MINUTES OF THE SIXTY EIGHTH MEETING OF ACAF HELD ON 28 OCTOBER 2015

Present:

Chairman	Dr Ian Brown
Members	Ms Angela Booth Mr Geoff Brown Ms Ann Davison Professor Stephen Forsythe Mr Peter Francis Professor Ian Givens Dr Wendy Harwood Mrs Chris McAlinden Dr David Peers Dr Tim Riley Professor Robert Smith
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
Speakers:	Mr Ricardo Manoel Arioli Silva – Aprosoja, Brazil Professor John Threlfall – formerly Public Health England Dr Susan Pryde – Food Standards Scotland

1. The Chairman welcomed delegates to the 68th 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 Mr Edwin Snow, Mrs Stephanie Young, and Ms Jayne Griffiths.

Agenda Item 1 – Declaration of Members' Interests

3. 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. Professor Givens declared the following:
   - renewed appointed member of University of Aberystwyth, Research Assessment Panel for the Institute of Biological, Environmental and Rural Sciences;
   - new appointment: International Chair on Cardiometabolic Risk- member of panel on dietary lipids;
   - new appointment: European Healthy Lifestyle Alliance - member of panel on obesity;
   - new appointment: International Expert Movement to Improve Dietary Fat Quality (not met yet);
   - co-operating with Universities of Copenhagen and Wageningen on Global Dairy Platform funded meta-analysis on dairy products and cardiometabolic disease; and
   - consultant to the Dairy Council on saturated fats in dairy products and cardiometabolic disease.

4. Dr Harwood said that she was representing the John Innes Centre (JIC) at platform meetings on New Breeding Techniques (NBT). Ms Booth said she had been appointed a member of AIC's Interim Management Board on Livestock and the European Sustainability Committee. Professor Smith declared that he had recently submitted an application to the Food Standards Agency for a grant to carry out research on smoked skin from sheep production. The ACAF Chairman announced that he was to represent the Responsible Use of Medicines in Agriculture (RUMA) at a conference on antimicrobial resistance on 3 November 2015. Ms Davison said that she was a member of a consumer advisory panel for the British Standards Institute. Finally, Mrs McAlinden declared that she was carrying out consultancy work for one company which produces chemicals used as food/feed additives (including furan derivatives) and a second which is registering a pesticide with the EPA. The work for both companies is limited to regulatory compliance.

Agenda Item 2 – Draft Minutes of the Sixty Seventh Meeting (MIN/15/02)

5. The minutes were adopted subject to some minor changes.

Agenda Item 3 – Review of Scientific Advisory Committees

6. Dr Susan Pryde explained that the FSA had initiated a review of the scientific advisory committees that it sponsors. She said that the review had been launched on 10 September 2015; and as part of the evidence gathering phase, she had spoken to most of the Committees and the open call for evidence had generated 1,100 hits on the website. Dr. Pryde confirmed that the call for evidence would close on 3 November 2015. Other evidence gathering activities included contact with other stakeholders (including other government departments), a meeting with chief scientists and the setting up of three workshops.

7. Dr Pryde explained that the interim findings of the report should be available towards the end of November and agreed to share this with ACAF before the report goes through the clearance process with an aim of final publication in March 2016.

Discussion

8. The ACAF Chairman said that the overall purpose of the review was to ascertain the need for the individual committees and whether they provided value for money. A Member of the Committee asked about the involvement of consumers during the review. Dr Pryde said that there were a number of models used to engage with consumers, including liaising with Which? who had been asked to respond to the call for evidence. Additionally, the review team had also engaged with key stakeholders with a view to getting a reasonable number of responses from consumers directly.

9. Dr Pryde said, following a question from the ACAF Chairman on how the interim findings will be presented, said that they could not currently be made public. However, the findings will be passed to individual committee secretariats. Dr Pryde added that she was content to discuss the interim findings with individuals on a one-to-one basis. The ACAF Secretary agreed to share any information he could with the Committee.

