Potential Divergence of Food Safety Regulations Within the UK: Appendix 3 Research materials discussion guide

Note: this discussion guide is intended to inform the discussion in each workshop. Questions may not be asked in the order below, and not every question will be asked in each workshop.
Key:

- CAPITALISED = instructions for moderators
- Bold lower case = key questions
- Non-bold lower case = follow up questions and prompts

Arrival (before start)

15 to 20 minutes

Participants enter the ‘zoom room’ and any that have not already done so are asked to change their screen name to first name and initial of their surname.

Section 1

Section 1: Introduction

6 to 6:05pm, 5 minutes

PLENARY

SHOW STIMULUS SLIDES 1 to 4

Chair introduction:

- thank participants for taking part.
- introduce self and Ipsos UK, moderators, observers, and note-takers.
- the discussion will last three hours and we’ll have a short break part way through.

Explain purpose of the discussion: This research is being carried out on behalf of the Food Standards Agency. They are looking at the way the food industry, including production, is currently regulated and how regulations might change in the future. For this purpose, they have commissioned us to run this research, as they are interested in gaining a better understanding of public views. Today we’re going to talk in more detail about how different types of products are currently regulated and discuss potential scenarios of what it might look like in the future.

Talk through the ground rules/ housekeeping. TOTALLY VOLUNTARY

WHEN INTRODUCING OBSERVERS, PLEASE SPECIFY: We’re also joined tonight by observers from the Food Standards Agency, but please rest assured they don’t have any other information about you, other than what can be seen on the screen.

Objectives covered

- introduce participants to the research
- introduce moderators, observers and note-takers

Section 1: Ground rules and warm up

6:05 to 6:15pm, 10 minutes

BREAK-OUT GROUPS

Reiterate ground rules

We will be audio-recording this discussion in line with the MRS Code of Conduct. The recording will be stored on our secure servers before it is deleted when the research is over and no one outside of the research team will have access to this.

Following these groups, we will be writing up our findings into a report for the FSA, and these might be published at a future date. However, no findings will be attributed to you and we will not include your name in any reports.

Are there any questions at this point?
Can I check you are happy to take part in this research?

Ask if everyone is happy for the recording to begin TURN ON RECORDING and record consent that everyone is happy to participate in the workshop, that they understand the aims of the research, that their participation is voluntary and that their responses will remain confidential and anonymous.
TURN ON RECORDER NOW

SHOW STIMULUS: SLIDE 5
Introductions around the group. Please tell us:

- your first name
- where you're from (ROUGHLY, WE DON'T NEED SPECIFIC POSTCODES)
- what's your favourite meal

We want to start by talking about what happens before food arrives at the supermarket.

What do you know about where food comes from? This isn't a trick question!

- who do you think is involved? Probe: farmers, different types of food businesses, inspectors?
- how do you think this is regulated?
- what do you think happens to make sure the food you can buy in the shops is safe to eat?

Objectives covered

- clarify audio recording
- collect informed consent for participation
- ice-breaker exercise to get participants to know each other and build discussion dynamic

Section 1: Introduction to the FSA

6:15 to 6:25pm, 10 minutes

BREAK-OUT GROUPS

Reiterate ground rules

MODERATOR INTRODUCES BACKGROUND TO THE FSA

SHOW STIMULUS: SLIDE 6

What initially comes to mind when you hear “the Food Standards Agency”? How many of you have heard of this organisation before?

- what kinds of activities do you think the FSA does?
- what do you think they are responsible for?
- what does this look like in practice?
- where do you think they operate/enforce standards (e.g. what kind of businesses)?
- is there anything else you think the FSA does?

SHOW STIMULUS: SLIDE 7

How much of this information feels familiar to you?

- what had you heard about before? From where?
- is anything surprising? Unfamiliar? Confusing?
- do you have any questions?

What role do you think the FSA plays in making sure food is safe and is what it says it is?

