



**Further copies may be obtained from:**

Food Standards Agency  
PO Box 369  
Hayes  
Middlesex  
UB3 1UT

Telephone: 0845 606 0667

Fax: 0208 867 3225

Minicom: 0845 606 0678

E-mail: [foodstandards@eclogistics.co.uk](mailto:foodstandards@eclogistics.co.uk)

# Contents

	Page
<b>Foreword</b>	1
<b>About the Committee</b>	3
<b>Terms of Reference</b>	4
<b>Meet the Members</b>	5
<b>Summary of the Main Topics Considered by ACAF</b>	8
The Review of Animal Feed Labelling	8
BSE Related Issues	9
The Use of Fish Meal in Animal Feed	9
Draft EU Regulation on Animal By-products not Intended for Human Consumption	10
Proposed Exemptions to the EC Ban on Intra-species Recycling	10
Import of Meat and Other Animal Products	10
Openness	11
GM Issues	12
EC Proposals on GM Food and Feed and the Traceability and Labelling of GMOs	12
T25 Maize	13
GM Sugar Beet – Bovine Feeding Study	13
OECD Consensus Document	13
Other Issues	14
ACMSF – Second Report on Salmonella in Eggs	14
Update on Dioxins and PCBs in Animal Feed	14
Consultation on a Draft Code of Practice for Scientific Advisory Committees	14
Organic Feedingstuffs Regulation	14
Swill Feeding	15
Food Standards Agency Review of Scientific Advisory Committees	15
EC Proposals on Measures for the Prevention and Control of Zoonoses	15
On-farm Feeding Practice	16
Aflatoxin Levels in Wild Bird Foods	16

---

## **Annexes**

### **Annex I**

Abbreviations 17

### **Annex II**

Papers Considered by ACAF 19

### **Annex III**

Register of Members' Interests 21

### **Annex IV**

Review of Feed Labelling: Summary of Recommendations 23

### **Annex V**

T25: ACAF GM Sub-group Comments on Specific Points  
Raised by ACRE 25

### **Annex VI**

Code of Practice for ACAF Members 27

# Foreword

It has been an honour and a pleasure serving as the acting Chairman to the Advisory Committee on Animal Feedingstuffs. The previous Chairman, Professor Phil Thomas, led the Committee with great skill and a wealth of knowledge. I follow in the steps of an eminent animal nutritionist who always demonstrated balanced views and sound judgement.

Over the past year, the Committee has dealt with significant and challenging subject areas that potentially impact on the whole food chain and I have become increasingly aware of the interdependency of all species. Mankind's scientific ingenuity seems almost boundless, but all our great advances, especially in the field of animal nutrition, need to be properly evaluated to ensure we are fully aware of the consequences of the anticipated practical application of our knowledge. In this respect, none of the Government advisory committees work in isolation and ACAF regularly consults and collaborates with other expert committees and organisations to ensure that all aspects and dimensions are properly considered.

It has been the Government's intention to encourage expert advisory committees to work together on occasions and this approach is essential if we are to fully understand the holistic consequences of our decisions. Most recently, we worked closely with the Advisory Committee on Releases to the Environment (ACRE) on the evaluation of a genetically modified maize. This eventually led to an open hearing and allowed the views of other organisations and experts to be heard and questioned in a transparent and forthright fashion.

Transparency and consultation with stakeholders is an important part of our approach and ACAF held an Open Forum in July of last year. The object was to inform stakeholders about the work the committee had undertaken over the past year and to provide an opportunity for them to contribute ideas to our forward work plan. As a result of suggestions made at the Open Forum we are now undertaking a major review of on-farm feeding practice.

Spongiform encephalopathy related issues continue to be an important part of ACAF's work and we have looked at fishmeal, swill feeding and exemptions to the ban on intra-species recycling in this context. Our work has also included consideration of European Community proposals on GM food and feed and the traceability and labelling of GMOs. This is a complex and potentially confusing area, but stakeholders and the public need to be able to understand the terminology to allow properly informed choices to be made.

This year, ACAF intends to hold an open meeting on 24 September which will allow members of the public to observe the committee at work and how agenda items are debated and conclusions reached. This will be advertised in due course, but hopefully the following Annual Report will give a good indication of what we have achieved over the past twelve months.