Action: ACAF Secretariat

Agenda Item 4 – Soy production sustainability – presentation and discussion paper (ACAF/15/16)

10. Mr Arioli Silva presented ACAF paper 15/16 on the sustainable production of soy, describing the environmental and social management programme for Brazilian soybeans. He explained that the Soybean and Corn Farmers Association (Aprosoja) of Mato Grosso State was founded in 2005. Mr Arioli Silva said that Brazil was the second largest producer of soybeans and Mato Grasso State was Brazil's first producer of soya with 9.8% of the territory set aside for soybean production,

(responsible for 30% of Brazilian soyabean). He said that soybeans were not grown in the rainforest area of the State but in the Cerrado region which is a drier shrub area. Brazil has stringent national environmental protection laws that govern the amount of forest cover that can be converted for productive use; for example, in the Amazon region, 80% of the original forest on any individual property must be preserved (unfarmed). Soyabean cultivation is no longer considered the main factor of deforestation, as farmers are required to replant areas following the requirements of the Brazilian forestry code, producing 'more with less', i.e. more yields on less land as part of the sustainability programme. As part of this programme, a new system of growing is being developed based on rotating crops in two or three cycles annually, which is expected to increase yields by 132%.

11. Mr Arioli Silva explained that in order to be able to grow crops under new environmental law, farmers need to make a personal investment or 'Legal Reserve'. He explained that the sustainable landscape was a new concept and requires no tilling, erosion control, no intensive use of land, riparian areas (interface between land and a river or stream) for water protection, legal reserves, ecological corridors, recycling containers and environmental licensing.

12. Mr Arioli Silva then described the Soja Plus Program, an environmental and social management programme for Brazilian soybeans. The programme objective is to generate a continuous improvement process for soy production as a voluntary scheme for farmers, rather than a formal certification programme. Once farmers join Soja Plus, they (and employees) receive information and training on how to comply with Brazilian legislation on safety and the environment. The farmer controls the pace on adopting recommended adaptions to their farm depending on their investment capacity. The programme is expanding to other states in Brazil. So far there have been 1,620 participants attending 81 courses in three states. Additionally, there have been 12 field days with farmers to publicise the Soja Plus Programme and to motivate new participants to the scheme. The programme has also held seminars and developed management tools to support farmers and help them achieve the programme's goals. Visits have also been made to 685 farms.

13. Finally, Mr Arioli Silva described the procedures and costs for setting up farms, citing that under Brazilian law by May 2015 farms will be registered on the Environmental Registry (i.e. the CAR scheme). Soja Plus helps farmers register their farms with concentrated efforts on counties with fewer CARs. Requirements of CAR include satellite imaging of the farm land area showing where protected areas and farming areas are located. Following registration, farmers are required to sign an agreement with the Brazilian government which outlines how they will comply with the law mainly on legal reserves and permanent preservation areas. Mr Arioli Silva also noted that agreements between Soja Plus and FEFAC and FEDIOL were in place.

Discussion

14. Following a question from the ACAF Chairman, Mr Arioli Silva said that Brazil produced 98-99% GM soy. In Mato Grosso state, approximately 30% of the soy grown was non-GM. A Member of the Committee asked whether there was a difference observed in yield when GM was introduced and whether a no-till approach could be used without GM crops. Mr Arioli Silva said that farmers did not want to till the soil and that GM materials (i.e. with glyphosate resistance) control weeds. Also, another issue for farmers was the cost and ways to reduce these were of benefit to the farmer. Another member of the Committee enquired about the perception on the difference of GM and non-GM products and the environmental benefits of each. Mr Arioli Silva said that non-GM products require the use of herbicides; however, the use of GM technology helps to reduce the need of herbicides thus ensuring environmental benefits.

15. Following a question from the ACAF Chairman, a member of the Committee explained that approximately 2.5m tonnes of soybean was imported into the UK, of which about 150 – 200, 000 tonnes was non-GM. Previously, the level of non-GM imports had been significantly higher – about two thirds of the total. Following a question from another member of the Committee, Mr Arioli Silva said that it was very difficult to produce organic soya in tropical climates due to the need for constant tilling which results in erosion of the land, and therefore organic production was not generally viable.

