DRAFT MINUTES OF THE SIXTY NINTH MEETING OF ACAF HELD ON 17 FEBRUARY 2016

Present:

Chairman	Dr Ian Brown
Members	Mr Geoff Brown Ms Ann Davison Professor Stephen Forsythe Mr Peter Francis Professor Ian Givens Dr Wendy Harwood Mrs Chris McAlinden Dr Tim Riley Professor Robert Smith Mr Edwin Snow
Secretariat	Mr Keith Millar (Secretary) – Food Standards Agency Miss Mandy Jumnoodoo – Food Standards Agency Dr Mark Bond – Food Standards Agency Mr Freddie Lachhman – Food Standards Agency
Assessors	Mr Alan McCartney – Department of Agriculture and Rural Development Ms Claire Moni – Food Standards Scotland Mrs Karen Pratt – Food Standards Agency Mr Stephen Wyllie - Defra Mr John Hirst – Food Standards Agency Wales
Speakers:	Lee Grist – Veterinary Medicines Directorate Two representatives of the Grain and Feed Trade Association Howard Leberman – Environment Agency Theo Hawkins – Food Standards Agency

1. The Chairman welcomed delegates to the 69th meeting of ACAF and reminded them that there would be an opportunity to ask questions at the end of the meeting.

2. Apologies for absence were received from Ms Angela Booth, Dr David Peers and Ms Jayne Griffiths (FSA Wales Assessor).

3. The ACAF Chairman reported that Stephanie Young had resigned from the Committee. He expressed his thanks to Mrs Young for her contribution and wished her well in the future.

Agenda Item 1 – Declaration of Members' Interests

4. Members of the Committee were asked to declare any relevant changes to their entries in the Register of Members' Interests, or any specific interest in items on the agenda.

5. Mr Snow declared that he had a number of customers who manufacturer medicated feed. Professor Smith confirmed that he has been involved in a project with the Veterinary Medicines Directorate (VMD) on medicated feed. The ACAF Chairman confirmed that he was now working part-time for Oxford University as a Research Fellow. Dr Riley declared that he was a major shareholder in a company that works with producers of medicated feeds.

Agenda Item 2 – Draft Minutes of the Sixty Eighth Meeting (MIN/15/03)

6. On paragraph 52 of the October 2015 minutes, Professor Givens said that in 2015, the University of Stirling had carried out a survey which showed large differences between levels of Omega-3 in farmed and wild salmon. He was uncertain if the SACN Secretariat was aware of the paper published by the University of Stirling, and therefore agreed to pass a copy to the ACAF Secretariat to forward to the SACN Secretariat for information.

Action: Professor Givens/ACAF Secretariat

7. The minutes were adopted.

Agenda Item 3 – Refuse Derived Fuel (ACAF 16/01)

8. A representative of the Grain and Feed Trade Association (GAFTA) said that Refuse Derived Fuels (RDF) consist largely of combustible components of municipal waste such as plastics and biodegradable waste. The GAFTA representative explained that in the last five years there had been an increasing growth on exports of RDF which was expected to expand further. RDF is transported across the UK to ports for export to EU Member States (MSs) for energy recovery. Although this area is growing and is compatible with the policy on a zero waste economy, UK regulation of RDF is still in its early stages. The GAFTA representative stated that although the environmental consequence of RDF is a consideration in UK legislation, potential food and

feed risks do not feature in the legislation. The GAFTA representative said that GAFTA believes that a holistic approach should be taken.

9. The GAFTA representative explained that the main issues surrounding RDF include the contents of bales, the quality of storage facilities at ports, quayside loading on vessels and the proximity of the RDF being stored to feed stores. The GAFTA representative said that RDF was usually domestic waste and might contain a range of materials including packaging, but also meat and meat products which would attract pests such as rodents and birds. Placing RDF near food and feed negates food and feed controls and examples include: leakage and poor operating standards, issues of damage from birds and other pests and the poor stacking of bales which may subsequently split. In some cases the waste itself may cause a build-up of gases which could cause the wrapping to rupture. The GAFTA representative suggested that a possible solution is stricter legislation on RDF such as mandatory zoning. Also the legislation should properly define RDF as currently different terms are used which raises questions of the safety of ships carrying RDF and other cargo loads. Dedicated equipment for RDF should be used to avoid cross-contamination in addition to specialist cleaning of equipment at the portside. Finally, the GAFTA representative suggested that waste management operators need better guidance on the handling RDF.