This wide-ranging and detailed work programme could never have been completed without the thoughtful and knowledgeable efforts of all my fellow Committee members who have selflessly given a tremendous amount of their personal time. Finally, I would like to thank the ACAF Secretariat and especially Keith Millar, Bill Knock and Karen Dell. Their excellent preparation and briefing has been of invaluable help to the work of the Committee and has allowed us to complete our programme of tasks in a timely and efficient manner.

A handwritten signature in black ink, appearing to read 'I. Brown', with a long horizontal line extending to the right.

Dr. Ian Brown BSc(Agric) FRCP FFOM DDAM

Acting Chairman of ACAF

## 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 (GM) 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 of animal feed.

4. ACAF is a UK-wide advisory 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 its papers on its website at: [www.food.gov.uk/science/ouradvisors/animalfeedingstuffs](http://www.food.gov.uk/science/ouradvisors/animalfeedingstuffs).

## **Terms of Reference**

5. ACAF advises the Food Standards Agency, the Secretary of State for Environment, Food and Rural Affairs, 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 has an acting Chairman and 11 members from wide-ranging backgrounds including consumer affairs, farming, the 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 areas of expertise are listed below. Professor Phillip Thomas resigned from the Committee in May 2001 to engage more fully in other interests.

**Professor Phillip Thomas** (ex Chairman resigned 2 May 2001) 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** (acting Chairman) 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.

**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 cordon bleu cook involved in food, food journalism and broadcasting for over twenty years. She has written eight cookery books and is a regular broadcaster on radio and television, including the BBC television series, "Taste of Wales". Mrs Davies also publishes "The Red Book", the independent guide to good eating in 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 MAFF's Farm Animal Welfare Council during her eight years' membership.

**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 has also been elected as 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 and feed industry) is a qualified nutritionist with considerable experience of feed manufacturing and supply. She is Director of Food Assurance for ABNA Ltd. and is 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.

**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.

## **Summary of the Main Topics Considered by ACAF**

### **The Review of Animal Feed Labelling**

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

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

8. ACAF consulted widely on feed labelling, issuing a consultation paper on 26 January 2000 to 95 interested parties. A total of 46 responses were received. These views helped inform the Committee's debate. ACAF's report on Feed Labelling, issued on 27 June 2001, made 15 recommendations, 7 on ingredient listing and 8 on GM labelling (these are listed at Annex IV).

### **Ingredients Listing**

9. The Committee concluded that all feed ingredients, including additives, should be declared and listed in order of descending weight. Percentage declarations for each ingredient should be permitted under law but should be optional rather than mandatory. Where full percentage declarations were made as part of a company's customer information or labelling policy, they should be capable of verification.

10. During the review a proposal for a banded declaration of feed composition was agreed by the Council of Ministers as a basis for discussion with the European Parliament. Whilst this proposal went beyond the requirements as indicated by the ACAF consultation, the Committee concluded that it would provide extra information without compromising the precise formulation drawn up by the manufacturer. The Committee was content to support the banding proposal, provided that each ingredient continued to be indicated in descending order by weight of inclusion.

## **GM Labelling**

11. The Committee noted the Commission's ongoing debate about traceability and labelling of GMOs and derived products, and supported the principle of transparency to allow the ultimate consumer to make choices about foods produced using GM technology. However, it sounded a note of caution concerning the practical difficulties of assuring traceability and labelling of all animal feed materials.

12. ACAF concluded that EC rules being drawn up to cover labelling the absence of GM material in food should apply also to animal feed. It recommended that any use of the term "GM-free" (or "free from modified genetic material") should relate to total freedom of any linkage with any genetically modified organism, whether this has been used in the derivation of a vitamin or enzyme, or in any other way. There might nevertheless be a threshold of 1%, provided this degree of precision was possible.

13. The Committee considered the term "non-GM" as implying almost the same level of absence from genetic modification, certainly if judged by the ultimate consumer of food. It believed that the term was nevertheless valid when applied to a single material. For example, "non-GM soya, extracted, toasted" would be a legitimate description of derived material whose identity had been preserved from its harvesting. In the above situation, the Committee recommended that the ingredients of GM origin in a feed should be labelled in the ingredients lists by law, with the implication that those not so labelled were not of GM origin.