- how might they ensure food is healthier and more sustainable for the future?
- is there anything else you think the FSA does?

Why do you think Scotland has its own Food Standards body (the FSS)?

- what do you think are the main benefits to having this regionalised approach?
- were you aware that Scotland had its own food standards body?
- do you have any questions about how this works in practice?

Objectives covered

Gauge awareness levels of regulation in the food industry and the FSA's role in this.

Section 1: Four-country working and devolution

6:25pm to 6:35pm, 10 minutes

BREAK-OUT GROUPS

MODERATOR INTRODUCES FOUR-COUNTRY WORKING AND DEVOLUTION

SHOW STIMULUS: SLIDE 8

MODERATOR TO PROBE FOR SPONTANEOUS REACTIONS:

How much of this information feels familiar to you?

- what had you heard about before? From where?
- is anything surprising? Unfamiliar? Confusing?

- do you have any questions? [MODERATOR TO USE WHATSAPP GROUP TO BRING IN FSA OBSERVERS IF REQUIRED TO ANSWER SPECIFIC QUESTIONS. THESE CAN ALSO BE CAPTURED AND ASKED IN THE PLENARY SESSION.]

Does the concept of devolution make sense to you? Do you have any questions?

MODERATOR TO NOTE DOWN QUESTIONS TO BE ASKED IN THE PLENARY SESSION.

- is anything clear/ unclear about the FSA's current approach to 'four-country' working?
- is anything confusing?
- is anything surprising?
- how do you feel about the four-country working approach?
- can you imagine any scenarios where regulations might be different across the four nations? what are they?
- what might be the benefits of this approach?
- what do you like about it? Do you find anything reassuring?
- what might be the challenges?
- what concerns do you have?

6:35pm to 6:40pm, 5 minutes

PLENARY

Opportunity for questions and initial reactions from participants.

We will take a quick refreshment break before receiving a second presentation in the larger group, please be back here in 10 minutes.

Objectives covered

Gauge understanding and concerns about current devolution and plans for future

BREAK - 10 minutes

Section 2

Section 2: Introducing the concept of regulatory divergence

6:50 to 7pm, 10 minutes

PLENARY

LEAD MODERATOR INTRODUCES THE CONTEXT FOR CHANGE, REGULATORY DIVERGENCE AND ONWARD PROCESSING

SHOW STIMULUS SLIDES 9,10, 11 and 12

Opportunity for questions and initial reactions from participants incl. any questions for FSA observers.

Objectives covered

Present a broad overview of proposed divergence, the changes it involves and the wider context.

Section 2: Spontaneous reactions to regulatory divergence and the legislative context

7 to 7:15pm, 15 minutes

BREAK-OUT GROUPS

Initial responses to the presentation introducing regulatory divergence:

IF NECESSARY, SHOW AGAIN STIMULUS: SLIDES 9-12

- what do you think about the presentation?
- was anything confusing or unclear?
- was anything surprising?
- what did you think about the concepts presented? (Moderator to probe as relevant on context for change, regulatory divergence and onward processing)
- what do you think would be the main benefits if the UK nations were to make their own regulatory changes compared to continuing to follow adopted EU regulations?
- why do you think UK nations might consider different policies and regulations in future?
- at this point, what are your main concerns about the potential of more regulatory divergence happening in the future?
- do you have any worries about UK nations diverging from EU regulations?
- how could your concerns be addressed?
- what do you think about the idea that regulations could be different across each of the four nations in the UK?
- do you think there could be any positives to this?
- what about downsides?
- what do you think this could mean for consumers?
- do you have any concerns?
- how do you think this might affect you? Could it change what you consider when buying food?

Objectives covered

Explore spontaneous reactions to regulatory divergence and other concepts presented.

