



Advisory Committee on Animal Feedingstuffs

ANNUAL REPORT 2000

CONTENTS

Subject	Page
Foreword	1
About the Committee	2
Terms of Reference	2
Meet the Members	3
Summary of the Main Topics Considered by ACAF	5
Procedural Issues and Openness	5
GM Issues	6
• The role of ACAF in GM issues	6
• Adventitious Presence of GM Oilseed in Commercial Seed Stocks	8
• Results of a Survey on the Effects of Processing on DNA	10
• Research Project into the Fate of GM Materials Fed to Chickens	10
The Review of Animal Feed Labelling	10
BSE Related Issues	12
• The Use of Blood in Animal Feed	12
• The Food Standards Agency's Review of BSE Controls	12
• The EC Proposed Feed Ban on Processed Animal Proteins	12

Subject	Page
Other Issues	13
• Dioxins in Belgian Animal Feed and the Aftermath	13
• Proposed Amendments to the Undesirable Substances Directive	13
• Sewage Sludge in French Animal Feed and the Aftermath	14 14
• ACAF's Role in Assessing New Feed Additives and Bioproteins	14
• Risk Analysis and ACAF's Role	15
• Imports of Meat and Other Animal Products	15
• Homeopathic Additives and Herbs	15
• Alternatives to the Banned Antibiotic Growth Promoters	15
• The Draft Feeding Stuffs Regulations	16
• Use of Sweet Lupins in Animal Feed	16
• A Code of Practice for Scientific Advisory Committees	16
• A Consultation on Best Guidance in the Design of GM Crops	16
• Feed Mill and Farm Visits	

Annexes

• Abbreviations – Annex I	18
• Papers Considered by ACAF – Annex II	19
• Register of Members' Interests – Annex III	22
• Code of Practice for ACAF Members – Annex IV	24

Foreword

The past decade has seen a growing awareness of the importance of the integrity of the food chain from 'farm to fork', and a recognition of the role of animal feeds as a crucial link in that chain. The policies and practices of livestock feeding are fundamental to the safety, quality and consumer-assurance of our food supply, as well as to the health and well being of the livestock themselves.

The 1998 White Paper 'The Food Standards Agency: A Force for Change' implemented an earlier recommendation of a short-life Expert Group on Animal Feedingstuffs to establish an independent committee advising on animal feeds. The Advisory Committee on Animal Feedingstuffs (ACAF) was set up in June 1999; and it held its first meeting in September that year.

Since its establishment, ACAF has worked to provide advice to the Foods Standards Agency, the Minister of Agriculture, the Ministers of the Scottish Executive and National Assembly for Wales, and the Minister of Agriculture and Rural Development for Northern Ireland. It has also developed its public information procedures both through media releases and through publishing its minutes and papers on the Internet. The Committee has sought to create public openness and accessibility to its activities. This Annual Report is part of that process, and will form the basis of discussion of ACAF's work and forward work plan at a public meeting arranged for later this year.

ACAF is a broad-based Committee with members with knowledge and experience in a range of scientific disciplines, public health, local authority enforcement, consumer affairs and the feed and farming industries. The subjects it has considered to date reflect the focus of its remit and the priorities that have been created by long-term strategic and policy considerations and by more rapidly evolving developments in the UK and/or EU. Subjects such as BSE and also the labelling of GM feeds have a high level of public interest. But regulatory developments, such as the introduction of the Feeding Stuffs Regulations (2000), or brief enquiries, such as that into the use of homeopathic additives and herbs, are also important parts of ACAF's considerations.

I hope that readers will find this Annual Report informative and interesting, and that it will provide a helpful insight into the work of the Committee.

Finally, I should like to thank my Committee colleagues for their valuable contributions over the year, and to express my appreciation to Bill Knock

and his colleagues in the Secretariat for their unstinting support for the Committee's work.

Professor Phil Thomas
Chairman

About the Committee

1. The Advisory Committee on Animal Feedingstuffs (ACAF) was set up in June 1999 to advise on the safety and use of animal feeds and feeding practices, with particular emphasis on protecting human health and with reference to new technical developments and new feed materials.
2. The decision to set up the Committee was made in the light of concern about the integrity of animal feeds, particularly over the implications of Bovine Spongiform Encephalopathy (BSE) and the use of genetically modified feed ingredients. The decision was announced in the White Paper, 'The Food Standards Agency: A Force for Change', published in January 1998 and it implemented the principal recommendation of the report of the Expert Group on Animal Feedingstuffs, published in July 1992.
3. The Committee's primary purpose is to advise on the safety and use of animal feed in relation to human health but it also covers animal health aspects and a wide range of contemporary issues including advice on the UK negotiating line on new European Community (EC) proposals, animal feed ingredients including genetically modified organisms (GMOs) and labelling and information for purchasers.
4. ACAF is a UK-wide committee and is made up of independent experts who were appointed by UK agriculture and health ministers. Members are appointed for their individual expertise and experience and are not representative of any sector or organisation. ACAF is committed to a policy of openness and publishes its agendas, minutes, reports and most of its papers on its website at:
[www. foodstandards.gov.uk/committees/acaf/summary.htm](http://www.foodstandards.gov.uk/committees/acaf/summary.htm).

Terms of Reference

5. ACAF advises the Food Standards Agency, the Minister of Agriculture, Ministers of the Scottish Executive, the National Assembly for Wales and the Minister for Agriculture and Rural Development (Northern
-

Ireland) on the safety and use of animal feeds and feeding practices, with particular emphasis on protecting human health and with reference to new technical developments. In carrying out its functions, ACAF liaises with other relevant advisory committees as appropriate.

Meet the Members

6. ACAF currently consists of a chairman and 12 members from wide-ranging backgrounds including consumer affairs, farming, feed industry and science. Members were appointed in accordance with the Nolan Principles which aim to ensure fairness and transparency in appointments to public bodies. ACAF members and their main area of expertise are listed below. Professor Ian Shaw resigned from the Committee in March 2000 when he moved to New Zealand.

Professor Phillip Thomas (Chairman) is a self-employed consultant, Chairman of the Animals Medicines Training Regulatory Authority and a member of the Scottish Food Advisory Committee. He has academic associations with the Scottish Agricultural College, University of Glasgow and University of Edinburgh. He is a Fellow of the Royal Society of Edinburgh, Institute of Biology and Royal Agricultural Societies.

Dr Ian Brown (occupational health) is a medically qualified registered specialist in occupational medicine and toxicology. He is also a graduate in agricultural biochemistry and nutrition and has a wide range of knowledge and experience covering occupational health, toxicology, agriculture and food safety. Dr Brown is currently Director of Occupational Health and Safety to Southampton University Hospital NHS Trust and a Consultant Physician in Occupational Medicine and Toxicology. He has recently been appointed as Chairman of the Pesticide Residues Committee.

John Cheetham (local authority enforcement) is Head of Trading Standards (Operations) at Nottinghamshire County Council. He has extensive experience of local authority enforcement with specific knowledge of the enforcement of animal feedingstuffs legislation. He is the Chairman of the Feedingstuffs and Fertilisers Focus Group of the Local Authority Co-ordinating Body on Trading Standards.

