

DRAFT

FSA 05/03/01

AGENDA ITEM 1, 10 MARCH 2005

MINUTES OF THE OPEN BOARD MEETING, 9 FEBRUARY 2005, CONGRESS CENTRE, LONDON

Executive Summary

1. Draft minutes of the open Board meeting held on 9 February 2005 at the Congress Centre, London are attached.
2. The Board is asked to **confirm** that the minutes are a true and accurate record of the meeting.

Board Secretariat

Contact:	Keith Gregory	Tel: 020 7276 8612 (GTN 276 8612) Email: keith.a.gregory@foodstandards.gsi.gov.uk
	Barbara Gallani	Tel: 020 7276 8243 (GTN 276 8243) Email: barbara.gallani@foodstandards.gsi.gov.uk

DRAFT

MINUTES OF THE OPEN BOARD MEETING, 9 FEBRUARY 2005, CONGRESS CENTRE, LONDON

OPEN SESSION, 10:30 – 13:10

Present: Sir John Krebs, Chairman
Julia Unwin, Deputy Chair
Richard Ayre
Sati Ariyanayagam
Chrissie Dunn
Maureen Edmondson
Michael Gibson
Ann Hemingway
Valerie Howarth
Iain MacDonald
Andrew Miller
Vernon Sankey
Sandra Walbran
Nelisha Wickremasinghe

Officials attending:

Jon Bell – Chief Executive
Chris Lawson – Chief Executive (MHS) (item 3 only)
Steve Wearne - Head of Strategy, Risk and Regulation Division (item 4 only)
Rosemary Hignett – Head of Nutrition Division (item 5 only)
Keith Gregory – Board Secretary
Barbara Gallani – Board Secretariat

Chairman's Introduction

1. The Chairman welcomed all observers attending this open Board meeting and those watching via the webcast.
2. The Chairman reminded Board members of their obligation to declare interests before discussion of relevant items.

DRAFT

3. The Chairman noted that this was the last open Board meeting for Board members Vernon Sankey and Andrew Miller. Vernon Sankey had been a Board member since the FSA was established in 2000 and had come to the end of his second term of office. Andrew Miller had been a Board member since 2003 and had come to the end of his two-year appointment and would shortly be taking up an appointment as Secretary of the Carnegie Trust in Scotland. The Chairman thanked both Board members, on behalf of the Board, for their immense contributions and for their commitment and support.
4. The Chairman raised one item for discussion under Any Other Business:
 - The FSA's formal response to the consultation on Philip Hampton's interim report on reducing administrative burdens: effective inspection and enforcement. (*INT 05/02/01*)

Item 1 - Minutes of the Meeting on 8 December 2004, Congress Centre, London (*Paper FSA 05/02/01*)

5. The Board agreed the Minutes of the meeting held on 8 December 2004 at the Congress Centre, London as an accurate record.
6. In considering matters arising and the table of follow up action, the following issues were raised:
 - *Index 246, p.18*: Provide a short note on the experiences of other member states in introducing BSE testing. An information note was in preparation and would be circulated to Board members before the end of February 2005.
 - *Index 248, p.19*: Circulate the minutes of the last meeting of MHAC. Draft minutes had been circulated to MHAC members and would be approved and circulated to Board members by the end of February 2005. The minutes of the meetings of the MHS Board would in future be circulated to Board members on a regular basis.

Action: MHS Board Secretariat / Board Secretariat

DRAFT

Item 2 - Chairman's Report

Possible BSE in a Scottish goat

7. The Chairman informed Board members that the FSA and Defra had announced simultaneously on 8 February that re-examination of tissue taken from a goat that had died in Scotland in 1990 had suggested that it may have had BSE rather than scrapie. The final results of the bio-assay that could confirm this could take up to two years. If confirmed, this would be the second goat confirmed as having BSE in Europe. In January 2005 it had been announced that a goat that had died in France in 2002 had been confirmed as having BSE. This French case had been the only goat found to be positive for BSE out of 140,000 tested across Europe (439 of which had been UK goats). The European Commission would be stepping up its testing in the light of these reports. The FSA was not advising consumers to change their consumption of goat meat, goat products or dairy products from goats on the basis of these developments.
8. The full ban on feeding meat and bone meal (MBM) to cattle, sheep and goats had been introduced in the UK in 1996. MBM is thought to have been responsible for the spread of BSE. Few, if any, goats from 1990 would still be alive today, but on the basis of experience of scrapie in goats, maternal and environmental transmission could not be wholly ruled out. The European Food Safety Authority (EFSA) was working on a risk assessment on goat meat after establishing that, on the basis of current scientific knowledge, goat dairy products were unlikely to present any risk of Transmissible Spongiform Encephalopathy (TSE) contamination provided the milk is sourced from healthy animals. The FSA had welcomed the European Commission proposals for stepping up the goat-testing programme, in order to find out whether or not these were isolated incidents. The FSA would also be seeking advice from the Spongiform Encephalopathy Advisory Committee (SEAC) at its forthcoming meeting in March.
9. In response to a question from one Board member, the Chairman confirmed that, although some recent and rapid biochemical methods had been developed for testing for BSE, it would not be possible to apply these new methods to test the tissue taken from the Scottish goat in question because the samples were not in