Section 3

Section 3: Scenarios and trade offs

7:15 to 8:40pm, 20 minutes for each scenario, 5 to 10 minutes break between 2 and 3

BREAK-OUT GROUPS

MODERATOR INTRODUCES THE FOUR SCENARIOS OF REGULATORY DIVERGENCE IN TURN (SCENARIOS TO BE ROTATED ACROSS GROUPS)

We have developed some examples of what regulatory divergence could look like in the future, with regards to different types of products. We will go through each of these examples one by one and ask some follow up questions. It is important to note that these examples are not currently being worked on by the FSA and are entirely hypothetical. They have been created just to provide you with a sense of what regulatory divergence might look like. As we noted earlier, four nation working means the FSA and FSS work to achieve consistent approaches across policy areas where ever possible.

PLEASE SHOW STIMULUS FOR SCENARIO 1: SLIDE 13 and 14.

Product type: A vegetable additive

- the EU's Food Safety Agency (EFSA) consider an existing vegetable additive (permitted in both the EU and UK) to be of risk to the public. The European Commission removes authorisation for the additive to be used in the EU.
- the FSA's risk analysis process concludes that this removal is not proportionate to the risk given likely consumption levels of the additive. They advise Ministers in England and Wales that they can continue to use the additive but place future requirements on the amount which can be used in a product.
- the FSS agree with the FSA risk analysis but Scottish Ministers decide not to authorise continued use of the additive due to the Scottish Government's broad policy ambition to remain aligned with the EU.
- due to UK legislation and regulatory divergence, products containing the vegetable additive can be sold in Scotland for consumers to purchase, but cannot be used for onward processing.

General prompts for all scenarios:
What do you think about this example?

Do you have any questions about this example before we discuss it further?

What might the potential benefits be to regulatory divergence in this example?
Probe: regulatory divergence between the four UK nations
Probe: regulatory divergence from the EU

Who might this affect? Probe: the FSA, food businesses, consumers
Are there any other benefits you can think of?

What might be the potential risks or challenges of regulatory divergence in this example?
Probe: regulatory divergence between the four UK nations
Probe: regulatory divergence from the EU

Who might this affect? Probe: the FSA, food businesses, consumers
Are there any other risks you can think of?

If this scenario were to happen, would it affect your decision-making in any way when purchasing a product? For what reasons?
Do you consider how food is prepared, stored or regulated when you decide what to buy at the moment?

Example 1 specific questions:

In this example, the complexity of regulations is likely to increase for businesses as they may need to comply with different rules depending on where they sell to. For example, if they sell to both EU and GB markets.

Some businesses may decide to continue using the additive if they only produce products for the GB market. This could increase the choice for consumers as they will be able to continue purchasing the existing product developed for EU markets and any new products developed for the GB market. This would not apply in Northern Ireland, where products would need to comply with EU rules.

- what do you think the impact of this could be on businesses across the four UK nations? What about UK consumers?

- would you be prepared to accept increased business complexity if it gave greater consumer choice?
- what would make this scenario more acceptable to you as a consumer? For what reasons?
- how do you feel this scenario could be made more acceptable to businesses? For what reasons?
- if consumer costs increased, how would you feel about this scenario? How about if costs decreased?

In this scenario, English and Welsh businesses follow one set of regulations while Scottish and Northern Irish businesses follow another set of regulations. This means Scottish and Northern Irish businesses could not use English or Welsh products for onward processing. However, due to UK legislation, consumers in Scotland would be able to purchase products from England and Wales that contained the additive.

What do you think would be the potential benefits for businesses in this example?

- does this differ between businesses in the four nations?
- [If needed] Scottish and Northern Irish businesses could continue to be able to sell into EU markets with reduced checks on their goods. What might the impact of this be?
- [If needed] English and Welsh businesses could continue to sell into Scotland, giving consumers there the choice to buy vegetables with the additive.

What would this mean for consumers? Probe: increased choice, impact on cost

Are there any potential disadvantages businesses face?