Dr Andrew Chesson (animal nutrition) is Head of Biological Chemistry at the Rowett Research Institute. He is Vice Chairman of the European Commission's Scientific Committee on Animal Nutrition (SCAN) and a

member of the GMO sub-group of the Commission's Scientific Committee on Plants. Dr Chesson is also Vice-Chairman of the OECD Task Force on Safety of Novel Foods.

Gilli Davies (consumer) is a consultant and writer on food issues and cookery from Wales. She is a member of the Welsh Food Advisory Committee and has a strong interest in promoting quality foods, including organic food. Mrs Davies was a member of the Meat and Livestock Commission's Consumer Committee from 1996 to 1999.

Paul Foxcroft (animal by-products) is a director of Prosper de Mulder and has worked in the animal feed industry for 25 years, of which the last 17 have been in the animal by-products sector. He is a graduate in Agricultural Biochemistry and Nutrition. Mr Foxcroft is active in various industry associations that represent the animal by-products sector including the UK Renderers Association and the European Renderers Association.

Dr John Heritage (novel technology) is Senior Lecturer in Microbiology at the University of Leeds. He is a Chartered Biologist with a broad based background in biological sciences. He is interested in the evolution and dispersion of genes that code for antibiotic resistance. Dr Heritage is currently a member of the Advisory Committee on Novel Foods and Processes (since 1997).

Fiona Hodgson (lay person/consumer) owns her own interior design company as well as bringing up four children. She has a strong interest in animal welfare issues and consumer affairs and made a valuable contribution to the Farm Animal Welfare Council during her eight years' membership (until 1997).

Robert Moore (veterinary practice) is the Managing Partner of a Somerset based multi-person mixed veterinary practice. He is a past president of the British Cattle Veterinary Association and has been active in the British Veterinary Association, serving on several committees. He is a council member for the Royal College of Veterinary Surgeons. Mr Moore is particularly interested in cattle health and nutrition.

Andrew Peddie (farming) is a Scottish farmer with a broad range of agricultural experience involving pigs, poultry, suckler cows and dairy farming. He is Chairman of Scotlean Pigs Feed Committee and is a

former Chairman of the Intensive Livestock Committee of the National Farmers' Union of Scotland.

Dr Helen Raine (feed compounding) is a qualified nutritionist with considerable experience of the feed compounding industry. She is Director of Food Assurance for ABNA Ltd and is Deputy Chairman of the United Kingdom Agricultural Supply Trade Association. She also sits on the Council of the European Feed Manufacturers Federation and represents the UK on various working groups.

Dr Desmond Rice (feed compounding and veterinary background) is a Veterinarian who is recognised by the Royal College of Veterinary Surgeons as a specialist in livestock nutrition. He has sat on several industry committees, is a past president of the Northern Ireland Grain Trade Association and the Northern Ireland Veterinary Association. He has worked in veterinary practice, veterinary research and is currently a consultant to the veterinary profession and the animal feed and human food industries.

Professor Ian Shaw (toxicology) was Professor of Toxicology at the University of Central Lancashire and had a particular interest in food related toxicity. He was a member of the Advisory Committee on Pesticides (from 1996) and Chairman of the Working Party on Pesticide Residues (from 1995).

Dr Michael Stringer (microbiology) is Director of Food Technology at Campden and Chorleywood Food Research Association. His expertise lies particularly in food microbiology and food processing. He is also interested in conventional and novel processing technologies, quality management systems and risk assessment. Dr Stringer served on the Advisory Committee for the Microbiological Safety of Food for seven years (until 1997).

Summary of the Main topics Considered by ACAF

Procedural Issues and Openness

7. As a newly formed Committee, one of ACAF's first tasks was to agree its remit, guiding principles and basic procedural matters. At its first meeting on 24 September 1999, the Committee agreed its terms of reference (see paragraph 5 above) and adopted a Code of Practice (see Annex IV) to help ensure high standards of conduct and integrity amongst its members. The Committee also discussed its work
-

programme for the forthcoming 12 to 18 months and agreed its priorities. At this meeting, ACAF began to formulate its policy of openness by agreeing basic publicity measures such as issuing regular news releases on the work of the Committee, publishing an annual report and creating a website.

8. ACAF has continued to develop its policy of openness. The Committee publishes its agendas and minutes on its website and issues news releases announcing the outcome of its meetings and any other significant issues. ACAF now publishes its papers on the website following its meetings, although there are limited exceptions to this rule (such as draft documents) as laid down in the Code of Practice on Access to Government Information.
9. The Committee is committed to operating openly and encouraging two-way communication with the public. Members have discussed ways of achieving these aims, including regular open meetings and holding an annual open forum. It was agreed that an open forum, geared to a broad based audience, represented the best way forward. This open forum will be centred on the Committee's first annual report and is expected to be held in Manchester on 5 July.

GM Issues

The role of ACAF in GM Issues

Legislation

10. There is no EC or national legislation concerning the assessment or approval of novel animal feeds, including those containing or derived from GMOs, although the European Commission is currently working on proposals in this area. Until such rules come into effect, animal feeding aspects of new GM plants are considered under Council Directive 90/220, on deliberate release to the environment of GMOs. This Directive governs the release and marketing of GMOs in the EU, laying down detailed approval procedures. It is implemented in the UK by Part VI of the Environmental Protection Act 1990 and the Genetically Modified Organisms (Deliberate Release) Regulations 1992, as amended.

The Role of ACRE and the ACNFP

11. The assessment of GMOs in the UK has mainly been carried out by two advisory committees, the Advisory Committee on Releases to the Environment (ACRE) and the Advisory Committee on Novel Foods and Processes (ACNFP).
12. The Government is advised on the safety of proposed releases or marketing of GMOs under Directive 90/220 by ACRE, a committee of independent experts set up under Part VI of the Environmental Protection Act. Until the establishment of ACAF, ACRE sought advice on the feed aspects of applications under 90/220 from the Ministry of Agriculture, Fisheries and Food (MAFF) and its advisers on animal feed. ACRE now refers these applications to ACAF for an opinion on their safety for use in animal feed.
13. Foods and food ingredients containing or consisting of GMOs are controlled by EC Regulation 258/97 which lays down a system for assessing and approving new foods for marketing in the EU. Safety assessments of applications under this Regulation are carried out in the UK by the ACNFP.

ACAF's Role

14. Since its first meeting the Committee has considered and developed its role in the assessment of new genetically modified (GM) material to be used in animal feed and its relationship with other committees advising on GM issues. ACAF's role is to advise on the impact, both on animals and the ultimate consumer, of GM crops used in animal feed. It has set up a sub-group to specialise in GM matters, specifically the animal feed aspects of dossiers referred to it by ACRE. The Committee agreed that the sub-group should correspond mainly by e-mail (or by post) and that its composition should be flexible, being augmented where necessary from outside the Committee on an ad hoc basis. The GM sub-group was given the following remit:

“The sub-group advises ACRE, on behalf of ACAF, on the animal feed aspects of applications to release and market new GMOs or material derived from them under EC Directive 90/220. The sub-group is accountable to ACAF and should submit regular reports on

its work for the Committee's scrutiny. Appointments to the sub-group are made and revoked by ACAF"

To date the sub-group has comprised Professor Phillip Thomas, Dr Ian Brown, Dr Andrew Chesson and Dr John Heritage.