14. The Committee also recommended that the Food Standards Agency and enforcement authorities monitor the pronouncements of retailers and other companies about the absence of GM material in animal feed. This was with a view to ensuring that consumer choice was not prejudiced by misleading information, and could involve asking companies to justify their claims.

## **BSE Related Issues**

### **The Use of Fish Meal in Animal Feed**

15. ACAF was asked by the Food Standards Agency in January 2001 for information and advice on the nutritional and other benefits of including fish meal and oil in animal feed, set, with the cost of any controls, against any human and animal health risks. This review of the use of fish meal in animal and fish feed was finalised in May 2001. The Committee acknowledged that the feeding of fish meal to farmed animals would probably be regarded as unacceptable by many people. However, it concluded that the use of fish meal in feed did not in itself represent a risk to human or animal health.

Furthermore, having considered the controls in place in the UK, ACAF considered that there was no significant risk of contamination of fish meal with meat and bone meal. The Committee therefore recommended that the UK seek exemption from the proposed extension of the temporary EC ban on processed animal proteins to include fish meal. Recognising the welfare benefits of feeding fish meal to certain animals, ACAF urged that EC legislation ensuring the safe use of fish meal throughout the EU should be introduced in the longer term.

16. However, the EC ban on the feeding of fish meal to ruminants was extended indefinitely to Great Britain from 1 August 2001 because of the risk of contamination with meat and bone meal (MBM). At its eleventh meeting on 25 September 2001, ACAF confirmed its earlier advice that fish meal itself was safe to feed to livestock. It urged more progress on research into methods for detecting MBM in fish meal, as an effective detection method was the key to any future relaxation of the ban. The acting Chairman, Dr Ian Brown, wrote to the Parliamentary Secretary at DEFRA, Elliot Morley, on 26 October 2001 expressing these views and requesting that ACAF be informed of research results when they are available.

### **Draft EU Regulation on Animal By-products not Intended for Human Consumption**

17. The Committee discussed a MAFF (now DEFRA) consultation on a draft EU Regulation on Animal By-products not Intended for Human Consumption. ACAF re-iterated its support for the prohibition of swill feeding but cautioned against including low risk non-meat materials, such as biscuits, in the ban as their use in feedingstuffs provided nutritional and environmental benefits. Members also discussed possible controls over food waste.

### **Proposed Exemptions to the EC Ban on Intraspecies Recycling**

18. The Committee confirmed its advice that the feeding of own species material to animals should be prohibited where this represented a risk of transmitting disease and it also recognised the aesthetic and ethical objections to this practice. It went on to discuss four exemptions to the current EU-wide ban proposed for blood products, gelatin, hydrolysed proteins and dicalcium phosphate from animals. The Committee agreed to await the results of the Spongiform Encephalopathy Advisory Committee's (SEAC) risk assessments in this area.

### **Imports of Meat and Other Animal Products**

19. The Committee has been concerned about possible inconsistencies between the standards under which food is produced in the UK compared with those existing in other countries from which food is imported. In

particular, ACAF expressed concern about the implications of imports of meat and other animal products not having been produced under comparable feed regimes to those in the UK. The Committee wrote to the Chairman of the Food Standards Agency and organisations representing, or with an interest in, imports of meat and other animal products, during 2001 voicing its concerns.

20. The Committee contended that the control of animal feed was important in the UK and elsewhere in the EU, but it was equally important in feeding systems used by third countries exporting animal products to the UK and Europe. ACAF supported the statement in the Report of the Food Standards Agency's review of BSE Controls<sup>1</sup>, that imports should not carry a significantly greater risk than domestic produce.

21. The Committee considered that EC animal feedingstuffs legislation formed a useful basis on which those feeding livestock in third countries, for eventual export to the UK, should proceed. ACAF therefore believed the wider application of these EC standards in countries supplying meat and other animal products to the EC should be sought. This could be by broadening EU rules to such countries through discussions in international fora. These included the Codex Alimentarius Commission and the OIE (the World Organisation for Animal Health).

22. The Committee believed that, in the interim, companies that were involved in the merchandising of imported food should show due diligence in ensuring that the animal produce they import was subject to satisfactory, and ideally UK equivalent, standards where animal feed manufacturing and feeding regimes were concerned. An ACAF position paper on imports of meat and other animal products was placed on the Food Standards Agency website.