- does this differ between businesses in the four nations?
- [If needed] Scottish businesses might lose out to English and Welsh producers if Scottish consumers prefer vegetables with the additive. They may need to change their production processes or find new vegetable suppliers.
- [If needed] English and Welsh businesses might be prevented from selling into EU markets or find this more difficult to do.

What would this mean for consumers? Probe: increased choice, impact on cost

To what extent would you want vegetables produced with (or without) the additive to be labelled?
Would this differ depending on which UK nation you are based in?
PROBE: Would you want vegetables to be labelled in England and Wales even though there has been no change?
PROBE: Would you want vegetables produced in Scotland to be labelled as not containing the additive so consumers could distinguish these from English or Welsh products?
If this change were to happen, how should the FSA communicate this with consumers? How about communicating this change with businesses?

PLEASE SHOW STIMULUS FOR SCENARIO 2: SLIDE 15 & 16.

Product type: Chilled chopped fruit

- **new research commissioned by the EU suggests that a lower storage temperature in supply chains can improve the quality, food safety and shelf life of ready-to-eat chilled, chopped fruit. This can also help to reduce waste and increase consumer access to fruit products.**
- **The European Food Safety Authority (EFSA) recommends the EU amends their legislation to adopt this lower temperature for ready-to-eat fruit product**

manufacturing.

- **the FSA and FSS carry out their own risk analysis and do not agree with the EFSA recommendation due to higher business costs for a marginal increase in food safety. They recommend keeping the existing legislation in place for England, Wales and Scotland. However, Northern Ireland must follow the new EU legislation.**
- **due to regulatory divergence, two chopped and chilled pineapple products could appear next to each other on shelves, one at facility which has used the new lower temperature and another which uses the existing storage temperature.**

Cycle back through general prompts for all scenarios

What do you think about this example?
Do you have any questions about this example before we discuss it further?

What might the potential benefits be to regulatory divergence in this example?
Probe: regulatory divergence between the four UK nations
Probe: regulatory divergence from the EU

Who might this affect? Probe: the FSA, food businesses, consumers
Are there any other benefits you can think of?

What might be the potential risks or challenges of regulatory divergence in this example?
Probe: regulatory divergence between the four UK nations
Probe: regulatory divergence from the EU

Who might this affect? Probe: the FSA, food businesses, consumers
Are there any other risks you can think of?

If this scenario were to happen, would it affect your decision-making in any way when purchasing a product? For what reasons?
Do you consider how food is prepared, stored or regulated when you decide what to buy at the moment?

Scenario 2 specific questions:

In this example, businesses in Northern Ireland must comply with the new regulations because of a change implemented at the EU level. Food safety and food quality are improved but the costs for Northern Irish businesses increase.

Businesses in England, Scotland and Wales can choose which set of regulations they adhere to based on where they intend to sell their product in future. Consumer choice for those in England, Scotland and Wales is increased in this example as consumers could buy ready-to-eat fruit stored at both temperatures. Both products would appear the same when on display ready for purchase.

- what do you think the impact of this could be on businesses across the four nations? What about UK consumers?
- would you be prepared to accept higher costs for businesses if it meant improved food quality and safety? What would the impact of this be on costs for consumers?
- **would you accept products for sale at varying costs if it meant more consumer choice? What about if the two products looked the same?**
- wat would make this scenario more acceptable to you as a consumer? For what reasons?
- how do you feel this scenario could be made more acceptable to businesses? For what reasons?
- if in this scenario, consumer costs increased, how would you feel about it then?

In this scenario, Ministers in England, Wales and Scotland follow the FSA's and FSS' respective recommendations but those in Northern Ireland must comply with new EU regulations to continue being part of the EU open market. Businesses in Great Britain might have two production lines in order to continue selling to the EU and/or Northern Ireland. The Northern Irish product would still be available for sale in GB due to UK legislation. It could look exactly the same as products made in GB.

Would a different approach in different UK nations in this event be acceptable to you? Why / why not?