15. The Committee has agreed that each application relating to a novel GM feed should be assessed on a case by case basis using the concept of substantial equivalence and/or animal feeding studies depending on the individual circumstances. The concept of substantial equivalence is where a GM food, plant or animal feed is compared with an existing conventional counterpart. Differences between the GM item and its counterpart are identified and undergo a detailed examination to establish whether the GM variety is as safe as the conventional one. Animal feeding studies look at the effects of new feeds on the animals that eat them. They generally concentrate on nutritional aspects but can also be used to identify any animal health problems and highlight any unexpected effects that require further examination. ACAF also believes that post-market monitoring has a role to play in verifying the ongoing safety of new feeds.
16. ACAF has met with members of the ACNFP (on 1 December 1999) and ACRE (14 September 2000) to discuss their respective remits and approaches to assessing GMOs. These joint meetings were very useful in clarifying roles, helping to avoid duplication of effort and optimising the expertise available to the Committees. They have also resulted in closer liaison between ACAF and these two committees, with Dr John Heritage of ACAF assisting in an ACRE molecular biology sub-group and ACRE's Professor Christopher Pollock agreeing to contribute to ACAF's assessment of GM plants.

The Adventitious Presence of GM Oilseed Rape in Commercial Seed Stocks

Background

17. In its first fifteen months, ACAF has looked at only one complete dossier, Monsanto's glyphosate tolerant oilseed rape, in connection with its low level presence in conventional seed stocks. On 17 April 2000, Advanta Seeds UK notified the Department of the Environment, Transport and the Regions and MAFF of the possibility that some conventional rapeseed stocks sold to farmers for spring sowing in 1999 and 2000 had contained low levels (around 1 per cent) of GM rapeseed.

The seed stocks in question were produced in Canada in 1998, and appeared to have been affected by growing too close to GM rapeseed. Further investigation showed that the seeds had been crossed or mixed with Monsanto Round-up Ready glyphosate tolerant RT73 oilseed rape variety. This variety was not approved for marketing in Europe under Directive 90/220, but ACRE had approved similar constructs for experimental field trials in the UK. RT73 was approved for food uses (refined oil) in the EU.

ACAF Advice

18. ACRE and the Food Standards Agency were asked for advice concerning this incident and they concluded that it posed no risk to the environment or to human health. On 12 May ACAF was asked for advice on the implications for the use of oilseed rape and its by-products for animal feed, given that seed containing 1% or less of the RT73 variety had been imported for use in the UK. The Committee considered the summary information provided and on 26 May, issued a letter containing preliminary advice to Sir John Krebs, Baroness Hayman and the relevant Ministers in Scotland, Northern Ireland and Wales. This letter stated that, on the information provided, ACAF saw no reason to disagree with the views of ACRE and the Food Standards Agency. Ministers then asked ACAF for a more definitive review of the relevant technical dossier.

Composition of RT73

19. On considering the detailed dossier, ACAF noted that compositional data making comparisons between RT73 and corresponding unmodified rape seed had been reviewed by ACNFP at the time of the product's approval as a source of extracted oil for human food consumption. In almost all respects, the RT73 product was demonstrably equivalent to unmodified rapeseed product. This was reflected in the ACNFP's report, with which ACAF concurred.

20. Nonetheless, there were compositional differences, most notably in total alkyl glucosinolates (anti-nutritional factors), which were found in higher levels in the RT73 line than in the control (~11 and 8 $\mu\text{mole/g}$ defatted meal respectively). Whether this reflected any difference in the make-up of the glucosinolate fraction was not recorded. However, glucosinolates are comparatively unstable in plant material and levels of individual

metabolites can vary significantly, making comparisons of glucosinolate profiles of limited value

21. Whether the higher levels of glucosinolate in the RT73 line were a product of differences in crop cultivation conditions or resulted from an unintended modification effect, they appeared to be consistent. Moreover, there was evidence from studies carried out with growing rats that the higher anti-nutritive levels in the modified line exerted detectable effects on nutritive value. However, the levels of glucosinolates in the RT73 product were well within the range found in existing cultivated strains of oilseed rape which were accepted as safe. They therefore did not represent a safety issue.
22. The dossier provides indirect evidence that the gene conferring resistance to antibiotics including streptomycin and spectinomycin that was used as a marker gene during the development of the GM strain is not present in RT73. This evidence relied on selective polymerase chain reaction (PCR) amplifications.

Conclusion

23. On the basis of the information outlined above, ACAF concluded that the adventitious presence of RT73 oilseed rape in rape seed stock, at the levels reported, presented no threat to human or animal health via use in animal feed. Within this sphere there were therefore no risk management issues to consider. This opinion took full account of the known uses of oilseed rape and its products in animal feeding, the very low level of RT73 in the seed stock and the compositional information on RT73 presented in the dossier on the product. The Committee accepted that a further, more specific dossier would be provided if the developers were to seek full marketing consent for the variety in question.
24. Members also commented that the problem of adventitious mixing was more than a scientific matter. The Committee was disappointed that such contamination had occurred, and recognised that those people who did not wish to consume GM crops or products derived from them would have been very concerned by the incident. ACAF considered it most important to avoid further such challenges to the purity of seed stocks in order to safeguard the various claims made as regards the GM status of seed, animal feed and foods. It believed that the authenticity of seed sold to farmers should be assured by appropriate

surveillance and traceability. The Committee also sought clarification on the sterility or otherwise of the GM hybrid.

Results of a Survey on the Effects of Processing on DNA

25. Members considered a paper at the fifth ACAF meeting, on 27 June 2000, summarising the results of a research project on the effects of various types of processing used in the feed industry on the integrity of deoxyribonucleic acid (DNA). The Committee noted that DNA fragments large enough to contain potentially functional genes survived processing in most of the samples studied but there was a greater degree of fragmentation when the processing regime was more extensive. However, the results varied considerably between different feed materials and, even between samples of the same material.

Research Project into the Fate of GM Materials Fed to Chickens

26. At the joint meeting of ACAF and the ACNFP, the Committees discussed a paper providing a draft specification for a proposed research project investigating the fate of transgenic material fed to chickens. The project was not intended as a safety study on the GM material involved, which had already been fully assessed. It was noted that evidence to date indicated that little (if any) DNA survived processing and passage through an animal's digestive tract and any that does, did not end up in meat, milk or other animal products. The Committees agreed that this would be a useful piece of research but that attention should be paid to the feeding regime with respect to the relevance of the data obtained.

The Review Of Animal Feed Labelling

27. At its first meeting, the Committee highlighted animal feed labelling as a priority area for its attention. This issue was taken forward at its second meeting on 1 December 1999, when the Committee considered a paper outlining existing labelling requirements for animal feed and an EC proposal to amend legislation on the listing of feed ingredients. The Committee decided to carry out a general review of feed labelling which would focus particularly on the identification of compound feed ingredients and the need for, and type of, labelling for the presence or absence in animal feed of GM material. As a first step in this review, the Committee launched a consultation on all aspects of feed labelling.