10. Howard Leberman of the Environment Agency (EA) responded to concerns outlining the role of the EA. The EA is involved in regulating major industry and waste activities through the issuing of permits. He said that RDF is municipal waste – household waste – collected by contractors and sent to receivers where products such as cardboard, glass, metal, etc. are recovered. This leaves waste which may also include by-products which were previously sent to landfill. However, costs have risen and these residues are sent abroad as the UK has not invested significantly in energy from waste facilities and it is cheaper to send RDF abroad. Most ports using RDF are on the east coast of the UK for export to Netherlands, Belgium and Sweden. There are specifications set up for facilities abroad that can process RDF. RDF from the UK can be sent in three ways – in baled form, in sheeted open lorries for discharge directly to ship or transported in cargo containers. The EA regulates sites that produce RDF. Operators have a duty of care in the transportation of the RDF and the EA, working with the police and local authorities, carries out spot checks on vehicles to ensure compliance with duty of care. At ports, the EA is responsible for regulating waste storage facilities. Where the operator has a waste storage facility at a port the EA issues permits covering the waste activity and sets conditions to prevent or minimise impacts on the environment, (e.g. nuisance, vermin, odour, noise and contamination of ground and surface water). Where RDF is transferred to docks for loading onto ships, this is

incidental to transport and the EA has no jurisdiction other than duty of care considerations. Mr Leberman noted that there has been rapid growth of RDF export. Mandatory guidance was introduced in March 2015 on the prevention of fires, early detection, preventive measures, site abandonment and long term storage of RDF.

11. Mr Leberman reiterated that the EA can enforce the permit conditions, and where breaches occur, the operator is required to deal with these quickly. The EA cannot deal with zoning or site suitability for RDF; it can only act as a consultee to the planning process. Port health authorities have to manage their competing interests and contractual arrangements.

Discussion

12. The ACAF Chairman noted that Mr Leberman had outlined the EA's responsibilities and the areas not within their legislative remit. The issue appeared to be focused on material waiting to be loaded onto vessels and potential risks during transportation. The ACAF Chairman asked how long RDF can be stored and how hazardous waste is treated. Mr Leberman said that where RDF storage facilities are permitted, storage is allowed for up to 3 months and that hazardous waste was strictly defined and dealt with differently from RDF, which was not considered hazardous waste under the legislation despite containing some chemical materials. The EA does not permit temporary storage of waste which is incidental to transport – waste is stored ready for loading on to a ship. Temporary storage pending loading can typically be for up to 5 days. Following a further question from the ACAF Chairman, Mr Leberman said that RDF could not be categorised as hazardous waste as there were strict definitions and any changes to the definitions would involve huge costs and amendment of the prevailing legislation.

13. A Member of the Committee asked whether clinical waste can be present in RDF. The GAFTA representative said that he would check the accuracy of the statement after the meeting. Another Member of the Committee asked whether there were any circumstances where any other types of waste could be added to RDF material. Mr Leberman said that non-hazardous industrial waste could find its way into material recycling facilities; however, loads are accompanied by documentation and there is a clear differentiation between hazardous and non-hazardous waste.

14. Following a question from a Member of the Committee on the proportion of waste that would be attributable to large and small operators and around the use of balers, would the balers also be used for farm use and was there any separation? Mr Leberman said that he did not have any figures to hand. However, smaller scale operators do not secure contracts with local authorities

or with energy from waste facilities on continental Europe. All waste activities are regulated by the EA and where RDF arises the EA permits the facility and when the RDF is transported, operators have a duty of care to ensure that RDF is properly contained. From time to time the EA run 'Duty of Care' campaigns to carry out checks and identify any potential breaches in regulatory requirements.

15. The ACAF Chairman asked the GAFTA representative for any additional comments on the discussions. The GAFTA representative stated that there was currently no legislation on how and where RDF is stored. Industry had fought hard to prevent BSE and TSEs but was concerned by the potential growing threat from RDF. The GAFTA representative therefore suggested that zoning, as undertaken in European ports, may be a solution.