16. A member of the Committee commented that there was a need for alternative sources of proteins: however, it was not sustainable for these sources to travel great distances. Mr Arioli Silva noted that unlike Europe, China does not place the same demands on imports; however, he would like to discuss this issue with the UK. He added that it was more sustainable to export chickens than soyabean, due to the added value. Another member of the Committee asked whether the need for water to grow the crops was an issue for Brazil. Mr Arioli Silva said that to date there was not an issue as water can be accessed during the long rainy season which is sufficient to ensure growth of a second crop in May (usually of cotton and corn). Therefore, irrigation is not a problem.

17. Following a question from a member of the Committee, Mr Arioli Silva said that there was no difference in the market of animals fed non-GM soy and those fed GM soy. Another member of the Committee asked whether an environmental footprint had been carried out, to which Mr Arioli Silva responded that this had been assessed through a partnership agreement with scientists at the local university. Following a question from the Defra Assessor on whether the reforestation initiative was based on native/commercial species, Mr Arioli Silva said that Brazilian law states that only 10% of non-native plants can be grown.

18. The Committee welcomed Mr Arioli Silva's insights and agreed that this was an important issue given the significant protein deficiency of home-produced animal feed throughout Europe.

Agenda Item 5 – Maximum permitted levels of nutritional feed additives- relationship to human dietary intake (ACAF/15/17)

19. Geoff Brown and Ian Givens (ACAF Members) introduced ACAF paper 15/17 which outlined the issue of feed additives and the manipulation of animal diets and links to animal and human nutrition. Mr Brown said that all trace elements are feed additives and subject to European Union authorisation, and as per Regulation (EC) 1831/2003 many additives are currently undergoing re-authorisation. This process involves an assessment by the European Food Safety Authority (EFSA) which includes a safety assessment and consideration of target animals, non-target animals, consumers of animal derived foods, users and the environment. EFSA opinions have recommended reduced maximum permitted levels (MPLs) for iron, zinc, cobalt, selenium, iodine and vitamins. However, some of the MPLs suggested for vitamin A, vitamin D and iodine are considered to be too low and studies have shown that some sectors of the UK population may not receive the required trace elements (notably iodine) or vitamins (notably vitamin D) through dietary intake (i.e. resulting in malnutrition). Mr Brown suggested that there are links between human and animal nutrition and that a holistic approach could be taken when considering this area.

20. In terms of concerns, Mr Brown highlighted that it may not always be possible to achieve lower feed additive levels due to variances in background levels. There are also significant geographical and/or geological variations in micronutrient levels in feed materials across the European Union. It was also difficult to obtain evidence to demonstrate potential health and welfare concerns in some species groups. Finally, Mr Brown suggested that the perceived poor control on farms needs to be measured and better managed.

21. Similarly, in terms of concerns about food, Mr Brown questioned whether EFSA was correct on the protection strategies of high-level consumers, suggesting that there could be a problem of changing sub-optimal levels for other groups and he queried whether there any alternatives. High intake consumers may be 'atypical' and dietary intake assessments may be unreliable especially for foods consumed infrequently. Mr Brown then explained that to be a 'source' of a nutrient, foods must supply at least 15% of the recommended daily allowance per portion, this rises to 30% if the food to be termed as 'rich' in a nutrient.

22. Professor Givens explained that the British Nutrition Foundation is undertaking a review of micronutrient status and intake in the UK. Some of the issues emerging are largely due to a reduction in consumption of milk and red meat, rather than from reducing levels of nutrient within the foodstuff. Professor Givens said that whilst a good relationship between iodine intake by the dairy cow and milk iodine concentration has been reported, it is concerning there are no data for the effect of modern dairy cattle consuming modern diets on milk iodine concentration in the UK. Additionally, EFSA has suggested that chlorates present in diets reduce the uptake of iodine by the thyroid gland and highlighted that drinking water and milk are key sources of dietary chlorate.

23. Finally, the Committee was asked to consider whether the imposition of MPLs of feed additives impact on human consumption of key nutrients, whether the levels of nutrients in animal feed positively influence human dietary consumption and whether the two topics of feed additives and manipulation of feed should be linked.

