DRAFT MINUTES OF THE SEVENTY-SIXTH MEETING OF ACAF HELD ON 28 JUNE 2018, Abode Hotel, Chester

Present:

Chairman Dr Ian Brown

Members

Ms Angela Booth	Mr Geoff Brown
Ms Ann Davison	Prof. Ian Givens
Prof. Stephen Forsythe	Mr Peter Francis
Prof. Wendy Harwood	Dr David Peers
Mrs Christine McAlinden	Dr Tim Riley
Prof. Robert Smith	

Secretariat	Mr Keith Millar (Secretary)	Food Standards Agency
	Miss Mandy Jumnoodoo	Food Standards Agency

Assessors

Ms Claire Moni	Food Standards Scotland
Mrs Karen Pratt	FSA
Mr Stephen Wyllie	Defra

Officials	Mr Giles Davis	Veterinary Medicines Directorate
	Mr Scott Reaney	APHA
	Mrs Julie Benson	FSA

1. Dr Brown welcomed everyone to the meeting.

2. Apologies for absence were received from Dr Mark Bond (ACAF Secretariat) and Ms Elizabeth Hirst (FSA Wales).

3. The Chairman advised Members that Edwin Snow (Feed industry Representative) and Michelle Beer (Feed Law Enforcement Representative) had tendered their resignations from the Committee. The Chairman wished them well in the future and thanked them for their contribution.

4. The Chairman confirmed that colleagues in Northern Ireland are still considering who is best placed to fill the current NI Assessor role on ACAF. It is hoped that a decision may be agreed before the Committee's October 2018 meeting.

Agenda Item 1 Declaration of Members' interests

5. Professor Forsythe declared that he had been appointed as an external examiner for Lincoln University. Mr Geoff Brown confirmed that he had been appointed as an independent consultant to the China Export Industry Interest Group, a group of companies developing data to submit to the Chinese authorities to enable export of feed additives and premixtures. Ms Booth advised that she had been appointed a Governor of Bishop Burton College of Agriculture, and was a member of the Industrial Advisory Board, School of Natural and Environmental Science, Newcastle University. Additionally, Professor Rob Smith declared that he had been appointed as an external examiner to the University of Reading.

6. The ACAF Chairman declared he had undertaken a clinical consultancy role for a biotechnology company. Mrs McAlinden confirmed that her company was working on an application for a processing aid for food and feed. It is a solvent for oil extraction from crops, the remaining plant material going into animal feed. It is for use in all of the applications for which hexane is currently used. Her company is also working on the registration of a basic (inert) substance for Plant Protection Products under Regulation (EC) No 1107/2009. Eventually this may be used in products applied to animal and human food crops. Additionally, Mrs McAlinden said that in the USA, phosphine (which is used as a fumigant in grain stores) has been subject to a data call-in. Her company is involved in the monitoring of the additional studies.

Agenda Item 2 – Draft Minutes of the seventy fifth Meeting (MIN/18/01)

7. The minutes were adopted subject to the following minor amendment:
   - Second bullet point in paragraph 7 delete the 'd' in the word 'commercialised'.

Agenda Item 3 –Follow-up to site visit (ACAF/18/10)

8. The ACAF Chairman thanked Professor Smith and John Cameron (Dairy Unit farm manager) for their help in organising the visit to the Dairy Unit on 27 June.

9. Professor Smith introduced paper ACAF 18/10 explaining that the University of Liverpool has two campuses and the one at Leahurst sites the veterinary school and farm. Professor Smith said that the campus works with students and industry. He provided background on the farm, providing data on the size of the farm, the size of the herd and provided details of the unit's performance in terms of milk production and cases of mastitis and endometritis between 2008 and 2017. The herd is a closed herd. Professor Smith also provided details of the typical cow ration, explaining that he routinely takes samples from the cows to monitor their health and welfare and he also explained the details of purchased premixed components. The farm tries to feed the animals with natural products and a high percentage of forages to keep the animals healthy. Their work with Tesco is mostly on horizon scanning, looking at milk quality, farming efficiency, animal welfare and environmental impacts. Feedback on the results of studies is provided via workshops. The work with industry is to provide high quality evidence and identify best practice where there is insufficient scientific evidence. Professor Smith introduced N8 Agrifood, a collaboration of eight Northern Universities to provide a one-stop shop for Food security research, with Liverpool hosting 'a Centre of excellence for sustainable food systems'.