16. One Member of the Committee stated that forage balers would not be used; but where farms are diversifying into handling waste, this may increase the risk of contamination of wagons, etc. and asked how this can be regulated. The GAFTA representative said that legislation had not kept up with a growing industry. Mr Leberman noted that farmers are diversifying into the waste sector and they need to be on an equal footing to the waste management industry. For example, some farmers are taking food waste for their anaerobic digesters for biogas production and the resulting digestate is spread on land. Mr Leberman said that the transportation of waste must meet the Duty of Care requirements. Another Member of the Committee asked about the fate of commercial waste that is combustible. Mr Leberman reported that there are a number of incinerators in the UK where municipal solid waste (raw residual waste left over after recycling, re-use and composting have taken place) or pre-treated waste such as RDF is combusted. When asked what the potential increase in RDF would be in the next few years, Mr Leberman did not have the figures but said that the expectation was that the export of RDF will continue.

17. The ACAF Chairman noted that there is a safety and containment issue and legislative gaps in duty of care should be closed. Another Member of the Committee raised the issue of spreading abattoir waste on land. Mr Leberman noted that any anaerobic digested matter spread onto land had to meet the requirements of Animal By-Products Regulations. The ACAF Secretary said that the issue surrounding RDF had been noted and should be kept on the agenda for discussion at the next meeting. The ACAF Secretariat will make enquiries with LA and PHA bodies to ascertain as to whether they are aware of the issue. The aim would be for the Committee to make recommendations, following seeking views from other MSs, European trade associations and the European Commission. He asked whether Aberdeen was one of the ports that

RDF is exported from and Mr Leberman agreed to make some enquires on this point.

Action: ACAF Secretariat/Mr Leberman

18. Another Member of the Committee noted that there are a number of robust assurance schemes that should be made aware of the RDF issue. Additionally, the Defra Assessor noted that raw abattoir waste cannot be spread onto land without treatment. The Defra Assessor also stated that, Defra is interested in any potential cross-contamination and agreed to liaise with colleagues that had responsibility for animal by-products issues. The ACAF Secretariat asked the Members and the Defra Assessor to keep him informed of their investigations.

Action: ACAF Members/Defra Assessor

19. Another Member of the Committee was interested to learn about what happens in European ports. The GAFTA representative noted that most European ports are zoned and Malmo (Sweden) had stopped a consignment of RDF because the product was being transported in open containers. The GAFTA representative agreed to make enquiries on the zonal approach adopted at European ports. The GAFTA representative asked what the next steps would be if no resolution could be found. The ACAF Secretary said that he would like the Committee to make formal recommendations on how the issue should be addressed.

Action: GAFTA

Agenda Item 4 – Update on the Review of The Report on On-farm Feeding Practices (ACAF/16/02)

20. Dr Tim Riley (Deputy Chairman of the sub-group) reminded everyone that the sub-group was hoping to finalise the document for publication before the June 2016 meeting. Since the October 2015 meeting, the sub-group had worked hard to significantly progress the document and he thanked the sub-group and the ACAF Secretariat for their efforts. The objective of the review was to build on the previous document where necessary, bringing it up to date with legislative, environmental and technical developments. New areas in the review report included a summary of changes, potential gaps in safety, new risks development in different sectors, e.g. hobby farmers. The Deputy Chairman of the sub-group hoped that the observations were common sense, and reinforced areas such as traceability and cross-contamination. He asked the Committee for their views including where any gaps remained.

Discussion

21. The ACAF Chairman noted that the previous document was produced in hard copy format; however, the new version will be available electronically. He went through the document heading by heading, encouraging Members to provide comments. The Deputy Chairman of the sub-group suggested that the executive summary and recommendations could be a standalone document on a laminated sheet. The ACAF Secretary agreed with this suggestion commenting that when the original report was published in 2003, a poster was produced which summarised the recommendations. The poster proved to be very popular and therefore something similar could be considered, finances permitting.

22. The Scottish Assessor noted that reference to FSS and updates on feed law need to be included in the document. Members agreed to provide the Secretariat with written comments prior to the document being circulated to stakeholders before final publication.

Action: ACAF members and Assessors

Agenda Item 5 – British Society of Animal Science (ACAF/16/03)

23. At the Committee's September 2012 meeting, a representative from the British Society of Animal Science (BSAS) provided Members with details on the Society's register of animal scientists and technologists. Professor Colin Whittemore referring to paper ACAF 16/03 provided an update on the BSAS accreditation register scheme. He said that the scheme is operated by the BSAS and the Royal Society of Biology and accords with other schemes that are targeted at professions in the public sector, academia and commerce who work with animals and livestock. Membership includes researchers, teachers and consultants and also industry technologists and technical sales. However, the register does not cover roles at technician level. There are two levels: (i) associate level, which is a learning grade; and (ii) certified level, which defines expertise and knowledge. Professor Whittemore went on to provide information on the purposes of accreditation. This included assurance of competence, career development and also provides international recognition. Essential elements of the register are that the oversight, audit and governance is independent and current, and continuing competence is registered.

