ACTIONS ARISING – BOARD MEETING

From the FSA Board Meeting on 18 November 2020

Index	Action	Due Date	Owner and progress to date
Action 1 – (FSA 20/11/04) Annual Surveillance Report	To provide figures showing increase in non-compliance ratio.		Jesus Alvarez-Pinera **Complete –** figures included at Annex A. Jesus Alvarez-Pinera content to hold discussions with Board Members requiring further clarification.
Action 2 – (FSA 20/11/06) Annual Report from the Advisory Committee on Social Science	To share Research Evaluation Framework with Board Members for information.		Michelle Patel **Complete –** Templated included at Annex B.

ACTIONS FROM PREVIOUS MEETINGS

Index	Action	Due Date	Owner and progress to date
Action 2 – (FSA 20/09/03) Chief Executive's Report to the Board	To return to Board with proposals for a regular published assessment giving the FSA view on food standards.	March 2021	**Officials** Proposals are being prepared for the Board to consider in the new year.
Action 3 – (FSA 20/09/05) Risk Analysis Process: Update	To update Risk Analysis Flow Chart to include the commitments to publication of material and more clearly set out the end-to-end process.	December 2020	**Rebecca Sudworth** **Complete -** New version of the chart circulated to Board on 12 November.
Action 6 - (FSA 20/03/08) Beef Burgers Served Less Than Thoroughly Cooked: Update	To provide update to Board Members on the outcome of the consultation on the proposed revision to the guidance on less than thoroughly cooked burgers and on the additional level of assurance about the triggers, controls, and the ability to monitor and implement them.		Rebecca Sudworth **Paused due to Covid-19** Public consultation on the updated guidance has been delayed due to the Covid-19 pandemic. Key stakeholders who use the guidance, including local authorities and food businesses, are unlikely to be able to respond to a consultation during these unprecedented times. The position will be regularly reviewed, and a consultation launched when appropriate. Work on triggers to monitor and provide assurances that controls are being applied effectively has also been delayed due the COVID-19 pandemic and its effect on the hospitality industry. Work will begin again as resources become available.

ANNEX A

Action 1 – (FSA 20/11/04) Annual Surveillance Report
Figures showing increase in non-compliance ratio.

The numbers below give the ratios mentioned in the Annual Surveillance Report. Combinations are defined by country of origin, commodity and hazard.

The quoted increase in hits for non-compliance (132%) is the result of comparing the 6% obtained by using other sources of information and the 14% obtained when adding results from the Risk Likelihood Dashboard.

Metric	Combinations sampled	Non-compliant cases	% non-compliant cases
Overall (with + without Risk Likelihood dashboard inputs)	57	8	14.04%
Sources other than Risk Likelihood dashboard	33	2	6.06%
Using Risk Likelihood dashboard only	24	6	25%

ANNEX B

Establishing Project Impact: Guidance notes

Why is it important to establish impact?
Establishing the impact of FSA research is key in both ensuring effective strategic prioritisation / resource allocation, and in the facilitation of evidence-led policy development.

What is impact?
Research impact has been defined as "*the demonstrable contribution that excellent research makes to society and the economy*"[1]. Research can also have an academic impact in the contribution that it makes to understanding and advancing scientific, method, theory and application.

For the most part FSA research is likely to have either instrumental impact, that is "*influencing the development of policy, practice or service provision, shaping legislation and/or altering behaviour*" [1] or conceptual impact by "*contributing to the understanding of policy issues, reframing debates*"[1].

Research impacts may be achieved at different time points and are rarely linear or immediate. "*They can take a wide variety of forms, and may become fully apparent some time after the underpinning research from which they flow was conducted*"[2].

It is therefore key that research commissioners and lead researchers meet at different stages of the research cycle, and post project completion, to discuss intended impact, other potential outcomes and how these will be achieved. The establishing project impact (EPI) process has been designed to ensure that these conversations are documented, and assist in resource prioritisation.

