cloned animals and their offspring, consideration of papers relating to the Government's One In One Out initiative, the Macrory Sanctions, and the FSA Board's revised Standing Orders and Code of Conduct would be deferred to the October meeting of the Board.

ACTION: Board Secretary

ANNUAL REPORT FROM THE CHAIR OF THE SCOTTISH FOOD ADVISORY COMMITTEE (FSA 10/09/10)

61. The Chair of SFAC noted that this was his last report to the Board as Chair of SFAC. He commented that it had been a busy year for SFAC. He welcomed the recent decision to arrange FAC meetings ahead of Board discussions and said that as a result, discussions would become more meaningful for SFAC members. He also commented that Charles Milne had made a significant impact since his appointment as Director of FSA Scotland.
62. The Board said that the visits to local stakeholders the previous day had been extremely interesting and useful.

ANNUAL REPORT OF THE DIRECTOR OF FSA IN SCOTLAND (FSA 10/09/11)

63. Charles Milne outlined a number of key areas within his report. Scottish Ministers were considering the future of the FSA's remit, but in the meantime, it would remain unchanged. As such, FSA Scotland provided active support to the Scottish Government on the National Food and Drink Policy and the obesity route map. Guidance FSA Scotland had produced jointly with the Scottish Government on Country of Origin labelling had been well received.
64. FSA Scotland was prioritising four key issues to reduce food incidents: listeria in smoked fish, amnesic shellfish poisoning in scallops, on-farm incidents and norovirus associated with raw oysters. He reported that 26 of the Scottish local authorities were participating in or had signed up to the Food Hygiene Information Scheme. Over the long-term he hoped that Scotland would align with the rest of the UK.
65. In response to a question from a Board member, he said that he had recently met Health Protection Scotland to discuss achieve greater consistency of information with the rest of the UK.
66. The Chair thanked Charles Milne for his report and for the support of his staff in hosting the Board's visit to Aberdeen.

FSA RESPONSE TO THE REVIEW OF THE ADVISORY COMMITTEE ON ANIMAL FEED (ACAF) (INFO 10/09/01)

67. The Board agreed to note the FSA's response to the ACAF review, which had previously been circulated to them.

WELSH FOOD ADVISORY COMMITTEE (INFO 10/09/02)

68. The Board received the report of the Chair of the Welsh Food Advisory Committee.

NORTHERN IRELAND FOOD ADVISORY COMMITTEE (INFO 10/09/03)

69. The Board received the report of the Chair of the Northern Ireland Food Advisory Committee.

ANY OTHER BUSINESS

70. One board member referred to the report published by Ofcom in July assessing the restrictions on advertising of foods high in fats, salt and sugars to children. She noted that the FSA was still responsible for these issues and wanted to draw attention to the important piece of work the FSA had contributed to improving children's diets.

71. The Chief Executive noted that Ofcom's report confirmed its earlier findings and that the restrictions continued to work. It was agreed that the report should be signposted from the FSA website and a copy sent to Board members in the mailout on Friday.

ACTION: Director of Communications / Board Secretary

DATE OF NEXT MEETING

72. The next open meeting of the Board would be held in London on 12 October 2010.