24. Professor Whittemore described future initiatives to strengthen the register's credibility, with increasing membership to gain reputational usefulness. He reported that improvements were being completed in the application, assessment and continuous professional development recording. This will lead to greater personal involvement and help develop overseas membership.

Discussion

25. The ACAF Chairman noted that re-validation appraisal as a physician is not voluntary. Science and technology is continuously developing and physicians need to keep their CPD updated in line with any changes. He suggested that re-validation and appraisal should not be prohibitively expensive or time consuming and asked about the current membership fee to join the BSAS register. Professor Whittemore said that to go through application and join the register, prospective members paid £80. The scheme's managers were currently considering whether to recharge for renewal after 3 years. Following a supplementary question from the ACAF Chairman, Professor Whittemore confirmed that there were no obligatory and specific degree entry qualification requirements to join the register and advised that the scheme was specifically looking at the competence of individual members. A further question arose on whether the scheme was for technologists or researchers, to which Professor Whittemore replied that both disciplines were sought as the aim of the scheme was to bring together knowledge seekers with users. Professor Whittemore reinforced the need for registered members to confirm and provide evidence of their respective expertise. There was also a question on how the register may apply to research scientists in terms of peer review. Professor Whittemore replied that the accreditation needed to be vigorous and that assessors were required to be competent in the field under assessment.

26. Another Member of the Committee asked about the associate level to which Professor Whittemore said that the BSAS does not carry out formal career mentoring; however, there is opportunity as part of the review assessment. Associate status is usually targeted at students in the last year of a PhD, or post doctorate. The time to complete was dependent on the individual, but Professor Whittemore estimated it could take approximately 5 years. Another member of the Committee asked what the Register recommended at technician level and how many members were on the Register. Professor Whittemore advised that technicians look after laboratories and that the Royal Society of Biology have good schemes for this level, and therefore technicians are not eligible for BSAS registration. He added that there were 150 Members on the register but the Scheme was targeting approximately 1000 new members. The scheme had not moved faster in the first year due to learning and IT system issues. BSAS will have new IT interfaces in Spring 2016 and proposes at that time to have a recruitment drive.

27. Another Member of the Committee enquired about the power of peer review, when judging research quality. Professor Whittemore replied that papers were peer reviewed and scored. He noted that in the area of nutritional research, the Nutrition Society was developing a scheme where registration was pitched more toward human nutritionists.

Agenda Item 6 – Update on EU proposal on medicated feed

28. Mr Lee Grist (Veterinary Medicines Directorate) referred to the presentation he provided to the Committee at its February 2015 meeting. He noted that the aim of the Commission's proposal is to gain harmonisation and address antimicrobial resistance. The proposal was part of a package of three draft Regulations, including Veterinary Medicines and the role of the European Medicines Agency.

29. The proposal was now on its third version, with ten European Council Working Group meetings being held to reach an agreed text. The proposal has 23 Articles and 6 Annexes. Mr Grist said that the Regulation had been in place for 26 years and there was variation between MSs on its implementation; therefore, the proposal had generated considerable debate and agreement had not been straight-forward. The scope of the proposal had been expanded to include pets. Mr Grist reported that two European Parliament committees had tabled 250-350 amendments to the proposal and a consolidated list of amendments is expected. On the veterinary medicines side, Mr Grist said that there were 900 amendments proposed which had been reduced to 35.

30. Mr Grist said that since the 2015 update there had not been any major changes in the draft to the medicated feed proposal. There were however two key issues of contention in the proposal:
•*Article 7 cross-contamination (formerly termed as carryover)* – Mr Grist explained that the Commission had originally set a 1% carryover limit for antibiotics and 3% for non-antibiotics. He said it was technically feasible to test for antibiotics to 1% in mills, labs, and for enforcement purposes. The Commission has subsequently produced a table of accepted carryover levels based on 1% of active substance. Mr Grist added that there had been some debate about terminology – carryover versus cross-contamination. UK stakeholders had raised concerns about the levels being proposed by the Commission. Mr Grist said that the UK would like to see the European Food Safety Authority carry out work to determine the optimum limits; however, time to determine these would be lengthy. Another concern raised by UK stakeholders is the cost of reaching the levels, as feed mills will have to increase flushing processes, leading to increases in energy and waste costs which will have to be passed onto farmers.