### **Openness**

23. ACAF is committed to a policy of openness and engagement with stakeholders. As part of this policy the Committee held an Open Forum at the Jarvis Piccadilly Hotel in Manchester on 5 July 2001. The event attracted a wide range of interests including consumer, environmental, farming and feed industry representation. The presentations and open discussion in the morning session centred primarily on the Committee's first Annual Report and its subsequent report on Animal Feed Labelling, including GM issues. The afternoon session, mainly in syndicate groups, covered a wide range of issues in respect of the Committee's future work plan.

---

<sup>1</sup> Review of BSE Controls (December 2000) published by Food Standards Agency – available from [www.bsereview.org.uk](http://www.bsereview.org.uk)

24. At its twelfth meeting on 5 December 2001, the Committee discussed ways of improving its communication with stakeholders and continuing its policy of openness. It agreed to hold an open meeting in 2002, which members of the public and other interested parties could attend. Members also agreed to implement a policy of occasional presentations, inviting organisations representative of sectors with an interest in feed issues, e.g. consumer, environmental, farming and the feed industry, to come and give their views to the Committee.

## **GM Issues**

### **EC Proposals on GM Food and Feed and the Traceability and Labelling of GMOs**

25. The Committee discussed two linked EC proposals on GM Food and Feed<sup>2</sup> and Traceability and Labelling of GMOs<sup>3</sup> at its eleventh meeting. It noted that the EC proposals were broadly in line with ACAF's own recommendations in its Report on Animal Feed Labelling. Much of the discussion focused on the proposal to link GM labelling to the use of GM technology rather than to the detectable presence of GM protein or DNA in the food or feed. The majority of members favoured feed being labelled as GM if any ingredient, enzyme or additive used in it was derived from GM technology, regardless of the presence or absence of GM protein or DNA.

26. Members agreed that it was impossible to guarantee that conventional crops were free from any GM contamination, but there was a feeling that any threshold or tolerance allowed should be as small as technically possible. The Committee concluded that there should be a threshold for adventitious contamination of up to 1%, but that this figure should be kept under review as detection methods improved. The Committee will consider further developments on these proposals at future meetings.

27. The Committee reserved its view on the role of the proposed European Food Safety Authority until further details of its working procedures became available.

---

<sup>2</sup> Proposal for a Regulation of the European Parliament and the Council concerning Traceability and Labelling of Genetically Modified Organisms and Traceability of Food and Feed Products Produced from Genetically Modified Organisms.

<sup>3</sup> Proposal for a Regulation of the European Parliament and the Council on Genetically Modified Food and Feed.

### **T25 Maize**

28. The Advisory Committee on Releases to the Environment (ACRE) reviewed written representations against the national listing of Chardon LL that relate to the T25 maize variety. It concluded that there were no new science or risk issues that impacted on the safety of T25 but, in May 2001, it asked for ACAF's advice specifically on the safety of this variety for use in animal feed. The original application made under Directive 90/220 was considered by ACAF's GM sub-group comprising Dr Ian Brown, Dr Andrew Chesson and Dr John Heritage.

29. The GM sub-group was critical of some aspects of the information provided in support of the animal feed safety, but on the basis of all of the available data, members saw nothing to indicate that T25 maize grain or its products posed any more risk to animals or humans than non-GM varieties if used in animal feed. However, the data was not sufficient to conclude that T25 silage was "substantially equivalent" to that of other maize varieties. It was considered unlikely that T25 silage was unsafe to feed to animals but its equivalence should be confirmed before it could be said with confidence that T25 silage was of a low risk. Details of ACAF's views and comments on T25 are set out in Annex V.

### **GM Sugar Beet – Bovine Feeding Study**

30. The Committee advised ACRE on an application from Monsanto to use GM sugar beet from existing farm-scale evaluations in a small-scale cattle feeding study. Members were content that the proposed feeding study would not represent a risk to human or animal health, but had some suggestions on how it could be made more robust.

### **Organisation for Economic Co-operation and Development (OECD) Consensus Document**

31. ACAF welcomed the draft structure for an OECD consensus document on the safety assessment of animal feed derived from GM plants<sup>4</sup>, presented at its tenth meeting on 6 July 2001. Members were informed that the OECD recognised that animal feed had had a low priority in the past, and so its Task Force on Novel Foods and Feeds had decided to produce a consensus document drawing together areas on GM feed where consensus existed, and highlighting areas that were still being questioned. The document concentrated on issues specific to the safety assessment of animal feed to avoid duplicating work being done on GM food assessments. The Committee was particularly interested in feeding studies on target species.