Discussion

10. Following Professor Smith's presentation, Members raised a number of points and questions to which Professor Smith responded as follows:

- samples from the rumen were taken orally;
- although the milk yields have increased since 1968 per annum, the current production yields are smaller compared with the production yields in the USA;
- retailers have stipulations in their contracts on animal welfare conditions;
- some retailers provide the times that cattle should be allowed to graze in fields; whilst others focus on outcomes for the cow, such as mobility and abrasions, regardless of the management system followed;
- although the dairy unit has a relatively low mastitis rate, the unit does want to reduce the prevalence of cases. Additionally, the whole industry is looking to reduce antimicrobial usage;
- the success of the unit is reliant on a good farm manager; and
- the Defra assessor disagreed that anecdotal evidence should be discounted as evidence. However, the Defra Assessor and Professor

Smith agreed that it can point to possible areas for further scientific study.

Agenda Item 4: Update on the EU proposal on medicated feed

11. Mr Giles Davis (Veterinary Medicines Directorate) provided an update on the latest position on the EU proposal on medicated feed and touched upon the 'veterinary medicines proposal' (VMP). He explained that since the last meeting discussions had progressed to attaché level and the UK's views and positioning had been put forward by the UK Permanent Representative (UKREP) after consultation with experts and relevant stakeholders.

12. On 25 May the European Council agreed a new mandate, meaning that a new negotiating platform was established. Agreement of the text in both proposals was reached, and it is likely that the Bulgarians, who currently hold the Presidency, will get this finalised with only 'tidying-up' required by the Austrians when they take the mantle in July (clearance through jurist linguists etc). Finally, it will go through internal clearance processes and this could take a further 6 months to complete. The implementation period for this text will be 3 years.

13. Mr Davis explained that during the negotiations there were a couple of issues, one on carry-over, which will now be referred to as cross contamination, and the other on tightening up on the requirements on prescriptions for medicated feed. However, Mr Davis confirmed that carry-over will be based on advice from EFSA, although Member States will be able to set their own limits. On prescriptions for medicated feed with antimicrobials, these should be for 5 days; however, an interpretation on the requirements was needed.

Discussion

14. In response to Mr Davis' oral update, both he and Members made the following comments:

- the Regulation would be adopted after the UK leaves the EU:

- whether the amount of carry-over suggested was a sensible amount was questioned and was a further reduction required (and would labelling requirements need to be strengthened)?
- Mr Davis confirmed that the UK was supportive of the Commission's proposal, which was on prophylactic use;
- metaphylaxis was the identification of disease on site with follow-up treatment;
- prophylactic treatment was used in the absence of clinical disease;
- what the impact would be across MSs where occurrence of antimicrobial resistance (AMR) was high? Mr Davis said that the production systems in different Member States was not always comparable;
- during the negotiations, with respect to carry-over the Commission had initially recommended a percentage of 1% and then 0.5%; and
- Mr Davis confirmed that science would be used to underpin the AMR therapeutic mutation window, where non-resistant pathogens are killed, and resistant pathogens continue to multiply.