Discussion

24. In response to a question from the Chairman, Mr Brown confirmed that the issues raised during the presentation did fall within the Committee's remit of safety. A member of the Committee commented that if consumers were asked whether they advocated good diets or diets which included supplements, they would say that consumers should be encouraged to have a balanced diet. Another member of the Committee said that the potential impacts on industry of manipulating animal diets to enhance existing diets are outside the scope of the Committee.

25. A member of the Committee commented that there were no modern data available on the fortification of animal feed diets. Mr Brown agreed that thirty years ago a lot of work was being carried out on trace elements; however, there was no recent work. The ACAF Chairman said that the topic was complex and that care should be taken not to compromise the animal's health. Mark Bond (ACAF Scientific Secretariat) stated that a number of trace elements were in the process of being re-authorised (these included zinc, selenium and iodine). When asked if there were any legal issues in supplementing the feed when the benefit was targeted at people rather than the animal itself, Dr Bond said that as long as maximum permitted levels were adhered to, there should be no legal issues.

Agenda Item 6 – Antimicrobial resistance – presentation on the work of Joint Interagency Antimicrobial Consumption and Resistance Analysis (JIACRA) (ACAF/15/18)

26. Professor Forsythe explained that the FSA's Advisory Committee on Microbiological Safety of Food (ACMSF) set up a sub-group to investigate links to antimicrobial resistance in food in September 2013. He said the sub-group

comprised members of ACMSF, the VMD, specific experts including Professor John Threlfall and himself. Professor Forsythe reported that in January 2015, the European Centre for Disease Prevention and Control (ECDC), the European Food Safety Authority (EFSA) and the European Medicines Agency (EMA) published the first European survey of the consumption of antimicrobial agents and corresponding resistance in animals and human for EU Member States in 2011-12. He added that Public Health England (PHE) had recently published the 'UK One Health Report' which was also a joint report on human and animal antibiotic use, sales and resistance for 2013 and emphasising that an integrated approach (i.e. human and veterinary medicine) to surveillance and action is needed with respect to the control of antibiotic resistance.

27. Professor John Threlfall (a member of the JIACRA working group) referred to ACAF paper 15/18 noting that the report utilised data from five different surveillance networks (EU Member States, Iceland, Norway, and Switzerland) for purposes other than the current integrated analyses, and the analyses focused on certain combinations of antimicrobials and bacterial species. In particular, biomass and consumption data. Professor Threlfall explained that a fully comparable unit of measurement is not available. To make a comparison possible, consumption data of antimicrobials for humans were converted to a mass of active substance. When comparing the consumption of antimicrobials from humans and food-producing animals in 2012, the average consumption expressed in milligrams per kilogram of estimated biomass was 116.4 mg/kg in humans (range 56.7–175.8 mg/kg) and 144.0 mg/kg in animals (range 3.8–396.5 mg/kg). Consumption in food-producing animals was lower or much lower than in humans in 15 of 26 countries; in three countries it was similar, and in eight countries consumption in food-producing animals was higher or much higher than in humans. He said that the highest antimicrobial consumption classes in human medicine were penicillins, macrolides and fluoroquinolones, and for food-producing animals, tetracyclines, penicillins and sulphonamides.

28. Data on antimicrobial consumption in food-producing animals are not available by species; therefore, to analyse the relationship between consumption of antimicrobials and resistance in bacteria from food-producing animals, a summary indicator of resistance in the main three food-producing animals species was calculated on the basis of the weighted mean by per population correction unit (PCU) of the proportions of resistant bacteria in each of those animal species. Overall, a positive association was observed between antimicrobial consumption in food-producing animals and occurrence of resistance in bacteria from such animals for most of the combinations investigated. The strongest associations between consumption and resistance in food-producing animals were found for the antimicrobials studied in relation to *Escherichia coli*. Positive associations were also noted for *Salmonella* spp. and *Campylobacter* spp. However, consumption of third and fourth generation

cephalosporins was found to be lower for animals than in humans. These antimicrobial classes are predominantly used in hospitals, and therefore the comparison may be misleading for countries not reporting such hospital consumption.