Scope of the Review

28. The review covered all aspects of labelling animal feed (excluding pet food) but concentrated particularly on two key issues:

- the ingredient listing of compound feeds (on which negotiations were proceeding concerning a European Commission proposal for mandatory percentage declarations of ingredients by weight); and
- the need for, and mechanics of, labelling in relation to GM materials and animal feed.

29. The question of labelling the meat, milk or eggs for the ultimate consumer was excluded from the scope of the review as food labelling was outside the Committee's remit.

Consultation Exercise

30. The consultation paper was issued on 26 January 2000 to 95 interested parties and a total of 46 responses were received. ACAF discussed responses to the consultation at its fourth meeting on 4th May 2000. It noted that respondents to the consultation in respect of ingredient listing were almost unanimous in wanting declarations in full, showing each ingredient in descending order by weight. However, opinion was divided over whether this should go as far as to give a percentage inclusion rate for all ingredients. The GM labelling aspect of the consultation exercise attracted the most comment, with the clear message that some form of labelling was necessary. There was a majority which wanted the presence of GM material to be declared. Support for this form of positive labelling was particularly strongly expressed by consumer representatives. There were also comments in favour of considering pet food labelling and attention was drawn to the necessity for openness and full traceability of materials in the feed supply system.

The Report

31. By the end of 2000, the Committee had considered three drafts of its report and had agreed that finalising the text should be the task of a small sub-group comprising Professor Phillip Thomas, John Cheetham, Dr Andrew Chesson, Fiona Hodgson and Dr Helen Raine.

BSE Related Issues

The Use of Blood in Animal Feed

32. At its sixth meeting on 4 October 2000, the Committee discussed media claims that cows, born after the 1996 feed ban, may have contracted BSE through the use of cow's blood in animal feed. The Committee was advised that the risk of disease transfer via this route had been discussed by the Spongiform Encephalopathy Advisory Committee whose conclusions were due to be published on 19 October. For its own part, ACAF noted that the UK feed manufacturing industry had recognised consumer concerns about the feeding of animal protein sources. Thus, whilst the use of mammalian blood was not prohibited under the 1996 feed legislation, the industry had indicated that it was not used in manufactured feeds for ruminant or other classes of livestock in the UK. It was noted that the existing feed regulations would require any use of blood in UK feeds to be declared on the feed label.

Food Standards Agency's Review of BSE Controls.

33. The Committee discussed the Food Standards Agency's draft report on this review at its seventh meeting on 30 November 2000. It supported the recommended ban on feeding own-species material to animals where this represented a risk of transmitting disease. However, ACAF believed that there could be exceptions to the ban where there was no known risk of transmission. The example of porcine gelatin being used as a stabiliser for vitamins in pig diets was given. The Committee recognised that, aside from safety considerations, there were aesthetic and ethical objections to own species re-cycling and therefore concluded that any exceptions should be limited and carefully justified. Recognising that the report was still at the draft stage, members also offered suggestions on how the draft could be improved to give the general public a better understanding of the issues behind the report's recommendations. The Food Standards Agency's report was published in December 2000.

EC Proposed Feed Ban on Processed Animal Proteins

34. At its seventh meeting, the Committee discussed at short notice an EC proposal to ban the use of all processed animal protein, that is virtually all products of animal origin, in feed for farmed livestock. This proposal

was one of a number of measures considered at EC level in response to the spread of BSE in various EU countries. Members were informed that the ban could include fish meal.

35. The Committee fully supported the EC proposal to ban mammalian meat and bone meal (MBM) from all livestock feeds, thus extending to other EU countries arrangements already in place in the UK, on the grounds of reducing the threat of cross-contamination further spreading BSE. However, ACAF did not think that the ban should automatically be applied to fish meal as they were not aware of any similar threat from using fish meal in animal feed. The risk with fish meal was linked to the theoretical possibility of contamination with MBM. The Committee considered that any controls introduced beyond MBM should be justified in terms of risk to human and/or animal health. It believed that any proposed restrictions on the use of fish meal should be considered carefully, preferably by the Commission's Scientific Steering Committee, before any action was taken. ACAF's views were passed onto the Minister of Agriculture, Fisheries and Food before the ban was discussed at the Agriculture Council meeting on 4 December. A ban on processed animal protein was agreed subsequently by the Council, initially for a period of six months, until 30 June 2001. It included blood meal, fish meal, poultry offal meal and feather meal, although fish meal for non-ruminant animals and non-ruminant gelatin used as a coating for feed additives were among the exemptions.

Other Issues

Dioxins in Belgian Animal Feed and the Aftermath

36. ACAF discussed the European Commission's proposals to tighten EC animal feed rules following the contamination of Belgian feed fats with dioxins and Polychlorinated Biphenyls (PCBs) which occurred early in 1999. The Commission's proposals included a ban on the use of recovered vegetable oils (RVOs) and setting maximum permitted levels for dioxins. The Committee agreed the UK negotiating line that dioxin limits should not be set without a full risk assessment and to oppose a total ban on the use of RVOs in favour of improved traceability and approval of fat blenders and processors.

Proposed Amendments to the Undesirable Substances Directive

37. ACAF considered an EC proposal to amend Council Directive 1999/29 which contains provisions for the control of undesirable substances and
-

products (contaminants) in finished feeds and feed materials. In particular, it sets maximum permitted levels (MPLs) for a range of contaminants including heavy metals, nitrites, aflatoxin and certain pesticides. Amendments to this Directive were envisaged in the Commission's legislative work programme drawn up following the Belgian dioxin incident and included a proposal to ban the dilution of contaminants regulated by the Directive. The Committee was concerned that such a ban would merely move the dilution and/or use of such materials to countries outside EU regulation, whilst permitting importation of related feed products or animal produce. Its initial view was that a multi-strand approach to regulation would be appropriate. A new upper level should be set for each undesirable substance and any feed ingredient found to contain more than this level should be destroyed. Between the acceptable level and upper level, blending down should be permitted under regulated circumstances within the EU. ACAF accepted that there were levels at which certain materials should not be used in feed, and believed that some of the existing EC MPLs might be re-examined in terms of a full scientific risk assessment.

Sewage Sludge in French Animal Feed and the Aftermath

38. At its second meeting, the Committee discussed media reports that sewage sludge had been incorporated into French animal feed and the European Commission's resulting proposal to amend Decision 91/516 to clarify legislation in this area. The Chairman had been consulted urgently by MAFF on this matter, together with the Chairs of two other advisory committees. ACAF agreed that the UK should strongly support the European Commission's efforts to tighten the rules prohibiting the use of sludge from treating waste waters to ensure equally high standards apply throughout the EU. However the Committee thought it was important that any new legislation should not prohibit safe and sensible use of by-product materials from food processing.

ACAF's Role in Assessing New Feed Additives and Bioproteins

39. Also at its second meeting ACAF, discussed and endorsed existing procedures in the UK for assessing new feed additives and bioproteins. It requested to be kept fully informed of the progress of dossiers and other developments via regular written reports.

