

<b>Minutes and Action Points</b>	
<b>Wednesday 22 June 2016 – 14:30 to 17:30</b>	
<b>Agenda Item:</b>	<b>Actions:</b>
<b>1. Introductions made and apologies for absence</b>	
<p>Attendees:                      Bill Stow (Chair), Stuart Roberts (SR), Stephen Crouch (SC), Michael Bailey (MB), Richard Stevenson (RS), Richard Griffiths (RG), Conall Donnelly (CDon), Paul Bell (PB), Prys Morgan (PM), Richard Collier (RC), Martin Evans (ME), Tim Bennett (TB), Rowlando Morgan (RM), Fiona Steiger (FS), Stephen Crookes (SMC), James Ridsdale (JR)</p> <p>Teleconference:                      Elliott Bell (EB), Peter Hewson (PH), Deirdre Mclvor (DM), Chris Dodd (CD)</p> <p>Apologies:                      Phil Hadley, Elizabeth Andoh-Kesson, Chris Sturman, Zoe Davies, Emma Holland-Lindsay, Jason Feeney, Nicholas Daniel, John Lawrence</p>	
<b>2. Terms of Reference</b>	
<ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1. RC updated the group regarding the addition to paragraph 1.1 in regards to risks being managed and mitigated appropriately.</li> <li>2. Membership to be updated accordingly</li> <li>3. Group agreed Terms of Reference</li> </ol>	<b>Action: SMC</b>
<b>3. Steering Group Ground Rules</b>	
<ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1. Chair gave an overview of the Ground Rules and the amendments that he has made to them from the original edition.</li> <li>2. RG raised concerns in relation to points 1 and 2 of Ground Rules; he feels that these are contradictory if there is a need to consult his members on specifics at any time during Phase 2. Following group discussions it was agreed to amend item 2 as follows:                             <ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>a. Replace 'so that there are "no surprises"' with 'as soon as possible.'</li> </ol> </li> <li>3. Group Agreed to Ground Rules with amendment. SMC to circulate amended version.</li> </ol>	<p><b>Action: SMC</b></p> <p><b>Action: SMC</b></p>

<p><b>4. Update of March FSA Board Meeting</b></p>	
<ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1. RC updated the group in regard to the FSA Board meeting in March; highlighting the following points:             <ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>a. FSA Board appreciative of the work carried out during Stow Phase 1 and would like to thank all involved.</li> <li>b. FSA Board accepted all recommendations within the Board paper.</li> <li>c. Heather Hancock (FSA Chair) expressed the wish that the group focus on transformational change rather than starting from where we are currently and getting tied up in the details of getting to the end goal.</li> <li>d. During Board discussions it was mentioned that the principle of differential treatment for small businesses should be transitional rather than an essential component of the model in the long term.</li> <li>e. Consideration as to who bears the cost of large scale incidents i.e. horsemeat incident.</li> </ol> </li> <li>2. TB reiterated the FSA Board's appreciation for the work carried out by everyone involved in Stow Phase 1.</li> <li>3. TB updated the group in regard to the work that the FSA has been carrying out over the past year:             <ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>a. Looking at what other countries are doing in relation to delivery of official controls.</li> <li>b. Looking at new delivery systems, which will work smarter and more risk based, across all official control areas. Timescales for implementing these work streams are being looked into.</li> <li>c. The FSA Boards position is that there will be change to the delivery systems across the whole of official controls.</li> </ol> </li> <li>4. TB emphasised that Stow Phase 2 needs to tie-into the work of the other work streams looking at delivery of official controls.</li> <li>5. ME reiterated that everything is on the table to be looked into.</li> </ol>	
<p><b>5. Middle Lane Project update - JR</b></p>	
<ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1. JR updated the group regarding the Middle Lane work streams, highlighting the following areas:             <ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>a. The work streams are looking at all aspects of official controls as well as working with other countries in the</li> </ol> </li> </ol>	