Agenda Item 5 – Animal Feed Official Control Delivery Strategy (ACAF/18/07)

15. In introducing paper ACAF 18/07, Mrs Benson explained how official controls were undertaken in England, which included regular discussions with Devolved countries. Mrs Benson said that the Strategy was needed to develop an innovative and radically different 'whole system' approach to the delivery of official feed controls in line with the FSAs ambition to be an 'excellent accountable modern regulator'. The strategy's priorities and approach had been informed by the findings and recommendations of a programme of LA audits and an internal FSA review in 2016 and the findings and recommendations of the United Kingdom Animal Feed Threat Assessment 2017. The vision is to safeguard public and animal health by driving up sustained improvements in business compliance through intelligence led enforcement. However, Mrs Benson said that the biggest issue is in building resilience. Mrs Benson outlined the key elements of the strategy and how the strategy would be delivered which included arranging regular workshops with local authorities. Mrs Benson informed Members of the key partners involved in the strategy which included the feed industry, Local Authorities, the APHA and VMD as well as the Office for Product Safety and Standards.

16. Mrs Benson then provided examples of what success will look like – including having a level playing field resulting in strong trade, strong collaboration, improved quality and consistency of official controls and a reduction of unnecessary burdens on business. She finished the introduction by asking Members how industry may support the FSA's vision.

Discussion

17. Mrs Benson and Members provided the following comments and suggestions:

- Mrs Benson explained the term 'primary authority' – which is a means for businesses to receive assured and tailored advice on meeting environmental health, trading standards or fire safety regulations through a single point of contact. This ensures start-ups get it right at the outset and enables all businesses to invest with confidence in products, practices and procedures, knowing that the resources they devote to compliance are well spent.
- Members appreciated the difficult task of delivering the Strategy within the framework and the importance of a level playing field and raising compliance.
- The aim was to get as many businesses working with the FSA as possible.
- Although systems are robust, they are administratively burdensome and are always looking for ways to improve. ACAF Members suggested that a forum where information could be shared and where common issues could be discussed could be set up.
- Mrs Benson acknowledged that while there was a broad spectre of expertise within local authorities they were doing an incredible job, (given the current climate), in delivering official feed controls.
- Members also noted that money and resources for carrying out official controls were tight.
- The Committee agreed to assist making the strategy a success wherever it could be useful.

Agenda Item 6 – Feed Additives (ACAF 18/08)

18. Dr Riley introduced paper ACAF 18/08 on the activities of the Working Group on Feed Additives and over-supplementation. He outlined the aims of the working group and the activities undertaken. For example, identifying the evidence on the issue, the size and compliance at farm level and ensuring that it does not duplicate work already being carried out by other organisations. The Group had agreed to

produce a matrix on the species against particular supplements and additives that should be considered a structural and integral part of the Group's overall work.

19. Dr Riley said that the Group was now trying to populate the matrix with a view to identifying the issues, the gravity of these and to hopefully try and mitigate them by producing tailored advice. He confirmed that the area of work that has been excluded for the time being included aquaculture.

Discussion

20. During the discussion the following points were made and actions agreed:

- Overview on why the working Group was set up i.e. because of poor compliance and non-compliance with the use of some products in terms of maximum permitted levels, other regulatory issues and over-supplementation in terms of different intake levels given to animals. There was a need to look at smallholder situations and large-scale producers. It was acknowledged that in poultry a high proportion of animals could be over-supplemented where nutrients were supplied via drinking water. However, this is usually done to maintain daily intakes rather than to deliberately exceed permitted levels. Sources are merchants and veterinary practices and the concern was the level of nutritional advice over the sale of products. The issue is where to target the advice produced by the working group, as on a whole, the feed sector was reasonably compliant.
- the Group is due to meet again in September before which time it is hoped that the matrix will be populated further to help determine its work structure and next steps. No consideration had been made whether the matrix would be species or supplement led. The matrix is to help identify the processes being adopted with a balance between human and animal health impact.
- Additionally, no discussion had taken place on the veterinary supply in terms of authorisation of mineral supplements.
- It was originally suggested that products on the Internet may not be compliant and this will need further investigation. It was also suggested that during hot weather animals will drink more water and it was best to reduce concentration of the feed additives at that time because of this inevitable increased intake.
- An important factor will be how to educate and get the message across once all the data has been gathered
- It was noted that Mark Bond (FSA) was carrying out a literature study

- The VMD had been particularly helpful when Members of the Committee were preparing a paper for the British Cattle Veterinary Association on this issue,
- VMD and APHA both confirmed that they would be happy to participate as Members of the Working Group and would provide nominations.