Risk Analysis and ACAF's Role

40. The Committee considered its approach to, and role in, carrying out risk analysis. It adopted a risk analysis system, developed by the FAO/WHO, as the basis of its approach to animal feed and human food safety issues. This system consisted broadly of three elements: risk assessment, risk management, and risk communication. The Committee agreed that that it would generally be involved in all three stages of the system, although there might be occasions when contributions from other scientific specialists might be needed for the risk assessment stage.

Imports of Meat and Other Animal Products

41. The Committee considered, over a number of meetings, the implications of meat and other imports not having been produced under comparable feed regimes to those in the UK. It agreed that although controls existed for the safety and standards of imported food and animal feed, there was no requirement for assurance information on the feeding regimes of animals whose meat or other products were imported into the UK. ACAF supported the Food Standards Agency's view, expressed in its then draft report on BSE controls, that there was concern among consumers and the industry that imported produce may come from animals whose feeding is subject to less strict controls than apply in the UK. The Committee believes more should be done and is keeping this area under active review.

Homeopathic Additives and Herbs

42. The respective responsibilities of ACAF and the Veterinary Products Committee for such products included in animal feed were discussed and noted at the Committee's second meeting. Later, at its fourth meeting, ACAF considered a paper on legislation affecting such products, and functional foods for human consumption. The opportunity was also taken for members to ask questions about aspects of controls on veterinary medicines.

Alternatives to the Banned Antibiotic Growth Promoters

43. At its third meeting on 2 March 2000, the Committee noted that regulated antibiotic growth promoters (AGPs) which have been assessed for safety, quality and efficacy were being replaced in Europe by products which have not been subjected to the same rigorous assessment procedures. Often products that have already been approved as feed additives for other purposes have not been assessed against the new usage and claims. As a first step in addressing this issue, ACAF asked the Secretariat to collate information on the alternative products currently in use and to draft a statement on their status. The Committee reviewed this draft statement at its next meeting and urged that the issue be pursued by the Food Standards Agency at EU level. It was agreed that the draft statement should be sent to the European Commission for discussion at the Standing Committee on Animal Feeds.

The Draft Feeding Stuffs Regulations

44. The Committee discussed these draft Regulations which consolidated existing legislation as well as implementing a number of new EC measures at its third meeting. Members were informed that the draft Regulations had been the subject of a consultation exercise which concentrated particularly on whether the use of feed additives should be limited only to their incorporation into feedingstuffs. The Committee agreed with responses to the consultation that prohibiting the non-feed use of additives would create operational problems in animal feeding and have adverse implications for animal welfare. It urged the removal of this clause from the draft regulations. The Feeding Stuffs Regulations 2000 came into force in England on 29 October minus the clause banning the non-feed use of additives, and similar Regulations have now been made in Scotland, Wales and Northern Ireland.

The Use of Sweet Lupins in Animal Feed

45. At its fifth meeting, ACAF discussed a paper highlighting the increasing interest amongst farmers in the use of lupins as a source of animal feed protein and outlining MAFF-commissioned research on this topic. The Committee noted the research and expressed the view that advice to farmers on the management and use of the crop should accompany any significant introduction to the UK.

A Code of Practice for Scientific Advisory Committees

46. At its seventh meeting, the Committee considered the Government's draft guidance for advisory scientific committees which was issued by the Office of Science and Technology (OST) for consultation in July 2000. ACAF welcomed this draft Code of Practice as bringing together existing guidance and agreed that a number of specific points, relating mainly to the issues of confidentiality and conflicts of interest, should be made by letter to the OST.

A Consultation on Best Guidance in the Design of GM Crops

47. The Committee gave its views on draft guidance issued by the ACRE sub-group on Best Practice in GM Crop Design in October 2000. ACAF welcomed the draft guidance as a clearly laid out document which provided much needed sound technical guidance in the area. More detailed comments on the "problem formulation" approach (a key part of

risk assessment) described in the draft guidance and on the selection of desired characteristics were made to the ACRE sub-group by letter.

Feed Mill and Farm Visit

48. M
embers visited an animal feed mill at Bury St Edmunds and a nearby pig farm on 1 March 2000. The Committee agreed that the visits were very informative. Points of particular interest to members from the mill visit included the strong emphasis placed on the traceability of feed materials and the difficulties in taking samples for enforcement purposes at intermediate stages of production given that the system was almost entirely enclosed. One of the main observations from the farm visit was that complying with legislation can have considerable practical and economic implications for farmers.

Abbreviations

ACNFP	Advisory Committee on Novel Foods and Processes
ACRE	Advisory Committee on Releases to the Environment
AGPs	Antibiotic growth promoters
BSE	Bovine Spongiform Encephalopathy
DNA	Deoxyribonucleic acid
EC	European Community
EU	European Union
FAO	Food and Agriculture Organisation
GM	Genetically modified
GMO	Genetically modified organism
MAFF	Ministry of Agriculture, Fisheries and Food
MPLs	Maximum permitted levels
OST	Office of Science and Technology
PCBs	Polychlorinated Biphenyls
PCR	Polymerase chain reaction
RVOS	Recovered vegetable oils
UK	United Kingdom
WHO	World Health Organisation

Papers Considered by ACAF in 1999 and 2000

NO. OF PAPER	NAME OF PAPER	MEETING INFORMATION	
		NUMBER	DATE
ACAF/99/1	Introduction to the Chairman and Members	1 st Meeting	24 th Sep 2000
ACAF/99/2	Proposed Terms of Reference	1 st Meeting	24 th Sep 2000
ACAF/99/3	Future Topics for ACAF to consider	1 st Meeting	24 th Sep 2000
ACAF/99/4	Food Standard Agency and Animal Feedingstuffs	1 st Meeting	24 th Sep 2000
ACAF/99/04anx	Order to be made under clause 30 of food Content of Draft standard Bill	Joint Meeting with ACNFP	1 st Dec 2000
ACAF/99/5	Genetically Modified Organisms and Animal Feed	1 st Meeting	24 th Sep 2000
ACAF/99/6	ACAF Publicity Measures	1 st Meeting	24 th Sep 2000
ACAF/99/7	Dioxins in Belgian Animal Feed and the Aftermath	1 st Meeting	24 th Sep 2000
ACAF/99/8	Code of Practice for ACAF Members	1 st Meeting	24 th Sep 2000
ACAF/99/9	Fees and Expenses	1 st Meeting	24 th Sep 2000
ACAF/99/10	GM Crops seeking approval to be placed on the market in Europe under European council directive 90/220/EEC	2 nd Meeting	1 st Dec 2000
ACAF/99/11	Matters Arising - Future Topics for ACAF to Consider	2 nd Meeting	1 st Dec 2000
ACAF/99/12	Matters Arising - Other Advisory Committees which could have an effect on the work of ACAF	2 nd Meeting	1 st Dec 2000
ACAF/99/13	Matters Arising - Homeopathic/Herbal Additives	2 nd Meeting	1 st Dec 2000
ACAF/99/14	A Summary of the work of other Advisory Committees	2 nd Meeting	1 st Dec 2000
ACAF/99/15	Organic Farming and Animal Feed	2 nd Meeting	1 st Dec 2000
ACAF/99/16	Assessment of the Quality, Efficacy and Safety of new Additives and Bioproteins used in Animal Feed	2 nd Meeting	1 st Dec 2000
ACAF/99/17	Labelling Of Animal Feed	2 nd Meeting	1 st Dec 2000
ACAF/99/18	Up - Date on Aftermath to dioxin problems in Belgian Animal Feed	2 nd Meeting	1 st Dec 2000
ACAF/99/19	Sewage sludge in French Animal Feed	2 nd Meeting	1 st Dec 2000
ACAF/99/20	Approaches to Assessing the safety of Genetically modified material for use as Human food or Animal Feed	Joint Meeting with ACNFP	1 st Dec 2000