31. The other issue relates to *Article 15 - Prescriptions* – Mr Grist explained that in the UK, suitably qualified persons could issue prescriptions but not in respect of antibiotics. However, other MSs have systems where only a vet can issue prescriptions. The proposal refers to a veterinary prescription and also for national subsidiarity protecting suitably qualified persons. Also, in the

proposal, wording around examination is also causing issues. The Commission's interpretation of the term is physical examination; however, some MSs disagree with this view. Additionally, Mr Grist advised that only two weeks' supply of product can be prescribed at a time; however, some treatments are required for longer. The wording in the latest version of the proposal had been amended to address this issue.

32. Mr Grist confirmed that although there were previous discussions on whether medicated feed manufacturers had to manufacture products under good manufacturing practices, no further discussions on this issue had been subsequently raised.

33. Mr Grist then suggested that due to cross–over between the two proposals, it was likely that progression on proposals to medicated feed would be suspended to allow discussions on amendments to Veterinary Medicines Regulation to progress under the Dutch Presidency. Finally, Mr Grist advised that a collection system has to be in place in each MS for unused medicated feed and there are cost issues with this practice. The Commission's view is that it is likely the farm will use the feed if it remains on site, with the potential for antimicrobial issues to arise.

Discussion

34. On the point of examination, the ACAF Chairman noted that for physicians, the term examination may not involve a physical examination. He then asked whether the proposal was considering prophylactic use. Mr Grist said that the Commission stated prophylactic use of antibiotics in medicated feed would not be allowed. However, metaphylactic use would be permitted. He went on to explain that neither term had been defined as yet, but it was expected that metaphylatics will be included in the Veterinary Medicine proposals and will carry over into the Medicated Feeds proposal. The ACAF Chairman asked when the proposals would become law, to which Mr Grist responded that this could not be predicted. The two proposals cannot be uncoupled; therefore, it may take a further couple of years before agreement is reached on the text of the proposals.

35. A Member of the Committee provided an update on a recent teleconference of the Advisory Committee on Microbiological Safety of Food sub-group on antimicrobial resistance that they had participated in. The Member said that three topics had been discussed during the teleconference. These were:
    - Risk assessment on MRSA resistance in livestock
    - Fluoroquinolone in poultry feed – in 2015 usage was half that in 2014.

    Fluoroquinolones are administered via water and not in medicated feed. There

had been an EFSA document published and an article published in the Independent Newspaper on this subject.

- Colistin resistance can be carried on bacterial plasmids, which makes the spread of resistance a bigger issue. Resistance has been seen in a number of countries. The colistin AMR plasmid is being transferred between different bacteria strains. Lancet articles question the ongoing use of Colistin and there may be a re-evaluation on its use. Colistin was being used in pig farms in China. This was worrying as Colistin is a last line of defence in human medicine.

36. Another Member of the Committee said that they were reassured by the presentation and interested to hear about the debate between cross-contamination and carryover and the explanation where the maximum permitted levels proposed by the Commission originated. Mr Grist explained that the 1% carryover level of antibiotics was based on a study paper. Although he was not an expert, Mr Grist understood that one group did not agree with the science but the Commission had been content. The Veterinary Medicines Directorate had used its data and come up with a list to check with the laboratory – most were OK. However, the cost of analysis would be high, driving costs of medicated feed up and potentially off the market. Therefore, a balance was needed. The ACAF Secretary said the limits in EU legislation were based on formal risk assessments. Therefore, the ACAF Secretary suggested that ACAF should make a recommendation that there was a need for a formal EFSA Risk Assessment/opinion on limits.

37. A Member of the Committee agreed that it was important that a risk assessment based on levels causing mutations rather than harm was sought. The Member also thought that the change in terminology from carryover to cross contamination was not helpful. The ACAF Secretary agreed with the comments made by the Member and reiterated that the Committee should assist the Veterinary Medicines Directorate during the negotiations and that the European Commission should request a risk assessment. The ACAF Secretary also suggested that 'contamination' is an emotive word and that 'unauthorised presence' would be a more acceptable term.

38. A Member of the Committee asked whether consideration should be taken of the lowest achievable limits as part of good agricultural practice; for example, in the case of pesticide residues. Another Member of the Committee said that there appears to be no evidence that current practice is causing a problem. However, the Member said the main concern was that due to the increasing complexities and increasing barriers, manufacturers are considering ceasing production of medicated feeds. This is worrying as there are no obvious alternatives as currently, practices such as top dressing are illegal in the UK.