29. No associations were observed between the consumption of 3rd- and 4th-generation cephalosporins in food-producing animals and the occurrence of resistance to this sub-class in selected bacteria from humans. No associations were observed between the consumption of fluoroquinolones in food-producing animals and the occurrence of resistance in *Salmonella* spp. and *Campylobacter* spp. from cases of human infection.

30. Positive associations were noted for consumption of macrolides in food-producing animals and the occurrence of resistance in *Campylobacter* spp. from cases of human infection, and for consumption of tetracyclines and the occurrence of resistance in *Salmonella* spp. and *Campylobacter* spp.

31. In the reported analyses, associations between the consumption of selected combinations of antimicrobials and the occurrence of resistance in bacteria were observed for most of the combinations addressed in humans and animals. The epidemiology of resistance is complex, and several factors aside from the amount of antimicrobial consumption influence the level of resistance.

32. Professor Threlfall noted that differences between the systems for collection and reporting of data on antimicrobial consumption and resistance in bacteria from humans and food-producing animals, at the time of data collection (2011–2012), unavoidably hamper direct comparisons. Owing to the characteristics of these data, the interpretation criteria and differences in units of measurement, the results which indicate associations of potential concern should be interpreted with caution.

Discussion

33. Following a question from the ACAF Chairman, Professor Threlfall said in certain countries there is overuse of antibiotics; however, the European Commission's Guidelines for the Prudent Use of Antimicrobials in Veterinary Medicine published in September 2015 provides some recommendations on use. A member of the Committee asked about the evidence base between transmission of resistance between animal species. Professor Threlfall said that another study would need to be carried out to look at the evidence on transfer of resistance from animal to human and other outstanding points. He added that there appears to be correlation of the transfer of genes but not strains and that no assumptions can be made on transfer of genetic material. Professor Threlfall was unable to comment on a question raised by

another Member of the Committee on the variation in resistance in animal and human use.

34. The Committee agreed that although it had a peripheral interest in antimicrobial resistance it will continue to monitor further developments in this area.

Agenda Item 7 – Food Standards Scotland (ACAF/15/19)

35. Dr Susan Pryde introduced paper ACAF paper 15/19 on the changes that have taken place this year in Scotland with the advent of the new Scottish food body, i.e. the Food Standards Scotland (FSS). She explained that FSS had been set up on 1 April 2015, by the Food (Scotland) Act 2015. This followed the change in UK government in 2012 that led to a re-organisation of the responsibilities of the UK Food Standards Agency, i.e. the transfer of FSA's food standards and dietary health remit to Defra and the Department of Health, respectively. This prompted Scottish Ministers to move the Food Standards Agency in Scotland to a standalone food body which retained all of the original functions of the FSA, with an enhanced remit for dietary health to reflect its significance in the Scottish public health landscape. As with the FSA, FSS has retained its independence as a non-ministerial office, part of the Scottish Administration, which works alongside, but separate from, the Scottish Government. It shares the same core principles to ensure that the body is a consistent regulator and that all of the body's work is evidence based.

36. Dr Pryde confirmed that FSS would continue to work closely with FSA on many matters including policy development and European negotiations; management and response of UK wide incidents; and the development of its science and evidence programmes. FSS has the ability to act in a targeted way to deliver outcomes that benefit Scottish consumers and industries. It will have a more prominent voice in Europe, have the scope to develop its own regulatory strategy to ensure its approaches to monitoring and enforcement are consistent and aligned with the landscape of our industry, and finally FSS has the scope to align its objectives much more clearly to Scottish Government on outcomes and food and feed policy.

37. Dr Pryde explained that FSS comprises about 70 office-based staff and 80 operations staff, who are for the most part found in meat plants, as are meat inspectors in the FSA. The body is led by a Chief Executive, and a Senior Management Team within the Executive, but it has a Board that sets the strategic direction for FSS.