Agenda Item 7 – Raw Pet Food (ACAF18/09)

21. Referring to paper ACAF 18/09 Mr Scott Reaney (APHA) provided a definition of raw pet food i.e. raw meat that is chopped or minced, often with vegetables. There was no 'kill step' during the process and the final product may not be microbiologically safe. The raw pet food sector is a developing area with 68 companies having been approved by APHA. Mr Reaney advised Members that the Pet Food Manufacturers Association had produced a guidance document in association with FSA and APHA/Defra. It was agreed at the February 2018 meeting that a best practice guidance for consumers and manufacturers should be prepared. In producing the document Mr Reaney explained that he had looked at a number of websites that generally provided details on the benefits but not the risks associated with handling raw pet food. The Annex to paper ACAF 18/09 covered areas such as sourcing of materials, labelling requirements, temperature control, storage throughout the chain and users. The product was not microbiologically sterile and there was associated risks which consumers may not be aware of. Mr Reaney acknowledged that some Members had provided comments, but he welcomed other views.

Discussion

22. After the introduction, Members and others in attendance raised the following points

- the product is not hazardous from the freezer but during thawing – however, labelling requirements under both the Animal By-products and Marketing and Use Regulations did not specifically require safe handling instructions;
- there was no supporting evidence to support the claims that raw pet food was beneficial compared to conventional pet food – however, there could be anecdotal evidence;
- the purpose of feeding raw pet food is that it is a more natural product and therefore there is no formal kill step during the manufacturing process apart from freezing;

- several other committees were looking at the issue, e.g. the Defra Antimicrobial Resistance Coordination (DARC) Group had raised concerns about imports of raw pet food;
- A Member of the Committee disputed the issue that potential human and animal illness due to Listeria had been addressed in the Discussion paper. The Member cited a recent case in South Africa as an example. In terms of the paper, the Member noted that although highly likely to be present, listeria is not tested for in the product and that the control measures based on refrigeration are well known to be inadequate to stop the growth of Listeria during storage. Annex A implies the control of the four named bacterial pathogens (Campylobacter, E.coli, Salmonella and Listeria), through refrigeration. But the Member suggested that this is inaccurate as Listeria grows at refrigeration temperatures and has a low infection dose of ~1000 cells for pregnant women. The Member raised concern that since Listeria was not being tested for in the frozen pet foods, and that storage temperatures will be ineffective as a means of control, that the public and pets would still be at risk from Listeria;
- Annex A '1. Sourcing of raw materials', 3rd bullet point starting "The sourcing of good quality and safe raw materials..." as the statement is not accurate, given the lack of testing for *Listeria*, the current tests are not sufficient to regard the material as 'safe';
- the document should state that the product should be kept away from children;
- there should be advice that during preparation, raw pet food should be segregated from food for human consumption;
- additionally, although the internet makes recommendations on the use of glandular tissue e.g. liver, any guidance produced does not make any recommendations on the proportion to be used in raw pet food;
- at present the majority of raw pet food being produced is aimed at dogs, however the market for cats is increasing;
- where the document states ‘should’ this should be replaced with ‘must’. The document should also make reference to defined standards.
- The document should also be aimed at butchers who supply material direct to consumers;
- although the document makes reference to children it should also consider elderly pet owners;
- the introduction should emphasise not only the potential impacts of the microbiological risks to humans, but also the risks to pets;
- the document should identify the level of risk, e.g. handling of dog bones;
- a Member of the Committee agreed to obtain information on the surveillance of pet disease.