ACAF Annual Report 2000

ACAF/99/21	Research Project on the Fate of GM Materials Fed to Chickens	Joint Meeting with ACNFP	1 st Dec 2000
------------	--	--------------------------	--------------------------

ACAF Annual Report 2000

NO. OF PAPER	NAME OF PAPER	MEETING INFORMATION	
		NUMBER	DATE
ACAF/00/1	Matters Arising: An Up-Date on the Food Standards Agency	3 rd Meeting	2 nd Mar 2000
ACAF/00/2	Alleged Alternatives to Anti-Biotic Growth Promoters	3 rd Meeting	2 nd Mar 2000
ACAF/00/3	Risk Analysis and The Role of ACAF	3 rd Meeting	2 nd Mar 2000
ACAF/00/4	The Draft Feeding Stuffs Regulations 2000 Non - Feed Uses of Additives	3 rd Meeting	2 nd Mar 2000
ACAF/00/5	The Biosafety Protocol to the UN Convention on Biological Diversity	3 rd Meeting	2 nd Mar 2000
ACAF/00/6	Assessing the Animal Feed Aspects of Applications to Market new GMOS and GM material	3 rd Meeting	2 nd Mar 2000
ACAF/00/7	An Up-Date on the Progress of Feed Additive Dossiers	3 rd Meeting	2 nd Mar 2000
ACAF/00/8	Other EC Developments	3 rd Meeting	2 nd Mar 2000
ACAF/00/9	A Summary of the work of other Advisory Committees	3 rd Meeting	2 nd Mar 2000
ACAF/00/10	Open Meetings	3 rd Meeting	2 nd Mar 2000
ACAF/00/11	An Up-Date on the Progress of Feed Additive Dossiers	4 th Meeting	4 th May 2000
ACAF/00/12	Procedures for Marketing Herbal and Homeopathic Products and Functional Feeds for Human consumption	4 th Meeting	4 th May 2000
ACAF/00/13	A Summary of the work of other Advisory Committees	4 th Meeting	4 th May 2000
ACAF/00/14	The Launch of the Food Standards Agency	4 th Meeting	4 th May 2000
ACAF/00/15	Open Forum	4 th Meeting	4 th May 2000
ACAF/00/16	Draft Statement on Alleged Alternatives to Antibiotic Growth Promoters	4 th Meeting	4 th May 2000
ACAF/00/17	ACAF Consulting on Animal Feed Labelling	4 th Meeting	4 th May 2000
ACAF/00/18	Herbal and Homeopathic Additives	4 th Meeting	4 th May 2000
ACAF/00/19	Food Imports and their relation to Animal Feed Controls	4 th Meeting	4 th May 2000
ACAF/00/20	Other EC Developments	4 th Meeting	4 th May 2000
ACAF/00/21	Adventitious Contamination of Commercial Rapeseed with GM Seed	5 th Meeting	27 th Jun 2000
ACAF/00/22	Advice Concerning the Adventitious presence of Glyphosate tolerant oilseed rape in seed stock	5 th Meeting	27 th Jun 2000
ACAF/00/23	Analytical Detection Methods for Genetically Modified Organisms	5 th Meeting	27 th Jun 2000
ACAF/00/24	Imported Foods and their Control	6 th Meeting	4 th Oct 2000
ACAF/00/25	Results of a Project on the effects of Processing DNA	5 th Meeting	27 th Jun 2000
ACAF/00/26	The use of Sweet Lupins in Animal Feed	5 th Meeting	27 th Jun 2000

ACAF Annual Report 2000

ACAF/00/27	ACAF Branding	5 th Meeting	27 th Jun 2000
ACAF/00/28	An Up-Date of the progress of Feed Additive Dossiers	5 th Meeting	27 th Jun 2000
ACAF/00/29	Other EC Developments and Codex Task Force in Animal Feeding	5 th Meeting	27 th Jun 2000
ACAF/00/30	An Up-Date of the work of other Advisory Committees and the Food Standards Agency	5 th Meeting	27 th Jun 2000
NO. OF PAPER	NAME OF PAPER	MEETING INFORMATION	
		NUMBER	DATE
ACAF/00/31	Prescribing and Dispensing Veterinary medicinal Products	5 th Meeting	27 th Jun 2000
ACAF/00/32	The Precautionary Approach	5 th Meeting	27 th Jun 2000
ACAF/00/33	Research Projects Relating to Antibiotic Resistance	5 th Meeting	27 th Jun 2000
ACAF/00/34	Undesirable Substances	5 th Meeting	27 th Jun 2000
ACAF/00/35	Definitions Relating to Genetic Modification	5 th Meeting	27 th Jun 2000
ACAF/00/36	Open Forum	5 th Meeting	27 th Jun 2000
ACAF/00/37	Draft Report on ACAF's Review of Animal Feed Labelling	6 th Meeting	4 th Oct 2000
ACAF/00/38	Openness	6 th Meeting	4 th Oct 2000
ACAF/00/39	Outcome of the Joint ACRE / ACAF Meeting	6 th Meeting	4 th Oct 2000
ACAF/00/40	An Update on the progress on Feed Additive Dossiers	6 th Meeting	4 th Oct 2000
ACAF/00/41	Other EC Developments	6 th Meeting	4 th Oct 2000
ACAF/00/42	An update on the work of other Advisory Committees and the Food Standard Agency	6 th Meeting	4 th Oct 2000
ACAF/00/43	Pig Weaner Feed Label	6 th Meeting	4 th Oct 2000
ACAF/00/44	Consultation on a code of practice for Scientific Advisory Committees	6 th Meeting	4 th Oct 2000
ACAF/00/45	Review of risk procedures used by the government's advisory committees dealing with food safety	6 th Meeting	4 th Oct 2000
ACAF/00/46	Feeding studies involving GM herbicide-tolerant maize	6 th Meeting	4 th Oct 2000
ACAF/00/47	Copper toxicity in Cattle	6 th Meeting	4 th Oct 2000
ACAF/00/48	Sunday Times Article of 24 th September on Blood in Feed	6 th Meeting	4 th Oct 2000
ACAF/00/49	Draft response to a consultation on a code of practice for scientific advisory committees	7 th Meeting	30 th Nov 2000
ACAF/00/50	An update on the progress of feed Additive Dossiers	7 th Meeting	30 th Nov 2000
ACAF/00/51	ACAF Forward work programme	7 th Meeting	30 th Nov 2000
ACAF/00/52	An update of the work of other advisory committees and the food standards agency	7 th Meeting	30 th Nov 2000
ACAF/00/53	Draft Report on ACAF's review of Animal Feed Labelling	7 th Meeting	30 th Nov 2000
ACAF/00/54	Draft Report on the Food Standards Agency's	7 th Meeting	30 th Nov 2000