---

<sup>4</sup> Executive summary of outline and organisation of proposed contents for the OECD consensus document on the safety assessment of animal feedstuffs derived from genetically modified plants – ENV/JM/FOOD(2001)4

## Other Issues

### **Advisory Committee on the Microbiological Safety of Food (ACMSF) – Second Report on Salmonella in Eggs<sup>5</sup>**

32. Members gave their initial reactions to the animal feed aspects of the ACMSF's report at the ninth meeting on 4 May 2001. There was concern that the ACMSF report focused too much on feed manufacturers and overlooked the key area of integrated producers, i.e. poultry producers who manufactured their own feed. The need to monitor existing monitoring arrangements recommended at paragraph 6.58 of the report was questioned by some members. There was further consideration of the full report at later meetings, following its publication in May, and ACAF noted that recommendation 6.58 had been accepted by DEFRA.

### **Update on Dioxins and PCBs in Animal Feed**

33. At its ninth meeting, the Committee was given an outline of EC proposals for reducing the levels of dioxins and PCBs in animal feed and human food, which were at an early stage. ACAF was concerned that any dioxin and PCB limits in feed should be set to reflect the best scientific evidence concerning any animal or human health effects. In December 2001, it was informed that the Council of Ministers had agreed maximum permitted limits for dioxins in feed materials and manufactured feed.

### **Consultation on a Draft Code of Practice for Scientific Advisory Committees**

34. ACAF considered a revised draft Code of Practice for Scientific Advisory Committees at its ninth meeting. The Committee welcomed the draft as bringing together existing guidance but had nothing to add to its comments on the earlier draft of the Code. These points had mainly related to the issues of confidentiality and conflicts of interest.

### **Organic Feedingstuffs Regulation**

35. At its tenth and eleventh meetings, the Committee discussed European Commission proposals<sup>6</sup> relating to organic farming legislation with particular provisions for the livestock sector and the UK's response to these proposals. Members agreed with DEFRA's comments that organic feed labelling should be consistent with that for conventional feed, particularly in respect of ingredient listing. The Committee also endorsed the DEFRA view that the inspection regime proposed by the Commission was too onerous and that inspections would be better based on risk assessment. The Committee will be kept informed of further developments on this proposal.

---

<sup>5</sup> Advisory Committee on the Microbiological Safety of Food's Second Report on Salmonella in Eggs available from the Stationery Office (ISBN 0-11-322466-4)

<sup>6</sup> Draft Commission Regulation on labelling and inspection requirements and precautionary measures for animal feedingstuffs, compound animal feeds and animal feed materials and amending part B of Annex I Annex III to Council Regulation (EEC) No 2092/91 on organic production of agricultural products and indications referring thereto on agricultural products and foodstuffs.

### **Swill Feeding**

36. At its eighth meeting, the Committee considered an information paper outlining the provisions of the Animal By-Products Order 1999, which controlled the processing and disposal of meat and meat products which are not intended for human consumption. The paper concentrated especially on the definition and disposal of catering waste. The Committee was particularly interested in controls over the use of catering waste in light of speculation that the outbreaks of Foot and Mouth disease could have resulted from contaminated swill. The Committee agreed to take an active interest in this subject and asked to be updated on any progress by MAFF (now DEFRA) in determining the cause of the outbreak.

### **Food Standards Agency Review of Scientific Advisory Committees**

37. The Food Standards Agency Board undertook a review in 2001 of its relationship with the various expert committees that advise it on food matters. This was part of a wider look at how the Agency obtained scientific advice. The review included committee working practices, uncertainty factors, the role of consumer/public interest representatives and the relationship between committees and the Board. ACAF was kept informed of progress and fed its views into the review at a meeting of the Review Group with Chairs of the relevant committees on 27 September 2001. Areas of particular concern to the Committee included training for new committee members and fees for self-employed members. It was agreed that ACAF, with its wide ranging remit and broad based membership, was not solely a scientific committee, and it therefore should be allowed some flexibility in applying the recommendations of the Review Group. The report of the Review Group was published in March 2002.