Agenda Item 7 – Food and Veterinary Office –Fact finding visit

39. Mr Theo Hawkins (Food Standards Agency) said that between 18 - 22 January 2016, at the request of the European Commission's Food and Veterinary Office) (now renamed as DG SANTE's Directorate F – Health and Food Audits and Analysis), a study visit was organised to examine the interaction between private certification schemes and official controls in the UK feed sector. Mr Hawkins said the visit was not part of an audit but was part of a series of study visits being carried out to gain a better understanding of the advantages and challenges of developing a system of closer collaboration between official controls and private certification schemes in the feed sector, as well as sharing best practice between Member States. The UK was the third visit in the programme (after France and Belgium) with, as yet unconfirmed visits planned for Germany, Sweden and Denmark. In line with the objectives of sharing experiences, national experts from central competent authorities in Belgium, Czech Republic, Denmark and Italy accompanied the Commission officials.

40. As part of the visit, presentations were provided by relevant organisations (FSA, Veterinary Medicines Directorate, Red Tractor Assurance, Agricultural Industries Confederation, a local authority, the United Kingdom Accreditation Service and KIWI-PAI, a certification body). Additionally, two field visits to businesses took place. The Commission auditors recognised that the FSA had a relatively advanced system of earned recognition through interaction with approved assurance schemes. The Commission auditors identified a number of positive features of the system as good practice, including the excellent channels of communication the FSA has with the assurance scheme owners, the harmonized reporting processes for critical non-compliances and the robust approval process in place for assurance schemes.

41. Mr Hawkins explained that the Commission auditors recognised that the FSA is still in the early stages of implementing the system of earned recognition. However, they suggested that in future the FSA could build into the arrangements, with the approved assurance schemes, improved data sharing/communication of major non-compliances as they occur, additional to the quarterly summaries currently received. In addition the Commission suggested that the FSA could consider being more involved in the training that certification bodies provide to their assessors to ensure that feed priorities are given sufficient profile. Finally, the Commission auditors suggested that the FSA consider obtaining more detailed information from local authorities on official inspections of approved assurance scheme members to allow more direct comparisons to be made between data received from both the local authorities and from approved assurance schemes.

42. Mr Hawkins explained that the Commission auditors will write a report on the visit which will include contributions from the national experts of other MSs; however, the FSA will decide whether the report should be published. Following the series of study visits the European Commission intends to organise a workshop on earned recognition, which the FSA will be invited to attend. After the workshop, the European Commission will publish an overview report on the outcome of the programme.

43. Mrs Pratt (FSA Assessor) advised the Committee that during the study visit the Commission auditors also took the opportunity to discuss an outstanding recommendation from an audit to the UK that took place in 2014. Mrs Pratt said that the UK had taken follow-up action to resolve the issue and in 2015 evidence was provided to the Commission as part of a follow up general audit.

44. During the study visit, the Commission auditors advised that the only outstanding issue was now the use of the term 'pre-animal feed' on some fats and oils labelling documentation, which they considered did not have a basis under the animal feed law. There were no other underlying points. The UK gave the Commission auditors an assurance that a meeting would be held with relevant stakeholders to explain this and resolve the issue raised. Confirmation of the outcome would be sent to the Commission auditors.

Discussion

45. The Committee requested a formal note of the outcome of the European Commission's fact finding study visit. The ACAF Secretary added that meetings with relevant industry stakeholders to resolve matters related to the outstanding Commission audit would be held in the immediate future.

Agenda Item 8 - Matters arising from the minutes of previous meetings

Forward Work Plan

46. The ACAF Chairman on behalf the ACAF Secretariat thanked the Committee for their help in finalising the Committee's forward work plan, which was uploaded onto the ACAF website on 10 February 2016. The ACAF Secretary said that the forward work plan was a living document that would be updated regularly by the ACAF Secretariat in consultation with the Committee.

Action: ACAF Secretariat

Agenda Item 9 – Any Other Business

47. No issues were raised under this item.

Information Papers

48. The ACAF Chairman drew the Committee's attention to the following information papers:

- EU Developments (ACAF/16/04); and
- Update on the work of other advisory committees (ACAF/16/05).

Date of the next meeting

49. The next meeting will take place on 17 June 2016 in Pilgrims House, Aberdeen.

ACAF Secretariat
April 2016