<p>way they deliver official controls.</p> <p>b. Looking at how we interpret the Regulations/Legislation compared to other countries and looking at how we can use the flexibilities of the Regulations/Legislation but not compromising public health, animal health and animal welfare.</p> <p>2. JR timeframe for these work streams are between 18 month and 3 years.</p> <p>3. JR highlighted the 6 main work streams being:</p> <p>a. Flexibility of deployment of official veterinarians for official controls.</p> <p>b. FBO role in regard to delivering official controls.</p> <p>c. Visual inspection of pigs – looking at rolling out full implementation.</p> <p>d. Official controls for game handling establishments – more risk based approach.</p> <p>e. Review of audit frequency in compliant premises</p> <p>f. Looking at inspection of green offal requirements in poultry abattoirs.</p> <p>4. JR also updated the group regarding the Slow lane projects, work streams that deliver benefits over a long period of time such as changes to EU legislation, and the Fast lane projects, work streams that deliver benefits quickly.</p> <p>5. Chair requested that a paper regarding the Middle Lane project be presented at the next meeting; mapping out how the Stow Phase 2 Steering Group fits in to the project.</p> <p>6. Group discussion regarding project governance.</p> <p>a. <b>Post meeting note: After the meeting it was clarified that the middle lane work streams report to the Executive Management Team whereas the Steering Group on Meat Charging is advisory and operates at a strategic level and therefore reports to the FSA Board.</b></p>	<p><b>Action: JR/ John Lawrence</b></p>
<p><b>6. Update on EU Activity:</b></p>	
<p>1. RC updated the group regarding the review of 882, highlighting that everything at the moment is looking like it will result in a system similar to the current system.</p> <p>a. RC will keep the group updated of any progress</p>	<p><b>Action: RC</b></p>
<p><b>7. Update on Contracts</b></p>	

## Stow Phase 2: Sustainable Funding Model 22 June 2016 - AVH

---

<ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1. ME informed the group that the current service delivery contracts for official veterinarians run out at the end of March 2017. Tender proposals are currently being looked into and the FSA have appointed Denise Fitzsimmons on an 18 month contract to deliver the tender project.</li> <li>2. ME confirmed that the new tenders will be for multiple areas rather than the current system of England and Wales.</li> <li>3. Industry will be engaging on the tender process through the Partnership Working Group.</li> </ol>	
<p><b>8. Steering Group Members views as to priorities for the 1<sup>st</sup> stage of Phase 2</b></p>	
<ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1. Chair requested that all Steering Group Members gave their thoughts as to what they feel are the important areas that the group as a whole should look at for the first phase of Phase 2.</li> <li>2. ME highlighted that all Statements of Resources are now on a database that can be analysed to ensure that the correct resources are utilised and if/what changes can be made to utilise resources better.</li> <li>3. PH highlighted the following areas: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Concentrate on the quick wins.</li> <li>• Look into what costs are charged for i.e. direct and indirect costs.</li> <li>• Look into a single rate for all MHI hours used rather than overtime rates as some plants are charged at overtime rates because the MHI has used their standard rate hours at another plant earlier in the day. Also looking into having a rate for the job carried out rather than the rate for the person carrying out the work.</li> <li>• Poultry MHIs should be charged at a lower rate as their job is less demanding.</li> <li>• Look into EU minima in regards to it being charged at a national basis rather than at a plant basis.</li> </ul> </li> <li>4. EB highlighted the following areas: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Looking at the efficiencies that can be made and looking at ensuring that additional costs are not directly passed straight down to producers and farmers.</li> </ul> </li> <li>5. CD highlighted the following areas:</li> </ol>	



<ul style="list-style-type: none"><li>• Need to drill down into direct and indirect costs.</li></ul> <p>11. PM highlighted the following areas:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"><li>• Need to look at data sets of what's good and what's not so good.</li><li>• Essential that whatever we do we need to maintain consumer confidence for UK &amp; Export markets.</li><li>• Flexibilities of ways of working and resources utilised.</li><li>• Need for really good communications of any changes that we may want to make.</li></ul> <p>12. RS highlighted the following areas:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"><li>• Looking into and changes for small plants being carried out over a transitional period.</li><li>• Need to look at a decrease in overall costs.</li></ul> <p>13. RG highlighted the following areas:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"><li>• Need to look at options as to who carries out official controls.</li><li>• Need to look into all areas to see what would be a realistic end point that we can achieve.</li><li>• Quick wins should be taken but this should not be a main focus of the Steering Group.</li><li>• Industry has always said the FSA is too expensive. What can be done to mitigate this? The options are:<ul style="list-style-type: none"><li>i. Use fewer resources (within the terms of the Regulations)</li><li>ii. Make better use of the resources through efficiencies / investment</li></ul></li></ul> <p>14. SC highlighted the following areas:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"><li>• Looking into alternative delivery models for the game industry such as PIA as used in poultry.</li></ul> <p>15. ME suggested that rather than looking at plants being large or small it might be better to look at plants being compliant or less-compliant and seeing if there could be more to be looked at.</p> <p>16. The Chair summarised the discussions, highlighting the following 3 main areas:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"><li>• Define what a 'Sustainable Funding Model' is and putting this to the FSA Board for agreement.</li></ul>	
---	--