38. The Food (Scotland) Act 2015 lists specific provisions related to feedingstuffs; these are similar functions to that in the Food Standards Act. Dr Pryde outlined that the key function of FSS perhaps of direct relevance to the Committee was laid out in regulation 19, in relation to ensuring that FSS acquire and review the latest scientific and technological evidence pertaining to feedingstuffs. This is where the technical expertise of the Committee can help both the FSA and FSS. Of specific interest to

FSS will be information and technologies that have the potential to have a significant or even unique impact in Scotland.

39. Dr Pryde added that in the future, ACAF may wish to advise FSS (and possibly provide risk assessments) on Scottish specific feed issues referring to the safety and use of animal feed and feeding practices, with reference to any new technical developments, new feed materials and products from Scotland and which might affect animal feed and human health. There may be areas which are Scottish specific such as those associated with salmon farming – the use of certain feed additives and fishing/ fish processing sector, salmon/herring/mackerel used in fish oil production, and the by-products for feed from the whisky/beer sector. However, Dr Pryde suggested that these can be discussed in more detail when the Committee meets in Scotland in 2016.

40. Dr Pryde explained that FSS interaction with the FSA and SACs is set out in the FSA/FSS Memorandum of Understanding (MoU). The MoU describes, for example, how the SACs Secretariat (FSA lead); shares information and consults with FSS on Scottish specific issues. Dr Pryde confirmed that Claire Moni would continue to act as the conduit between FSS and the Committee. In terms of UK feed official controls delivery, Dr Pryde noted that the outcome of the FSA (UK-wide) review identified a need for a regional approach to delivery and the adoption of earned recognition. It was recognised that whilst the rest of the UK was in a better position to deliver the changes as recommended in its 2013 review, given that the establishment of a new food body in Scotland involved quite detailed consideration of the local authority functions for food as well as feed, it was considered appropriate for the recommendations of that review to be considered once FSS was established. As such, a presentation and recommendations for a new feed enforcement approach was made to the new FSS Board in September 2015 and as a result it is highly likely that Scotland will now come into line with the rest of the UK in terms of its enforcement approach to animal feed. Additionally, FSS intends to roll out an earned recognition scheme to the feed chain in Scotland (a scheme for primary production is already in place).

41. The FSS Board meeting also agreed to adopt a delivery of feed model based on a regional approach, with the fall back option of a centralised FSS delivery model. Dr Pryde noted that the FSS Board paper on the Animal Feed Review in Scotland was available on the FSS website.

42. Finally, Dr Pryde suggested that the ACAF's out of London meeting in Aberdeen in 2016 would provide a good opportunity to discuss further the official controls for feed in Scotland. In the meantime, she suggested that if the Committee had any questions on the work of the new body, these could be directed to Claire Moni (feed policy); or Jacqui Angus on (feed enforcement) within FSS.

Discussion

43. Following a question from the ACAF Chairman, Dr Pryde said that there was no suggestions that separate scientific advisory committees be set up in Scotland. However, there was a need to review the FSA-FSS MoU. Following a further question from the ACAF Chairman, Dr Pryde said that the project Board had requested that all parts of the UK were represented on the FSA Board.

44. Dr Pryde explained that the organisational structure of FSS was likely to change as a large recruitment campaign was underway. Following a question from a member of the Committee, Dr Pryde said that FSS had a strong connection with Health Protection Scotland in particular on incidents and microbiological issues. It also had close links with reference laboratories.

Agenda Item 8 - Update on the Review of the Report on On-farm feeding practices

45. The ACAF sub-group Chairman (Ms Angela Booth) thanked Members for their comments on the draft review report that had been received following the Committee's June 2015 meeting. She said that some further work was required before the report could be published. The sub-group would be convening following the main ACAF meeting to discuss finalisation of the report. It was hoped that the final report would be published in early 2016.

Discussion

46. The ACAF Secretary said that before the main Committee signed off the report in advance of its publication he wanted to circulate it to external stakeholders for a 'sense-check'. Additionally, the ACAF Chairman asked the farmer representative of the Committee to also review the document.