Action: Rob Smith

- the ACAF Secretary confirmed that concern raised by Members mirrored that by the CVO and CMO. The issue was also being discussed by ACMSF[1], UKZADI, DARC and HAIRS. The number of incidents are frequent and the volume of these was worrying. FSA is working with APHA/PHE/DEFRA and VMD on this issue. It was agreed that members would continue to be updated on the issue, including the provision of an information paper;
- Members also raised the lack of consideration of parasites, which can also pose a risk to animal and human health; and
- the ACAF Secretary confirmed that local authorities notify the FSA of incidents associated with raw pet food. Similarly, the APHA receive notifications from local authorities of non-compliance under the animal by-products regulations and will work with them to resolve the issues.

Agenda item 8 - Any Other Business

Science Council

23. The Committee suggested that the Science Council should have an expert on animal feed as it currently did not have any relevant expertise in this area. The ACAF Chairman agreed to raise this point and other animal feed issues at the next biannual meeting of SAC chairs.

Vitamin B2

24. A Member of the Committee raised the issue of the denial of authorisation of one source of Vitamin B2 and the method it is produced by. The Member advised that all vitamin B2 is produced by this method. He said that some genetic material had been identified in the product and the manufacturer had raised a dossier on the product and the authorisation was denied. The Member added that guidance from European Commission and national authorities on resolution of the issue was awaited. Additionally, the issue was a significant problem for poultry.

25. Members raised the following points:

[1] **See Annex**

- on whether there was any suggestion of environmental or human issues,
- the Member who introduced the above was unable to provide any further comments;
- the level of detection of the GM was low;
- the level of risk would be interesting to know and was there an AMR gene marker in the vitamin B2 product; and
- the issue had been discussed at a recent meeting of the Defra Antimicrobial Resistance Coordination (DARC) Group.

Shortage of carbon dioxide

26. Members raised the recent reports on the shortage of carbon dioxide, suggesting that the issue would affect the slaughtering of pigs, but would obtain more detail on this area. A Member said that if the problem was associated with feed, the rations would be adjusted.

Next meeting

27. The date of the next ACAF meeting is to be confirmed.

ACAF Secretariat

September 2018

Annex

Extract from the minutes of Advisory Committee on the Microbiological Safety of Food (ACMSF) meeting held on 10 May 2018

7. Microbiological risks associated with raw pet food

7.1 Paper ACM/1270 (microbiological risks associated with raw pet food) and annex A (raw pet food) had been circulated to members to comment on the risks to humans associated with the use of raw pet food. The Chair invited Dr Manisha Upadhyay to introduce the scene-setting section and Dr Mark Bond (FSA Food Policy: Animal Feed and by-products branch) to present the issues set out in annex A.

7.2 Dr Upadhyay reported that feeding of raw meat-based diets (RMBDs) to pets has become an increasingly popular trend amongst pet owners and has largely been driven by a movement towards consumption of more raw food by humans. She explained that the perception amongst certain pet owners is that such diets may be beneficial for their companion animals. However, the literature highlights significant concerns that such practices pose a health risk for both pets and their owners, as RMBDs may be contaminated with a wide range of pathogens including *Campylobacter* spp. *E. coli*, *Yersinia* spp., *Salmonella* spp., *Listeria* spp., *Clostridium* spp. and also zoonotic parasites, many capable of causing enteritis and serious illness not only in humans but also in companion animals.

7.3 It was underlined that while raw pet food is not considered directly to be a food safety issue, it can nonetheless be a potential source of zoonotic infection via unhygienic or inappropriate handling in a domestic kitchen environment through cross-contamination of food.

7.4 Dr Upadhyay highlighted that in addition to the potential to cause human illness, raw pet food also may have the potential to increase animal and human exposure to AMR bacteria. The ACMSF fixed-term task and finish group on AMR recommended that further research is required on the prevalence of pathogens in companion animal feed and their contribution to human AMR.