## Stow Phase 2: Sustainable Funding Model 22 June 2016 - AVH

---

<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Look at possible ways to reduce costs.</li> <li>• Broader delivery models, looking at data sets to see how these might work.</li> </ul> <p>17. Following group discussions the following sub groups and work streams where agreed for the next meeting:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Data – RC &amp; PM to look into data sets for analysis, taking into account time and costs of delivering official controls. RC/SMC to look into legalities of using specific plant data during group discussions.</li> <li>• Blank page approach – SR &amp; ME to define what a sustainable funding model would look like from a blank page approach (Action 8.9.a above).</li> <li>• ME to look into direct and indirect costs. <b>(Post meeting note – The following link is for the 2016/17 Cost Data presentation which provides a drill down into the costs included in the meat charge rates:</b>  <a href="http://www.food.gov.uk/sites/default/files/meat-hyg-cost-data-16-17.pdf">http://www.food.gov.uk/sites/default/files/meat-hyg-cost-data-16-17.pdf</a>).</li> </ul>	<p><b>Action: RC &amp; PM</b></p> <p><b>Action: RC &amp; SMC</b></p> <p><b>Action: SR &amp; ME</b></p> <p><b>Action: ME</b></p>
<p><b>9. AOB:</b></p>	
<p>1. SMC to circulate dates for next meeting, RG offered the use of BPC rooms if needed. <b>(Post meeting note – date of next meeting confirmed as 1 September 2016)</b></p>	<p><b>Action: SMC</b></p>
<p><i>Meeting close</i></p>	

**Action Plan:**

<b><u>Marked as complete:</u></b>				
<b>AP No.</b>	<b>Owner / Sub Group</b>	<b>Issue</b>	<b>Additional detail</b>	<b>Outcome</b>
<b><u>Ongoing:</u></b>				
<b>AP No.</b>	<b>Owner / Sub Group</b>	<b>Issue</b>	<b>Additional detail</b>	<b>Outcome</b>
<b><u>New:</u></b>				
<b>AP No.</b>	<b>Owner / Sub Group</b>	<b>Issue</b>	<b>Additional detail</b>	<b>Outcome</b>
22 June 16 – 2.2	SMC	Update Steering Group Membership		
22 June 16 - 3.2.a	SMC	Amend Terms of Reference		
22 June 16 – 3.3	SMC	Circulate amended Terms of Reference to Group		
22 June 16 – 5.4.a	JR / John Lawrence.  Middle Lane	Paper regarding the Middle Lane project be presented at the next meeting; mapping out how the Stow Phase 2 Steering Group fits		

## Stow Phase 2: Sustainable Funding Model 22 June 2016 - AVH

	Project	in to the project		
22 June 16 – 6.1.a	RC. EU 882 Activity	RC to keep updated of any progress with 882		
22 June 16 – 8.7.a	PB	Provide Unisons proposal of a more efficient delivery model to Steering Group Chair		
22 June 16 – 8.9.a & 8.17.b	SR & ME. Blank page approach	SR & ME to define what a sustainable funding model would look like from a blank page approach and provide update at next meeting.		
22 June 16 - 8.9.b	All Steering Group	Steering Group to decide on what they feel sustainable means and put this back to the FSA Board to see if they agree with the Steering Groups interpretation.		
22 June 16 – 8.17.a	RC & PM. Data sets	RC & PM to look into data sets for analysis at next meeting, taking into account time and costs of delivering official controls.		
22 July 16 – 8.17.a	RC & SMC Data Sets	RC/SMC to look into legalities of using specific plant data during group discussions.		
22 June 16 – 8.17.c	ME	ME to look into direct and indirect costs associated with delivery of official controls		
22 June 16 – 9.1	SMC	Circulate dates for next Steering Group Meeting	Date for next meeting is 1 September 2016	