DRAFT

a suitable form. It would therefore be necessary to use the established mouse bio-assay test, which would take up to two years to confirm BSE.

10. In response to a further question, the Chairman informed Board members that, as the infective agent could be spread more widely in the tissues of sheep and goats than in cattle, the possible extension of the existing specified risk material (SRM) rules for goats was being considered by an EU working group.

11. Board members asked if it would be possible to increase the level of testing in goats before completion of the EFSA risk assessment. The Chief Executive noted that the European Commission had asked all member states to step up their surveillance.

12. One Board member asked the Chairman to clarify, for the benefit of consumers, why the FSA advice on consumption of goat products had not been altered despite the recent announcement. The Chairman noted that no recent positives had been found in the UK despite increased controls. The goat found to have died of BSE in 2002 had not been a UK animal and the risk assessment would continue to be updated as new information became available.

Nutrition and Labelling

13. The Chairman reported on developments in the FSA's work on signposting and labelling. The recent White Paper on Public Health¹ had asked the FSA to develop a simple labelling system that would be adopted by industry on a voluntary basis. The first phase in this process had been to test five different labelling formats with focus groups. The second phase would begin in March and would be testing three different models of front of pack signposting:

- a Guideline Daily Amounts (GDA) system, which would clearly indicate on the label the proportion of GDA for key nutrients. Some multinationals were already using this system in the US and Canada;
- a 'multiple traffic light' system, which rated each nutrient as high (red), medium (amber) or low (green). An analogous system, named the Wheel of Health, was being piloted by Sainsbury's; and

¹ "Choosing Health – Making healthy choices easier", November 2004

DRAFT

- a 'simple traffic light' system, which labelled foods with a single green, amber or red traffic light on the basis of their overall contribution to a balanced diet. Research was underway to decide how to combine single nutrients.
14. The trials were being steered by a stakeholder group including retail, manufacturing and consumer representatives and would involve about 2,000 consumers in a more practical setting. The results would be presented to the Board in May or June.
15. A working group had been looking at nutrient profiling to help inform the work on signposting and to provide advice to OFCOM in relation to restrictions on advertising aimed at children (a White Paper commitment). This work would also be used to inform the development of advice on the use of health claims and on school vending machines.
16. The Chairman recognised that nutrient profiling was a very complex area and that it was important that any model chosen should be evidence based, robust, and acceptable to industry, since it would need to be adopted on a voluntary basis. Nutrition scientists would discuss the scientific underpinning of the research at a work shop on 25 February. Formal consultation would end on 25 February.
17. Some Board members were concerned that the work should be properly co-ordinated across Europe, given the international nature of food markets and the problems that might be caused should imported foods not be subject to any UK controls, which could also increase costs for the UK food industry. The Chairman noted that EFSA was currently working on "health claims" and that the FSA work would be influential in the development of European controls, as the work on vitamins and minerals had been. The Chief Executive noted that the FSA was holding talks with several European member states, in particular with Sweden and other Scandinavian countries and with France, on how to improve existing models and to ensure coherence across Europe.
18. Board members were concerned that the use of different models across Europe, or even within the UK, could cause confusion amongst consumers and subsequently not be effective in producing changes in dietary habits. The Chief Executive stressed the importance of developing a single system and ensuring clear co-ordination to avoid confusion amongst consumers. He also noted that this would be possible only by working together with industry to produce an

DRAFT

acceptable and effective scheme. The FSA had a real opportunity here to influence thinking across Europe to help encourage development of a practical EU-wide scheme that was evidence based and helpful to consumers.

19. In summary the Chairman noted the interesting discussion and the complexity of the issue and in particular the importance of working closely with expert nutrition scientists and with industry to ensure the best possible and most effective outcome for consumers.