ACAF Annual Report 2000

	review of BSE Controls		
ACAF/00/55	Copper poisoning in Sheep	7 th Meeting	30 th Nov 2000
ACAF/00/56	Other EC Developments	7 th Meeting	30 th Nov 2000
ACAF/00/57	A Consultation on Best Practice on the Design of GM Crops	7 th Meeting	30 th Nov 2000
ACAF/00/58	Review of EC Animal waste Directive	7 th Meeting	30 th Nov 2000
ACAF/00/59	ACAF Annual Report	7 th Meeting	30 th Nov 2000

Register of Members' Interests

Annex III

MEMBER	PERSONAL		NON-PERSONAL	
	COMPANY/ORGANISATION	NATURE OF INTEREST	COMPANY/ORGANISATION	NATURE OF INTEREST
Prof P C Thomas (Chairman)	Artilus Ltd	Director and shareholder	None	
	Animal Medicines Training Regulatory Authority	Chairman		
Dr I Brown	Novartis (through their legal advisors, all non-GM issues)	Consultancy	None	None
Mrs G Davies	None	None	None	None
Mr J Cheetham	None	None	None	none
Dr A Cheeson	None	None	None	None
Mr P Foxcroft	Prosper de Mulder	Executive Director (non-shareholding)	None	None
Dr J Heritage	None	None	None	None
Mrs F Hodgson	Conservative Women's National Committee	Member	None	None
Mr R Moore	None	None	None	None
Mr A Peddie	National Farmers Union Scotland	Member	None	None
Dr H Raine	ABNA Ltd	Technical Director	None	None
	United Kingdom Agricultural Supply Trade Association (UKASTA)	Director	None	None

Register of Members' Interests

	PERSONAL		NON-PERSONAL	
MEMBER	COMPANY/ORGANISATION	NATURE OF INTREST	COMPANY/ORGANISATION	NATURE OF INTREST
Dr D Rice	Nutrition Services, Vistavet Ltd, Agri Research Ireland, Agra Food Consultants	Director and Shareholder	None	None
	Jordan Bros, R Hoey, Hutchinsons, R Craig & Son, R Clarke, Daleside Feeds, Corby Rock Mills.	Consultancy	None	None
	NIGTA, UKASTA, Greenpeace	Member	None	None
Dr M Stringer	None	None	A range of companies from the food and drink industry.	Director of Food Technology at Campden and Chorleywood Food Research Association. A portion of the RA's work is funded by the food and drink industry.

CODE OF PRACTICE FOR MEMBERS OF THE ADVISORY COMMITTEE ON ANIMAL FEEDINGSTUFFS

Public service values

1. Members of the Advisory Committee on Animal Feedingstuffs must at all times:

- observe the highest standards of **impartiality**, **integrity** and **objectivity** in relation to the advice they provide and the management of this Committee;
- be **accountable** through Ministers, to Parliament and the public for its activities and the standard of advice it provides; and
- in accordance with the Government policy on **openness**, comply fully with the Code of Practice on Access to Government Information.

2. The Ministers of the sponsoring departments (the Food Standards Agency, MAFF, Department of Agriculture for Northern Ireland, Scottish Executive and National Assembly for Wales) are answerable to their respective Parliaments for the policies and performance of this Committee, including the policy framework within which it operates.

Standards in Public Life

3. All Committee members must:

- follow the Seven Principles of Public Life set out by the Committee on Standards in Public Life (see Appendix I);
 - comply with this code, and ensure they understand their duties, rights and responsibilities, and that they are familiar with the function and role of the Advisory Committee on Animal Feedingstuffs and any relevant statements of Government policy. New Committee members should consider the need for relevant training;
 - not misuse the information gained in the course of their public service for personal gain or political purpose, nor seek to use the opportunity of public service to their private interests or those of connected persons, firms businesses or other organisations;
 - not misuse the influence gained in the course of their public service for personal gain, political purpose or promoting personal views; and
-

- not hold any paid or high-profile unpaid posts in a political party, and not engage in specific political activities on matters directly affecting the work of this Committee. When engaging in other political activities, Committee members should be conscious of their public role and exercise proper discretion. These restrictions do not apply to local Councillors.

Role of Committee members

4. Members of the Advisory Committee on Animal Feedingsuffs have collective responsibility for the operation of the Committee. They must:

- engage fully in collective consideration of the issues, taking account of all relevant factors, including any guidance issued by the sponsor departments or the responsible Ministers;
- ensure that the Code of Practice on Access to Government Information is adhered to;
- agree an Annual Report and, where appropriate, provide suitable opportunities to open up the work of the Committee to public scrutiny;
- not divulge any information that is provided to the committee in confidence;
- respond appropriately to complaints, if necessary with reference to the sponsor departments; and
- ensure that the Committee does not exceed its powers or functions.

5. Communication between the Committee and Ministers will generally be through the Chair, except where the Committee has agreed that an individual member should act on its behalf. Nevertheless, any Committee member has the right of access to Ministers on any matter which he or she believes raises important issues relating to his or her duties as a Committee member. In such cases the agreement of the rest of the Committee should normally be sought.

6. Individual members can normally be removed from office by Ministers if they fail to perform the duties required of them in line with the standards expected in public office.

Role of the Chair

7. The Chair has particular responsibility for providing effective leadership on the issues above. In addition the Chair is responsible for:

- ensuring that the Committee meets at appropriate intervals, and that the minutes of meetings and any reports to Ministers accurately record the decisions taken and, where appropriate, the views of individual members;
- representing the views of the Committee to the general public; and
- ensuring that new Committee members are briefed on appointment (and their training needs considered), and providing an assessment of their performance, on request, when members are considered for re-appointment to the Committee or for appointment to the Committee of some other public body.

Handling conflicts of interests

8. The purpose of these provisions is to avoid any danger of Committee members being influenced, or appearing to be influenced, by their private interests in the exercise of their public duties. All Committee members should therefore declare any personal or business interests which may, or may be *perceived* (by a reasonable member of the public) to influence their judgement. Members' interests will be recorded in a register of interests which should be kept up to date and open to the public. A guide to the types of interest which should be declared and how to declare them is at Appendix II.

Declaration of interests to the Secretariat

9. Members of the committee should inform the Secretariat in writing of their current personal and non-personal interests, when they are appointed, including the principal position(s) held. Only the name of the company and the nature of the interest is required, the amount of any salary etc. need not be disclosed. Members are asked to inform the Secretariat of any change in their personal interests at the time the change occurs. Members will also be invited to complete an annual declaration of interests form. Where members are uncertain as to whether an interest should be declared they should seek guidance from the Secretariat. **If members have interests that are not specified in Appendix II, but which they believe could be regarded as influencing their advice, they should declare them.** However, neither the members nor the Secretariat are under any obligation to seek out links of which they might *reasonably* not be aware. For example not being aware of all the interests of family members or not being aware of links between one company and another.