- how would you feel about purchasing the Northern Irish product in comparison to the English, Scottish or Welsh product? Would you trust it more or less? For what reasons?
- how do you think Northern Irish businesses would react if they had to follow a new regulation recommended by the EFSA? What would this mean for Northern Irish consumers?

To what extent would you want products that are manufactured to the new set of regulations to be labelled?
Would this differ depending on which UK nation you are based in?
PROBE: Would you want fruit manufactured to the old set of regulations to be labelled in England, Scotland and Wales even though there has been no change?
If this change were to happen, how should the FSA communicate this with consumers? How about communicating this change with businesses?

What do you think the potential benefits for businesses would be in this example?

Does this differ between businesses in the four nations?

What would this mean for consumers? Probe: increased choice, impact on cost, food safety, shelf-life and food quality

Do you think there are any potential disadvantages businesses could face as a result of this divergence?

- Does this differ between businesses in the four nations?

Do you feel differently towards regulatory divergence when it relates to a fruit product compared to other food regulations?

- What is different, if anything, between the product types we've discussed?
- Is it more acceptable to change regulations on one product than the other? For what reasons?

BREAK 10 MINUTES SLIDE 17

PLEASE SHOW STIMULUS FOR SCENARIO 3: SLIDE 18 and 19.

Product type: Meat processing

- the EU places additional requirements on meat cutting plants following publication of new evidence from the European Food Safety Authority (EFSA). These requirements reduce the risk of a certain foodborne disease but implementing them significantly adds to business costs.
- the FSA does not recommend implementing the same requirements for a number of reasons: the prevalence of the disease is lower in the UK, the disease itself does not

present significant health risks, and the change is not considered proportionate to the costs the requirements would generate for the industry.
- Food Standards Scotland (FSS) and Scottish Ministers want to implement the change because there is some evidence that there are slightly higher outbreak levels of the foodborne disease in Scotland than in the rest of the UK.
- animal products produced in England and Wales could still be sold in Scotland, but they could not be used in onward processing for example, to use English or Welsh meat in burgers produced in Scotland. This difference would not be shown on product labelling anywhere in Great Britain.

Cycle back through general prompts for all scenarios

What do you think about this example?

Do you have any questions about this example before we discuss it further?

What might the potential benefits be to regulatory divergence in this example?

Probe: regulatory divergence between the four UK nations

Probe: regulatory divergence from the EU

Who might this affect? Probe: the FSA, food businesses, consumers

Are there any other benefits you can think of?

What might be the potential risks or challenges of regulatory divergence in this example?

Probe: regulatory divergence between the four UK nations

Probe: regulatory divergence from the EU

Who might this affect? Probe: the FSA, food businesses, consumers

Are there any other risks you can think of?

If this scenario were to happen, would it affect your decision-making in any way when purchasing a product? For what reasons?

Do you consider how food is prepared, stored or regulated when you decide what to buy at the moment?

Scenario 3 specific questions:

In this example, new EU regulations would mean marginally increased safety in meat processing plants, but also increased business costs to implement these safety measures.

Businesses in Northern Ireland must implement these new measures. Businesses in England, Scotland and Wales could implement these measures if they chose to, but that is not a requirement.

Consumers in Great Britain can buy meat products produced to either set of regulations, whereas those in Northern Ireland can only buy meat processed to the newer set of regulations.

- what do you think the impact of this could be on businesses across the four UK nations? What about UK consumers?
- would you be prepared to accept higher costs for businesses if it meant slightly increased safety?
- what do you think this would mean for consumer costs? How does it make you feel about the divergence now?
- what would make this scenario more acceptable to you as a consumer? For what reasons?
- how do you feel this scenario could be made more acceptable to businesses? For what reasons?

Do you currently consider processing safety measures when purchasing food?

Would any changes to regulations have an impact on the way you think about safety and business costs in the meat industry?

In this example, England and Wales follow FSA guidance. Due to the needs of the Scottish population and a higher risk of outbreaks in Scotland, the FSS chooses to follow proposed EU regulation. Is this acceptable to you? Why / why not?