7.5 Dr Bond in his presentation covered background information on the raw pet food industry, FSA incidents on raw pet food, typical composition of raw pet foods, microbiological profiles of raw pet food antimicrobial resistant bacteria and raw pet foods, commonly identified risks to pets from raw pet food, incidents of morbidity or mortality in pets associated with raw pet food, risks of raw pet food to humans, incidents of morbidity in humans associated with raw pet food and risk recommendations.

7.6 The Committee noted the number of raw pet food incidents from 2013 to date (up to quarter 1 figures for 2018). This data included domestic incidents as well as EU traded goods (i.e. imports into the UK and exports from UK producers). With the raw pet food comprising <5% of the total pet food sector in the UK, the cases reported represent a disproportionately high frequency of incidents for raw pet food. In line with observations from the academic literature, *Salmonella* contamination in raw pet food has generally been the source of incident notifications; although other recognised pathogens have also been reported to the FSA (i.e. *Listeria, Brucella suis* and Shiga-toxin producing *Escherichia coli* - STEC).

7.7 On risks of raw pet food to humans it was reported that *Salmonella* and *Listeria* can cause severe and potentially fatal infection in both the animals consuming the pet food, and the humans that handle the pet food. It was explained that there is a risk to humans

from handling contaminated pet food products, especially if they have not thoroughly washed their hands after having contact with the products or any surface exposed to these products. Pets can be carriers of the bacteria and infect humans, even if the pets do not appear to be ill.

7.8 From the wider literature, Members were informed that there were incidents of morbidity in humans associated with raw pet food. An illustration was a case (in February 2018 reported by the FDA) of two children in a single household in the USA becoming ill with *Salmonella* Reading; the same serovar was identified in the raw pet food fed to their dog. One child's illness resulted in septicaemia (blood infection) and osteomyelitis, a painful and serious bone infection.

7.9 Dr Bond outlined the risk recommendations/advice for raw pet food issued by the US FDA, the US Centers for Disease Control and Prevention (which does not recommend feeding raw diets to pets), the Canadian Veterinary Medical Association and the UK Pet Food Manufacturers Association (who has published a consumer advice factsheet specifically on feeding raw pet food) and the UK national charity, Pets as Therapy (PAT) who issued a statement in early 2018 urging volunteers not to feed raw meat-based diets to their therapy dogs; which often attend hospital/clinical and school environments, due to the potential of spreading disease especially to vulnerable groups.

7.10 The Committee was asked:

- • To consider the information in the scene-setting paper and;
- • To provide the FSA with any comments or recommendations in relation to microbiological risks to human health.

The following comments were made by members during the discussion.

7.11 A member referred to a large outbreak of *Salmonella* in Canada related to raw pet food, the multi-country outbreak of *Salmonella* Enteritidis (PT8 infection) associated with the handling of feeder mice and the cases of hedgehogs spreading *Salmonella* to humans emphasising that risk of *Salmonella* infection was high when pathogens are brought into the home and has a permanent presence. It was acknowledged that although proper hygiene minimizes the risk of infections from bugs in the home, the fewer pathogens that are brought into the home the better.

7.12 Cooking of raw pet food as suggested in some of the available advice/guidance was agreed would not make a difference.

7.13 It was recognised that the subject of feeding pets with raw food was a lifestyle choice (similar to the preference for unpasteurised milk) and an emotional issue which may need consideration from a social science perspective as there may be barriers or resistance to change regardless of advice provided by industry or health professionals.

7.14 It was noted that material that goes into raw pet foods products are from animals that had been passed by food inspectors to be fit for human consumption. They could possibly become a source of infection if handling/preservation standards fell when these ingredients are diverted from the food chain into the pet food chain (becoming animal by-products).

7.15 Although it was acknowledged that ACMSF has an interest in cross contamination in the domestic setting, it was pointed out that as ACAF (Advisory Committee on Animal Feedingstuffs) was also looking at issues relating to raw pet food the Committee should be mindful of straying into ACAF's territory.