Item 3 - Chief Executive's Report

Over Thirty Months (OTM) rule Breaches

[Prior to the discussion of this item Michael Gibson declared an interest as a primary producer and butcher. The Chairman considered that this was not a material interest and that Michael Gibson should participate in the discussion of this issue.]

20. The Chief Executive invited the Chief Executive of the Meat Hygiene Service (MHS) to the table to answer questions on some recently reported OTM breaches. The Chief Executive noted that he had been informed by the MHS that, for the month of November 2004, two further OTM animals had entered the food chain.

21. The animals had been found to be 292 and 131 days respectively over 30 months at the time of slaughter. These irregularities had been brought to light through the monthly reconciliation exercise to compare British Cattle Movement Service (BCMS) information with abattoir records. More than 99% of potentially infected material had been removed under SRM controls but there was potentially a slight increase in risk to consumers due to this breach. The Chief Executive reported that additional measures had been put in place in November 2004 by the MHS to ensure that no OTM animals entered the food chain, but these measures were introduced after these particular breaches. However, since they were introduced, no animal over 30 months had been known to have entered the food chain. Urgent investigation into both the most recent cases, which were more serious in view of their age, had been set in train by the MHS.

22. Board members expressed concern that animals that were well over 30 months of age had been presented by producers and had been accepted by plant operators and asked what range of sanctions was available to be used against

DRAFT

producers and operators, and what internal measures would be taken against MHS staff or contractors. The Chief Executive of the MHS explained that prosecutions of plant operators would need to be considered on a case by case basis. In relation to MHS staff and contractors, both were subject to the same sanctions, which included dismissal - and in this case an Official Veterinary Surgeon (OVS) had been dismissed - and were well aware of their responsibilities. The Chief Executive of the FSA added that the legal position would be discussed with Defra and a note presented to the Board intersessionally as soon as possible.

23. One Board member asked the reason for the delay in reporting the breaches that had happened in November 2004. The Chief Executive of the MHS explained that after the reconciliation exercise had shown up two possible anomalies, a number of checks had had to be carried out at operational level in order to confirm that breaches had indeed occurred, and to investigate the circumstances under which they had taken place.

24. In summary the Chairman noted that the Board had expressed a high level of concern with regard to the most recent OTM breaches and expected a note from the Executive on the potential for prosecution.

Action: MHS Chief Executive / David Dunleavy

Imported Food Controls

25. The Chief Executive of the FSA updated Board members on imported food controls in the UK. Following a report to the Board in May 2004, Ministers had agreed that the FSA, working with local authorities (LAs) had achieved a step change improvement in the effectiveness of imported food controls, and that this progress should be kept under review. Since then, the FSA had been building on these improvements and a full report would be made to the Board later in the year.

26. Some pointers on progress were:

- the training of 2,000 enforcement officers in UK LAs over the 2 years to April 2005;
- the additional funding (£850,000) provided for LA sampling and surveillance of imported foods;

DRAFT

- action plans had been agreed in each port and follow-up meetings would be taking place to ensure improvements had been carried out;
- the database on Guidance and Regulatory Advice on Imports Legislation (GRAIL) had been successfully piloted and rolled out to the main UK ports of entry for food;
- the FSA had strengthened its links with importers and agents;
- a seminar on imported foods had been held for trade and had been well attended by representatives from Her Majesty's Customs and Excise, LACORS and the Association of Port Authorities.

27. The FSA had also been involved in helping to develop the business case for a "single-window electronic entry" project (an electronic portal for all Government regulations relating to international trade. Board members would receive a further report as part of a full paper on import controls later in 2005.

Action: Sarah Appleby

Illegal Meat Trade

28. The Chief Executive informed Board members that, following the restructuring of the FSA in autumn 2004, the FSA had established a Meat Fraud and Diversity Branch within the Enforcement Division to act as a focus on the FSA's meat fraud work. Progress had also been made in the establishment of an Illegal Meat Task Force, which could now call on its 24 members throughout the UK based in local authorities. The members of the Task Force acted as a network providing information and advice to local authorities on any suspected meat fraud. The FSA was doing a survey on the levels of illegal meat activity and a full report would be presented to the Board when it next discussed the Waste Food Task Force Action Plan.

Action: Adrian Dally

29. The FSA had not been made aware of any recent large-scale meat scams since 2003. A dedicated Welsh Food Fraud Co-ordination Unit had recently been established to assist in tackling a range of different kinds of food fraud on a regional and national level. In addition, there was on-going research by Bristol University into whether smokies could be produced hygienically.