Responsibilities
In commissioning the research, the policy lead commits to discussions about impact as per the establishing project impact (EPI) process, and to consider how these impacts will be realised. The lead researcher needs to facilitate and document these discussions. Where impact is conceptual or academic, it may be that the researcher is also more heavily involved in engagement to ensure that the key messages are distributed to the wider stakeholder community.

The EPI process
The main premise of the EPI process is iterative discussions about impact, between the research commissioner and the research lead. It is important to consider the size and scope of a project, and the intended impact, when considering how best to assess impact. Discussions about project impact may happen at 5 distinct stages, although fewer will be needed for short projects. Timings of these discussions will be specific to the project - they will need to be fluid and evolve alongside the research project and policy requirements, but an indicative timetable should be set out at the start of the project.

The main stages in the EPI process are:

1. **Project initiation**: The research commissioner should have a clear idea of what the research is required for (the *primary impact*) and whether it is intended to have a conceptual or instrumental influence on policy development. In addition to primary impacts, it is also important to identify any additional impacts that may not be the focus of the research. The research commissioner should have a clear idea of how the primary impacts will be realised. An approach to assessing impact, that is proportionate to the size of the project, should be agreed and a rough date for the first interim discussion should be set.

[1]ESRC Impact tool kit https://esrc.ukri.org/research/impact-toolkit/what-is-impact/
[2]Joint statement on impact from HEFCE, RCUK and UUK https://www.ukri.org/files/legacy/innovation/jointstatementimpact-pdf/

2. **Interim:** An interim impact discussion should be held when emerging findings are identified. It may also be appropriate to revisit the impacts if research scope is revised and/or if external factors in policy development change (particularly if the primary impact is instrumental). Longer projects will likely require multiple interim discussions. A rough date for the outcome discussion should be set at interim stage.

3. **Outcome:** When key findings are known, and the researcher is producing the project outputs, an outcome discussion should be held with the research commissioner. This will form a more thorough discussion of the impacts and how they will be achieved. These should be formulated as recommendations/implications and included in the final research output. A rough date for the first post project discussion should be set at the outcome stage.

4. **Post Project:** Following dissemination of the findings, a post project impact review should be held. The timings of which should ultimately be led by the timeframes for the primary impact. The post project review should discuss which impacts have been realised, which recommendations have been implemented, and any other impacts that weren't identified during the research cycle. Most projects will not have immediate impacts and so, if deemed necessary, a rough date for the second post project discussion should be set.

5. **Follow up**: If deemed necessary, a post project follow up should be held to identify any further impacts and update on progress of intended impacts. Further follow ups may be required to capture all impacts. At the final post project review, the research commissioner and research lead should meet to assess the impact of the project, reflect on lessons learnt and what went well. This should be captured in the final part of the EPI form.

Establishing Project Impact: Data collection template

Project initiation

Project title:	
Commissioner:	(individual)
	(team)
	(date)
Research Lead:	(individual)
Description:	
Aims:	
ARI/strategic objective:	ARI: Strategic objective: ☐ **Food is safe** [*Consumers have the right to be protected from unacceptable levels of risk in the food they eat*.] ☐ **Food is what it says it is** [*Consumers have the right to make informed decisions about their food and have trust in the food system to do so. This is only made possible when it is correctly and accurately identified, and appropriately labelled*.] ☐ **Consumers can make informed choices** [*Informing and empowering consumers as part of securing their rights. Understanding how growing challenges around safety, affordability, security, technology and sustainability will affect consumers interests and values over time*.] ☐ **(Northern Ireland only)** [Only tick this if the project has a reach that extends to Northern Ireland consumers] ☐ **Consumers have access to an affordable, healthy diet, now and in the future** [Aligning incentives for businesses to ensure consumer interests are protected.] ☐ **The regulatory process is efficient** [To keep pace with rapid change, the regulatory regime requires modernising. By focussing on creating a risk-based, proportionate, robust and resilient system we can ensure consumers come first in everything we do.]
Which topic area(s) does the research address:	**6.** ☐Antimicrobial resistance (AMR) ☐Allergens ☐Foodborne diseases (FBD) ☐Consumer research ☐Market research ☐Regulatory research (including operations) ☐Nutritional [Tick this if the project has a reach that extends to NI consumers] ☐Scientific governance and capability