Action: ACAF Secretariat/farmer representative

Agenda Item 9 – Forward Work Plan (ACAF/15/21)

47. Miss Jumnoodoo introduced paper ACAF/15/21 on horizon scanning and future work for ACAF. She asked the Committee to agree on the proposals for new work and the movement of items as suggested in the paper. Additionally, Miss Jumnoodoo sought the Committee's views on whether trace element status of feeds and the manipulation of animal diets to enhance the nutritional value of food should be amalgamated into one topic following the presentation under agenda item 5 and on the priority for this topic.

Discussion

48. Committee Members agreed that there was a need for the forward work plan to be transparent, but questioned the need to have three distinct categories, i.e. high, medium and periodic updates, suggesting instead that the work areas should be simply listed in the order of importance. One member suggested that the topic of incidents and gaps in feed should be placed in a high position on the forward work plan as it was incumbent on the Committee to scan for gaps and potential safety issues constantly. The ACAF Secretary explained that assurance schemes and the work of the FSA's Animal Feed, TSEs and Animal By-products team helped to mitigate the severity of incidents. He added that the Committee was not required to comment on incidents at every meeting.

49. The Committee agreed to provide the ACAF Secretariat with their comments on the forward work plan, including whether the table should remain in its current format (subject to amendment as suggested), agree on whether the proposed new work areas be accepted, and the specific positioning of work items.

Action: Committee/Secretariat

Agenda Item 10 - Matters arising from the minutes of previous meetings

Food Innovation through advanced animal nutrition

50. At its meeting in June 2015, the Committee was asked whether the UK Government would consider reviewing its recommendation to eat oily fish as a source of Omega 3, since Omega 3 fatty acids can now be obtained in the diet through enriched meat, milk and eggs.

51. The ACAF Secretariat put the question to the SACN Secretariat who have said that 'when there is good (i.e. Randomised Control Trial) evidence that fortified/enriched foods offer the same protective effect as fish then SACN might consider revisiting their advice. The same goes for levels of n-3 in fish. SACN would be very happy to see any compositional studies, and then see if there is any evidence that farmed fish do not provide a protective effect.'

52. The following clarification was provided to Committee Members:

> 'SACN and COT produced joint advice on fish consumption in 2004. Regarding nutrition considerations, SACN/COT concluded that evidence suggests that fish consumption, particularly that of oily fish, decreases the risk of cardiovascular

disease (CVD); this is thought to be due to their long chain n-3 polyunsaturated fatty acid content (n-3 PUFA).

The SACN/COT advice does not make any distinction between farmed fish and wild fish. If SACN was asked to revisit its nutritional advice about the benefits of eating oily fish it would need see, at the very least, robust information about its n-3 content as well as up-to-date studies on benefits of consumption. If SACN was asked to see if there was any difference in health benefits, e.g. reducing the risk of **c**ardiovascular disease **(**CVD) (i.e. protecting against CVD) between consuming wild and farmed oily fish, it would need to see robust compositional information on both wild and farmed fish and studies looking at the health benefits of wild and farmed fish separately.'

53. The Committee was grateful to the SACN Secretariat for this additional information.

Agenda Item 11 - Any Other Business

GACS update

54. Professor Givens provided Members with an update on the GACS meeting held on 1 October 2015. Details of the meeting can be found on the GACS website.

Information Papers

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

- EU Developments (ACAF/15/22); and
- Update on the work of other advisory committees (ACAF/15/23).

Date of the next meeting

56. The next meeting will take place on 17 February 2016 in Aviation House.

ACAF Secretariat
February 2016

Question and Answers

Soy production sustainability – presentation and discussion paper

Rob Brocklesby (Adams and Green) asked about the enforcement of legal reserves. Mr Arioli Silva explained that the Brazilian Government requires businesses to show them where their reserve is via the business's Rural Environment Registration (CAR) and if there is a shortage in the Legal Reserve Area, the business will sign an agreement which sets out how the business will redress the issue. There is good follow-up on the agreement and banks cannot finance the business without the above guarantees and documentation.

David Howells (UK Feed Fats Association) asked what volume of soybean oil was used for biodiesel and not for human consumption. Mr Arioli Silva was unable to provide information during the meeting but said he would provide this.