Item 4 - Protecting Consumers: the Food Standards Agency and Regulation

(Paper FSA 05/02/02)

30. The Chairman welcomed Steve Wearne, Head of Strategy, Risk and Regulation Division, to the table and invited him to introduce this paper. Steve Wearne said that the paper described how the FSA decided what action it should take to meet its primary objectives of protecting public health and consumers' other interests in relation to food. These decisions might lead to information campaigns, the development of voluntary or statutory codes of practice, direct regulation or to a range of other activities and functions.

31. The general principles of the FSA's approach to these decisions had been established in some of its founding documents², and had since been expanded in a range of detailed operational guidance³. Towards the end of 2003, the Board had reflected on the importance of the process by which these decisions were reached, and had also recognised that the external regulatory environment was complex and changing. Subsequent work with stakeholders and with the Consumer Committee had investigated some of the underlying issues.

32. This paper proposed that the FSA should articulate a policy statement on regulatory decision-making, to describe:

- the regulatory and alternative interventions the FSA used;
- the FSA's approach to deciding the most appropriate action in each case; and
- how public accountability for regulatory decisions was assured.

33. Such a statement would increase the transparency of these processes, and help demonstrate to stakeholders the consistency and appropriateness of decision-making in the FSA. The paper further proposed that the FSA should consult on its policy statement, seek stakeholders' views on how the FSA might improve its approach to regulatory decision-making, and that the statement should subsequently be kept under review.

² Statement of General Objectives and Practices; and the FSA's Approach to Risk

³ Framework for measuring food risk management against Phillips lessons; Guidelines for FSA Technical Surveys; and Guidelines for assessing and acting on information from food incidents and food surveys

DRAFT

34. The Chairman thanked Steve Wearne for this very clear paper and introduction and invited Board members to focus discussions on the content of Annex A, following the three headings proposed in the paper:

- Options for intervention (p 9, box 1);
- Deciding when to take action to protect public health (from para 6); and
- Achieving public accountability (from para 15).

35. One Board member questioned the terminology used in paragraph 6 on page 10 and asked that the need to use the adjective “reasonable” in referring to consumers be reconsidered. Steve Wearne explained that the terminology, which was derived from the Phillips’ report⁴, would be revisited to recognise the existence of many different consumers with diverse and equally strongly held views.

36. One Board member asked that the text be clarified to make clear that the primary objectives of the FSA included looking after consumers’ interests in relation to both food and drink, not just to food.

37. One Board member commented that box 1 on page 9 could generate confusion and asked that the points made in the table be clarified so that it did not imply linearity or that the list was in order of priority. Other Board members thought that the box clearly suggested a range of options for intervention available to the FSA and should remain in the document. One Board member suggested adding to the list the FSA’s role in providing advice and recommendations to Ministers.

38. Some Board members noted that the paper needed to stress, in Annex 1 at paragraph 8, that Regulatory Impact Assessments needed to reflect better the importance of taking proper account of the benefits, as well as the costs, for business of pursuing particular courses of action. Other Board members asked for the text in paragraph 8 of Annex 1 to be revisited to ensure there was an appropriate balance between the FSA’s considerations of consumer protection and of industry interests. Some Board members also suggested that the paper should include some consideration of the costs to industry and ultimately to consumers from taking the wrong decision and changing regulations.

⁴ “The BSE Inquiry: The Report. The Inquiry into BSE and variant CJD in the United Kingdom” October 2002

DRAFT

39. Board members asked for some examples to be added to paragraph 7 to help clarify the text and to expand the paper to indicate why and when the FSA initiates action at European level and also its rationale for responding to initiatives from Europe.

40. Board members agreed that the public consultation documents should be accompanied by an explanatory note making clear to consultees which parts of the document it would be most useful for the FSA to receive comments on and that the paper should be discussed again by the Board in the light of the comments received following public consultation.

Action: Steve Wearne

41. In summary the Chairman noted that the Board had:

- recognised the complexity of articulating how the FSA addressed its responsibilities as a regulator within its public protection role, and had commended Steve Wearne for this paper, which had addressed FSA processes and expected outcomes;
- agreed the proposed draft policy statement subject to the modifications proposed during discussion;
- agreed that the published draft should be circulated widely to seek the views of stakeholders on how the FSA might improve its approach to regulatory decision making;
- asked for an explanatory letter to be prepared to accompany the document indicating to consultees the main issues on which the FSA would particularly like to hear their views; and
- agreed to have further discussions on this document in the light of the comments received during the consultation process;
- agreed that the FSA should consequently keep the policy statement under regular review.