What do you think would be the potential benefits for businesses in this example?

- Does this differ between businesses in the four nations?

  - how do you think businesses in England would respond to these regulations? What about if they wanted to sell their product into Northern Ireland?
  - [If needed] English and Welsh businesses may be able to continue manufacturing food at the same price, giving them a competitive advantage over Scottish and Northern Irish businesses.
  - [If needed] consumers may want to buy products that are safer, and therefore decide to buy from Scottish or Northern Irish businesses.
  - [If needed] Scottish and Northern Irish businesses can continue to sell into the EU.

What would this mean for consumers? Probe: increased choice, impact on cost, nutritional / health impact

Are there any potential disadvantages businesses face?

- does this differ between businesses in the four nations?
- [If needed] this could increase costs to Scottish and Northern Irish businesses.
- [If needed] consumers may have reduced trust in English and Welsh businesses.

What would this mean for consumers? Probe: increased choice, impact on cost, nutritional / health impact

How do you feel about meat produced in England and Wales being sold in Scotland for consumption but not used for onward processing? For example, a Scottish meatball manufacturer using English beef would not be able to use that raw product in future.

- how might this affect businesses? What advantages might businesses be able to capitalise on? How might this place them at a competitive disadvantage?
- what about the impact on consumers?

To what extent would you want products produced to the previous regulations to be labelled?

- how do you feel meat products produced to the new set of regulations should be labelled?

- does this differ at all depending on which nation you are in?
- should consumers be able to see a difference between the two products when both are available for sale next to each other?
- if this change were to happen, how should the FSA communicate this with consumers? How about communicating this change with businesses?

Do you feel differently towards regulatory divergence when it relates to meat processing compared to other food regulations?

- what is different, if anything, between the product types?
- is it more acceptable to change regulations on one product than the other? For what reasons?
- which products are you most open to seeing divergent regulations for? For what reasons?

PLEASE SHOW STIMULUS FOR SCENARIO 4: SLIDE 20 & 21.

Product type: Food packaging

- a new packaging material for meat and fish has been developed to help reduce food waste. This new material releases chemicals during the life of the product. This is designed to reduce spoilage by using a component that monitors gasses within the product and produces a colour change when it is no longer safe to eat.
- the EU is concerned that the packaging could mislead customers about the product age or quality and worries the material could mask bad practices in the food chain.
- a new packaging material for meat and fish has been developed to help reduce food waste. This new material releases chemicals during the life of the product. This is designed to reduce spoilage by using a component that monitors gasses within the product and produces a colour change when it is no longer safe to eat.
- the EU is concerned that the packaging could mislead customers about the product age or quality and worries the material could mask bad practices in the food chain.

Cycle back through general prompts for all scenarios

What do you think about this example?

Do you have any questions about this example before we discuss it further?

What might the potential benefits be to regulatory divergence in this example?

Probe: regulatory divergence between the four UK nations

Probe: regulatory divergence from the EU

Who might this affect? Probe: the FSA, food businesses, consumers

Are there any other benefits you can think of?

What might be the potential risks or challenges of regulatory divergence in this example?

Probe: regulatory divergence between the four UK nations

Probe: regulatory divergence from the EU

Who might this affect? Probe: the FSA, food businesses, consumers

Are there any other risks you can think of?

If this scenario were to happen, would it affect your decision-making in any way when purchasing a product? For what reasons?

Do you consider how food is prepared, stored or regulated when you decide what to buy at the moment?

Scenario 4 specific questions:

In this example, new GB regulations would mean that environmental standards are improved as a new food contact material shows the age, quality and shelf-life of a product.

This packaging is more expensive for businesses but helps to meet their sustainability goals. It is also more expensive for the consumer but helps them to reduce their food waste.