Declaration of interests and participation at meetings

10. Committee members are required to declare any direct commercial interests, or those of close family members, in matters under discussion at each meeting. Having fully explained the nature of their interests, the Chair may, having consulted with other members present, decide whether and to what extent the member should participate in the discussion and determination of the issue. If it

is decided that the member should leave the meeting, the Chair may first allow them to make a statement on the item under discussion. Where members are uncertain as to whether an interest should be declared they should seek guidance from the Chair.

Personal liability of Committee members

11. Legal proceedings by a third party against individual Committee members of advisory bodies are very exceptional. A Committee member may be personally liable if:

- he or she makes a fraudulent or negligent statement which results in a loss to a third party;
- he or she commits a breach of confidence under common law or a criminal offence under insider dealing legislation, by misusing information gained through their position.

However, the Government has indicated that individual members who have acted honestly and in good faith will not have to meet out of their own personal resources any personal civil liability which is incurred in the execution or purported execution of their Committee functions, save where the person has acted recklessly.

Openness and Confidentiality

12. The Government is committed to increasing the openness and transparency with which advisory committees and other public bodies operate. To further this aim, the agendas of ACAF meetings will be made available to the public and will be publicised by means of news releases. A news release will be issued after each meeting and minutes will also be available to the public. As a general rule, individual papers for information or discussion at meetings will also be available to the public on request. An annual report will also be published, summarising the Committee's activities and advice over the year.

13. However there will be some exceptions to this general principle of openness, for example:

- where individual papers contain commercially sensitive information such as product formulations/specifications, methods of manufacture, company evaluations and safety assessments, the general principle of the common law duty of confidentiality will apply, except in cases where the information was provided under legislation which deals specifically with disclosure and non-disclosure. Papers which are deemed to be confidential will be marked "For members' use only" by the Secretariat and their contents should not be disclosed outside of the Committee.
- draft papers or reports which are due to be published at a later date but are not yet in the public domain should not be disclosed outside of the Committee.

14. Questions or approaches from the media should normally be directed to either the Chair who will act as official ACAF spokesman or the Food Standards Agency press office. Although members are encouraged to promote the role of the Committee in general terms, if asked for views on subjects that have been or are being considered by ACAF, members should always give the line agreed by the Committee.

THE SEVEN PRINCIPLES OF PUBLIC LIFE

Selflessness

Holders of public office should take decisions solely in terms of the public interest. They should not do so in order to gain financial or other material benefits for themselves, their family, or their friends.

Integrity

Holders of public office should not place themselves under any financial or other obligation to outside individuals or organisations that might influence them in the performance of their official duties.

Objectivity

In carrying out public business, including making public appointments, awarding contracts, or recommending individuals for rewards and benefits, holders of public office should make choices on merit.

Accountability

Holders of public office are accountable for their decisions and actions to the public and must submit themselves to whatever scrutiny is appropriate to their office.

Openness

Holders of public office should be as open as possible about all the decisions and actions they take. They should give reasons for their decisions and restrict information only when the wider public interest clearly demands.

Honesty

Holders of public office have a duty to declare any private interests relating to their public duties and to take steps to resolve any conflicts arising in a way that protects the public interests.

Leadership

Holders of public office should promote and support these principles by leadership and example.

TYPES OF INTEREST AND THEIR NOTIFICATION

The following is intended as a guide to the kinds of interest that should be declared and indicates how they should be declared.

1. *Personal interests* - involve the member personally e.g.

<i>Type of interest</i>		<i>Notification</i>
Consultancies:	any consultancy, directorship, position in or work for the industry, or other relevant bodies, which attracts regular or occasional payments in cash or kind.	To be notified to the Secretariat in writing on appointment to the Committee and at the time of any change to these interests. To be confirmed annually on the declaration of interests form.
Fee- paid work:	any work commissioned by industry or other relevant bodies for which the member is paid in cash or kind.	
Shareholdings:	any shareholding or other beneficial interest in shares of industry. This does not include shareholdings through unit trusts.	
Membership affiliation:	or to clubs or organisations with interests relevant to the work of the Committee.	
		As above.
		As above.
		As above.

Definition of “industry”

For the purposes of the Advisory Committee on Animal Feedingstuffs, “industry” means:

- companies, partnerships or individuals who are involved in the production, manufacture, packaging, advertising, supply, sale or use of animal feedingstuffs. This definition includes those involved in the supply of animal feed raw materials and any other substance incorporated or otherwise used in the production of feedingstuffs. It also includes the users of animal feedingstuffs such as farmers;
- trade associations representing companies involved in such products;
- companies, partnerships or individuals who are directly concerned with research, development or marketing of an animal feedingstuff which is being considered by the Committee.

Definition of “other relevant bodies”

Organisations (not included in the definition of “industry”) with interests relevant to the work of the Committee. This could include charitable organisations and lobby groups.

2. Non-personal interests - involves payment which benefits a department for which a member is responsible, but is not received by the member personally e.g.

<i>Type of interest</i>		<i>Notification</i>	
		£1000 or more from a particular company in the previous twelve months	less than £1000 from a particular company in the previous twelve months
Fellowships:	the holding of a fellowship endowed by industry and other relevant bodies.	To be notified to the Secretariat in writing on appointment to the Committee. Any changes over the year should be declared on the annual declaration form and does not need to be notified at the time of change.	Does not need to be notified.
Support by industry and other relevant bodies*: e.g.	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • a grant from a company for the running of a unit or department for which the member is responsible. • the grant of a fellowship or other payment to sponsor a post or member of staff in the unit for which the member is responsible. • the commissioning of research or other work by, or advice from, staff who work in a unit for which the member is responsible. 	As above	As above
Trusteeships** :	any investment in industry held by a charity for which the member is a trustee.	As above	As above

* Members are under no obligation to seek out knowledge of work done for, or on behalf of, industry and other relevant bodies by departments/units for which they are responsible, if they would not normally expect to be informed. Where members are responsible for organisations which receive funds from a very large number of companies in the industry and from other relevant bodies, they can agree with the Secretariat a summary of non-personal interests rather than draw up a detailed portfolio.

** Where a member is a trustee of a charity with investments in the industry, they can agree with the Secretariat a general declaration to cover this interest rather than draw up a detailed portfolio.

2. *Non-personal* interests - involves payment which benefits a department for which a member is responsible, but is not received by the member personally e.g.

* Members are under no obligation to seek out knowledge of work done for, or on behalf of, industry and other relevant bodies by departments/units for which they are responsible, if they would not normally expect to be informed. Where members are responsible for organisations which receive funds from a very large number of companies in the industry and from other relevant bodies, they can agree with the Secretariat a summary of non-personal interests rather than draw up a detailed portfolio.

** Where a member is a trustee of a charity with investments in the industry, they can agree with the Secretariat a general declaration to cover this interest rather than draw up a detailed portfolio.