Item 5 - Review of the Agency's Dietary Surveys Programme

(Paper FSA 05/02/03)

42. The Chairman invited Rosemary Hignett, Head of Nutrition Division, to the table and invited her to introduce this paper on proposed changes to the dietary surveys programme.

DRAFT

43. Rosemary Hignett reminded Board members that the National Dietary Nutritional Survey (NDNS) collected intake data for individuals and was also essential for risk assessment calculations and communication. In 2002 the FSA had started a review of the survey activities to address the timeliness of the programme, which could leave gaps of up to 12-15 years between data, and the lack of flexibility. In December 2003 the Board had agreed that, in principle, the FSA should adopt a rolling programme model for future survey work subject to more detailed consideration of feasibility work on setting this up. The present paper set out proposals for the structure of the core programme and options for an enhanced programme, which would be more expensive but would deliver extremely valuable additional data. Discussions were already underway with the Department of Health (DH) to agree joint funding arrangements for future surveys and the paper proposed ways in which external funding might also be found.

44. The key features of the proposed core programme were that it covered all the UK, including Northern Ireland and all age groups other than infants. The enhancements proposed and considered most valuable were:

- to boost samples to allow comparisons for Scotland, Wales and Northern Ireland against the UK average; and
- to boost samples for ethnic minority groups.

45. Paragraphs 25-30 of the paper set out approaches currently pursued to secure external funding in addition to that expected from Health Departments. They included:

- exploring opportunities for collaboration with other funders of diet and nutrition surveys and those who used NDNS data; and
- developing funded add-ons which would be charged at full cost, including an appropriate proportion of the costs of the core programme.

46. The Scientific Advisory Committee on Nutrition (SACN) had recently discussed these proposals and strongly supported a rolling programme. The Committee considered a dietary surveys programme to be the bedrock on which all nutrition policy was based and expressed a strong desire to participate in the development of a detailed methodology.

DRAFT

47. The Chairman thanked Rosemary Hignett and her team for a very clear paper and presentation and noted that the Board was asked to approve the outline of the proposed rolling programme of dietary surveys. Officials would report back to the Board in July 2005 on the availability of co-funding and the Board would be asked then to consider the structure of the survey and its implications in more detail.
48. Some Board members asked the executive to contact Agriculture Departments, as well as Health Departments, to gauge their level of interest in results from this programme. Rosemary Hignett noted that contacts had been established and work was in progress.
49. One Board member asked about the response rate of 56% shown in paragraph 13 on page 5 of the paper and requested more information. Rosemary Hignett noted that SACN would favour the combination of a 24-hour recall survey with frequency questionnaires and diary recording and the FSA would be taking their advice on this issue.
50. Some Board members enquired about the willingness of industry to pay for additions to the survey and invited the Executive to look at the possibility of establishing funding consortia rather than pursuing funding from individual organisations. Some Board members also suggested that the Advisory Committee on Research (ACR) should be asked to assess the opportunity costs of this work in relation to the FSA's broader research strategy
51. One Board member asked whether, should funding be available from the Scottish Executive, it would be possible to boost the number of samples collected in Scotland beyond that suggested in the paper, and whether advice could be provided to carry out a cost-benefit analysis of different options. The Chief Executive pointed out that preliminary statistical analysis had indicated that to obtain full sub-analyses for any one country would require boosting the sample size to over 1,500. One Board member noted that no baseline data were available for Northern Ireland and therefore any nutrition initiatives undertaken by the FSA could not be evaluated.

DRAFT

52. Board members

- expressed caution about investing large sums of money in the development of funded add-ons to the programme without seeking expert advice on the opportunities and possibilities for income generation;
- agreed that such expert advice needed to be sought from the outset;
- agreed that it would be necessary to have a clear idea of any co-funding partners' likely financial commitment to an enhanced programme; and
- suggested that preference should be given to providing sample boosting for ethnic minorities rather than for devolved countries.

In response to a question from one Board member, Rosemary Hignett noted that FSA officials were liaising with other countries to help inform the contracting process through international expertise in this area.