7.16 A member while underlining that raw pet foods was clearly a risk to animals welcomed ACAF's role in tackling the issues however he could not see the potential risk it posed to the public as it was accepted that the public were already handling raw meat/raw poultry. He added that because these products are well packaged before they are used he could not see how they presented increased risk to the public/consumers.

7.17 There was discussion on the possible cross-contamination by contaminated pet food brought into the home of food for human consumption as both could be stored (frozen or refrigerated) in the same location. It was agreed that cross-contamination presented a real issue for domestic food handlers and home-based catering businesses as permanent presence of pathogens in the home presents increased risk of infection. Members accepted that pets (such as dogs and cats) after consuming food contaminated with pathogens and playing in close contact with children may constitute an increased risk especially as the pathogens won't be contained or restricted to a spot.
7.18 A member highlighted that the advice by health agencies to cook raw pet food was contradictory as it goes against the product manufacturers instructions. Members noted that the advice to cook products were mainly from the United States as mitigation against infection as the products are legitimate products that cannot be banned.
7.19 A member referring to an FSA study on domestic kitchen practices (published in July 2013) felt that as raw pet foods were legal products, there was merit for government to make guidance available for those who wish to use this material covering areas such as best way to handle, best way to prepare and present products for consumption, best way to clean and disinfect utensils that have been used for preparing the food explaining that these were important to prevent cross-contamination.
7.20 Reference was made to gastro-intestinal attribution studies in relation to domestic animals with the suggestion that it would be interesting to know the contribution of raw pet foods to GI infections in the home.
7.21 The issue of encouraging vets to be advising pet owners on the potential risks of raw pet foods was flagged. It was recognised that as the use of raw pet food was a lifestyle choice there may be resistance to any advice.
7.22 It was observed that some of the contaminated products mentioned in the paper (which may be a mixture of pork, lamb, beef or poultry) may not have been tested for all potential pathogens. Products from third country sources may not have been tested for pathogens not found in the EU. The antibiotic resistance issues flagged in the paper were noted. It was mentioned that some of the antibiotic-resistant organisms highlighted have not been found in the UK livestock sector.
7.23 As microbiological results for raw pet food in an US FDA study and Utrecht University study (highlighted in paper ACM/1270) revealed significant number of listeriosis isolates, a member asked if PHE's enhanced surveillance covering listeriosis was picking up cases linked to raw pet food. It was confirmed that PHE could be asked to include raw pet food in the scope of its enhanced surveillance of listeriosis cases.
Action: Secretariat
7.24 A member raised the omission of feeder mice in the discussion paper emphasising that because of the recent outbreaks associated with handling of feeder mice together with the variety of issues relating to the ongoing cases it should have been referenced in paper ACM/1270. Dr Bond explained why feeder mice was not discussed in paper. He informed the Committee that there were ongoing deliberations with the European Commission, PHE, APHA/Defra and FSA/ACAF on how to tackle its distinct issues.
7.25 As it was recognised that other government groups were discussing safety issues relating to raw pet food and feeder mice it was suggested to include mitigation of risk to humans in the advice/guidance that these groups will publish.
7.26 ACMSF was reassured that ACAF was involved in tackling the issues of concern relating to raw pet food and feeder mice and agreed that ACAF not ACMSF should be the lead Scientific Advisory Committee advising the FSA on this matter. However, ACMSF had no objection to working with ACAF and was happy to receive updates on developments on raw pet food.
7.27 A member corrected the worth of the pet food industry as indicated in the paper from £2.7bn to £52m. Dr Bond subsequently provided a corrigendum stating: Latest

figures collated by the PFMA indicate that the size of the UK raw pet food market has grown significantly over recent years and is now estimated to be in excess of £100m annually, within a total pet food market of £2.8bn per annum.

7.28 Dr Bond welcomed ACMSF's comments on paper ACM/1270 and the Committee's position that issues are more appropriate for ACAF in accordance with their remit.