Both this packaging type and the old packaging type are available to be produced by businesses in GB and purchased by consumers in GB. The EU is concerned that this packaging could mislead customers or mask bad practices in the food chain, and so this new packaging is unavailable for purchase or production in Northern Ireland.

- what do you think the impact of this could be on businesses across the four UK nations? What about UK consumers?
- would you be prepared to accept higher costs for consumers if it meant less food waste and better environmental standards?
- do you think businesses would be prepared to accept higher costs if it meant meeting sustainability targets?
- how do you think businesses in GB would respond to these regulations? What about if they wanted to sell their product into Northern Ireland?
- what would make this scenario more acceptable to you as a consumer? For what reasons?
- how do you feel this scenario could be made more acceptable to businesses? For what reasons?

To what extent did you think that packaging and food contact material was regulated by the FSA?

Do you currently consider environmental standards of packaging when purchasing a food product?

Do you currently consider the price of an item based on how it is prepared and packed ready for sale?

In this example, the FSA authorises the use of the new material as long as it is labelled clearly to consumers. How important is it for you that labelling would be clear in this scenario?

- how should products packaged in the new material be labelled so that consumers understand the difference?
- should consumers be able to see a difference between two products using different materials when both are available for sale next to each other?
- if this change were to happen, how should the FSA communicate this with consumers? How about communicating this change with businesses?
- what would be the advantages for businesses to being able to produce both types of packaging? Do you envisage any competitive disadvantages?

Do you feel differently towards regulatory divergence when it relates to packaging and food contact material compared to other food regulations?

- what is different, if anything, between the product types?
- is it more acceptable to change regulations on one product than the other? For what reasons?
- which products are you most open to seeing divergent regulations? For what reasons?

- **Objectives covered**

- Explore trade-offs between key factors through potential scenarios.

Section 4

Section 4: Final reflections

8:40pm to 8:55pm, 15 minutes

BREAK-OUT GROUPS

MODERATOR TO EXPLORE OVERALL REFLECTIONS ON THE DISCUSSION

Overall, what do you think regulatory divergence might mean for:

- the FSA
- food businesses
- consumers

How do you feel about separate nations within the UK deciding on regulations for themselves? What are the positives/negatives to this?

In some of the examples, the EU changed their regulations and the UK decided not to follow. In others, new regulations and policy decisions were led by the FSA and UK technology. Does it make a difference if the UK nations propose new rules compared to following new EU rules?

Does it make it more acceptable to you or less acceptable? For what reasons?

What would be the main risk or challenge the FSA would face when changing UK rules and diverging away from retained EU regulations?

Are there certain product types where you feel more open to the concept of regulatory divergence? For what reasons? (Moderator to probe on product types discussed: additives, meat processing, packaging, anything else?)

What key factors or principles are most important to you as a consumer that should shape the FSA’s decision making towards future regulations?

how important should consumer choice, cost, business complexity, and meeting long-term population needs be to informing future regulations?

MODERATOR TO PROBE ON POINTS RAISED EARLIER FOR FACTORS WHICH WERE POSITIVE FOR THE CONSUMER, HAD LITTLE IMPACT, OR APPEARED AS BARRIERS

Any final thoughts for the FSA? What would you like them to prioritise as they develop their plans?

Any questions about what we have discussed today?

Objectives covered

Summarise discussions and provide a chance to reflect.

Section 5

Section 5: Wrap-up and signposting

8:55 to 9pm, 5 minutes

PLENARY

Each moderator to give a brief summary of the most important take-aways from each group

- Chair to sum up most important priorities for FSA when considering any future regulatory divergence
- thank participants and explain next steps for the research

CHAIR TO SHARE SIGNPOSTING SLIDE ON SCREEN SHOW SLIDE 22

If anyone has any questions about food safety at home, you can contact these places. I’m going to leave this slide up, so you can take a note of their names and contact details if of interest. Please let me know if you would like me to send you a copy of this.

THANK AND CLOSE

Objectives covered

Sum up the discussion and thank participants for their time.