	☐EU Exit ☐Novel foods ☐Chemicals: supplements / additives / natural ☐Chemicals: contaminants / pesticides / veterinary medicine ☐Radiological ☐Other microbiological (including TSE) ☐Other - please specify:

Primary impact:	(why the research is being commissioned)
Project completion required by:	(linked to primary impact)
Through which of these pathways do you expect impact to be achieved?	☐ Policy development and/or regulatory change ☐ Industry action ☐ Change in consumer behaviour ☐ Through broader / other influence (e.g. international collaboration or improving the evidence base as a foundation for further research)
How/when will impact be achieved:	(include intended outputs, dissemination strategies and engagement events, and owners for these products activities)
What are the risks and barriers to delivery? **How can these be mitigated?**	(risks and barriers (technical or socio-political) to delivery of outcomes and impacts? Could there be negative outcomes or impacts? How can risks be mitigated)
How/when can impact be measured?	(consider possible metrics, or SH feedback/engagement, that will demonstrate whether primary impact has been achieved and when this measurement should be taken)
Additional impact:	(in addition to primary impact)
How/when will impact be achieved:	
What are the risks and barriers to delivery? **How can these be mitigated?**	
How/when impact measured:	

Agreed date for interim impact review:	

Interim impact review(s)

Date of review:	
Summary of review:	(include interim findings, potential recommendations)
Primary impact:	(note any changes from project initiation in terms of *primary* impact, how/when achieved, risks and barriers, how/when measured)
Additional impact:	(note any changes from project initiation in terms of additional impact, how/when achieved, risks and barriers, how/when measured. Any new emerging opportunities?)
Agreed date for next impact review:	

Outcome impact review(s):

Date of review:	
Summary of review:	(include key findings)
Research recommendations:	
Implementation of recommendations:	(outline when and how)
Primary impact:	(outline how recommendations relate to *primary* impact, note any changes from interim discussions in terms of impact, how/when achieved, risks and barriers, how/when measured)
Additional impact:	(outline how recommendations relate to *additional* impact, note any changes from interim discussions in terms of impact, how/when achieved, risks and barriers, how/when measured. Any new emerging opportunities?)

Proposed outputs:	
Proposed engagement/ dissemination events	

Agreed date for next impact review:	

Post project impact review:

Date of review:	
Summary of review:	

Outputs:	(Note outputs to date and plans for future outputs.)
Engagement/ dissemination events:	(Note activities to date, and plans for future activities)

Implementation of recommendations:	(Outline how recommendations have been implemented, and any related issues/obstacles overcome. If recommendations haven't been implemented outline why.)
Primary impact:	(With reference to means of achieving/measuring set out in the interim/outcome reviews, outline whether *primary* impact has been achieved. Note any related issues/obstacles overcome. If recommendations haven't been implemented outline why.)
Additional impact:	(With reference to means of achieving/measuring set out in the interim/outcome reviews, outline whether *additional* impact has been achieved. Note any related issues/obstacles overcome. If recommendations haven't been implemented outline why.)

Agreed date for post project follow up:	

Follow up impact review:

Outputs:	(Note outputs to date and plans for future outputs.)
Engagement/ dissemination events:	(Note activities to date and plans for future activities)

Implementation of recommendations:	(note any changes from post project review)
Primary impact:	(note any changes from post project review)
Additional impact:	(note any changes from post project review)

Lessons learnt:

Consider the impact the project has had and how this compares to what was intended. Was the desired impact achieved? Were there any obstacles you had to overcome? Is there anything that could have been done differently to maximise impact? Were risks successfully mitigated?