53. The Chairman summarised the main points raised in the discussion. The Board had:

- thanked Rosemary Hignett and her team for the excellent paper;
- expressed support for the broad design of the rolling programme;
- asked the executive to seek the view of the ACR on opportunity costs;
- supported the approach to finding external co-funders and suggested considering the establishment of funding consortia;
- agreed to continue discussion on the structure of the surveys and on the prioritisation of sampling, eg ethnic minorities, devolved countries, etc, and to report back to the Board in July 2005 after receiving clarification on the availability of co-funding; and
- recognised the need to consult expert advisors on the possibility of charging customers for using data.

Item 6 - Reports from Chairs of Advisory Committees

(Papers FSA 05/02/04, FSA 05/02/05 and FSA 05/02/06)

Northern Ireland

54. The Chair of the Northern Ireland Food Advisory Committee (NIFAC) informed Board members that the Committee's last meeting had had to be cancelled due

DRAFT

to bad weather. She added that this had happened due to exceptional circumstances and that it had not been considered necessary to review the quorum requirements.

Wales

55. The Chair of the Welsh Food Advisory Committee (WFAC) informed Board members that the Food Fraud Unit was receiving government funding and that it would be working in co-operation with local authorities.

Scotland

56. The Chair of the Scottish Food Advisory Committee (SFAC) informed Board members that SFAC had discussed the implications of the Freedom of Information (Fol) Act on catering establishments with regard to the disclosure of information held by local authorities. He also noted that the final report of the Shellfish Working Group, which contained 26 recommendations, would be circulated to FSA Board members shortly. He thanked Andrew Miller for his work on SFAC and for his support over the past two years.

Any Other Business

57. There was one item raised for discussion under Any Other Business:

FSA's formal response to the consultation on the interim report on reducing administrative burdens: effective inspection and enforcement.

(INT 05/02/01)

58. The Chairman noted that the FSA's response to Philip Hampton's interim report on inspection and enforcement had been sent and was now available on the FSA website.

Date of Next meeting

59. The next open meeting would be held on 10 March 2005 in Edinburgh.

DRAFT

Summary of Actions Arising

Index	Action	Due date	Progress to date
9Feb05/O/251	Circulate a note to Board members on penalty options for producers and operators in breach of OTM rules. (Para 24)	April 05	Note in preparation
9Feb05/O/253	Prepare an explanatory note to accompany the consultation document on "Protecting consumers: the Food Standards Agency and regulation" making clear to consultees which parts of the document it would be most useful for the FSA to receive comments on. (Para 40)	March 05	Note in preparation

Actions from Previous Meetings

Index	Action	Due date	Progress to date
9Dec04/O/245	Provide a note describing lines of accountability and definitions of roles of the MHS, the FSA and Defra. (Para 25).	March 05	Linked to MHS priorities exercise recommended by Wall. Paper to be developed in conjunction with Defra.
9Dec04/O/246	Provide a short note on the experiences of other member states in introducing BSE testing. (Para 38)	March 05	Information note in preparation.

DRAFT

Completed Actions

Index	Action
13Feb03/O/166	Further discussion paper to revisit HACCP strategy and, if necessary, re-examine licensing and prior approval issues in light of the work on the 'thirty percent' target. (Para 35).
11Mar04/O/213	Report back when piloting regional support centres has been completed. (Para 40)
11Mar04/O/214	Report on the action plan to implement food safety management based on HACCP principles, with oral updates as necessary. (Para 40)
9Sept04/O/235	Ensure that training aspects are addressed in the paper on food safety management based on HACCP principles, to be presented to the Board in the first half of 2005. (Para 46) These issues have been covered in the papers presented to the Board meeting in March 2005.
9Feb05/O/249	Circulate to Board members the minutes of the last meeting of MHAC. (Para 6). These minutes have now been circulated to Board members.
9Feb05/O/250	Circulate to Board members the minutes of the meetings of the MHS Board on a regular basis. (Para 5). The minutes of the first MHS Board meeting, held on 2 November, were circulated to Board members on 11 February. Minutes of subsequent meetings will be circulated on a regular basis.
9Feb05/O/251	Board members to receive a further report on the "single-window electronic entry" project as part of a full paper on import controls later in 2005. (Para 27). A paper on import controls has been provisionally scheduled for the Board meeting in July 2005.
9Feb05/O/252	A full report on the levels of illegal meat activity to be presented to the Board when it next discusses the Waste Food Task Force Action Plan (Para 28). This discussion has been provisionally scheduled for the Board meeting in May 2005.
9Feb05/O/254	The paper on "Protecting consumers: the Food Standards Agency and regulation" to be discussed again by the Board in the light of the comments received following public consultation (Para 40). This discussion has been provisionally scheduled for the Board meeting in September 2005.