### **EC Proposals on Measures for the Prevention and Control of Zoonoses**

38. At its twelfth meeting, the Committee discussed two linked European Commission proposals on measures for the monitoring and control of zoonoses<sup>7</sup> (i.e. diseases and infections which are transmitted naturally between vertebrate animals and man). Members broadly supported the measures but queried the proposed mandatory sampling of feedingstuffs by farmers. ACAF concluded that sampling of feed should take place at various points in the chain, not just on-farm, and that these points should be determined by risk analysis. The Committee will discuss further developments on these proposals at future meetings.

<sup>7</sup> Proposal for a Directive of the European Parliament and of the Council on the monitoring of zoonoses and zoonotic agents, amending Council Decision 90/424/EEC and repealing Council Directive 92/117/EEC – 2001/0176 (COD)

Proposal for a Directive of the European Parliament and of the Council on the control of salmonella and other food-borne zoonotic agents and amending Council Directives 64/432/EEC, 72/462/EEC and 90/539/EEC – 2001/0177 (COD)

### **On-farm Feeding Practice**

39. Following points made at its Open Forum in July 2001, the Committee agreed that a review of on-farm feeding practice should be a priority in its future work plan. The Committee decided at its twelfth meeting that the scope of its proposed review should cover all aspects of feeding on-farm, including on-farm mixing, liquid feeding systems and feed materials such as by-products from the food industry. It was agreed that this review should begin with a consultation, seeking information and views from interested parties on feeding practices and any associated risks. The ACAF review will continue throughout 2002 and include farm visits.

### **Aflatoxin Levels in Wild Bird Foods**

40. At its twelfth meeting, ACAF considered whether the maximum permitted levels for the contaminant aflatoxin B1 in animal feed were also appropriate for wild bird foods. Currently both animal feed and wild bird food are subject to the same legislation and maximum levels. It was agreed that more information was needed on the effects of this toxin on birds before the Committee could reach a considered decision. ACAF has written to interested parties seeking further views and information on this issue. This review will continue in 2002.

## Annex I: Abbreviations

<b>ACMSF</b>	Advisory Committee on the Microbiological Safety of Food
<b>ACNFP</b>	Advisory Committee on Novel Foods and Processes
<b>ACRE</b>	Advisory Committee on Releases to the Environment
<b>BSE</b>	Bovine Spongiform Encephalopathy
<b>DEFRA</b>	Department for Environment, Food and Rural Affairs
<b>DNA</b>	Deoxyribonucleic acid
<b>EC</b>	European Community
<b>EU</b>	European Union
<b>GM</b>	Genetically modified
<b>GMO</b>	Genetically modified organism
<b>MAFF</b>	Ministry of Agriculture, Fisheries and Food
<b>MBM</b>	Meat and bone meal
<b>NOAEL</b>	No Observed Adverse Effect Level
<b>OECD</b>	Organisation for Economic Co-operation and Development
<b>OIE</b>	The World Organisation for Animal Health
<b>PAT</b>	Phosphinothriline Acetyl Transferase
<b>PCBs</b>	Polychlorinated Biphenyls
<b>SEAC</b>	Spongiform Encephalopathy Advisory Committee
<b>UK</b>	United Kingdom



## Annex II: Papers Considered by ACAF in 2001

NO. OF PAPER	NAME OF PAPER	MEETING INFORMATION	
		NUMBER	DATE
ACAF/01/1	ACAF Annual Report	8th Meeting	28th Feb 2001
ACAF/01/2	An Update on the Work of other Advisory Committees and the Food Standards Agency	8th Meeting	28th Feb 2001
ACAF/01/3	Results of an Investigation into the Levels of Dioxins and Polychlorinated Biphenyls (PCBs) in Animal Feed Binders, Anti-caking Agents and Coagulants and Associated Feed Materials	8th Meeting	28th Feb 2001
ACAF/01/4	An Up-date on the Progress of Animal Feed Additive Dossiers	8th Meeting	28th Feb 2001
ACAF/01/5	Draft Report on ACAF's Review of Animal Feed Labelling	8th Meeting	28th Feb 2001
ACAF/01/6	The Use of Fishmeal in Animal Feed	8th Meeting	28th Feb 2001
ACAF/01/7	ACAF Open Forum	8th Meeting	28th Feb 2001
ACAF/01/8	Other EC Developments	8th Meeting	28th Feb 2001
ACAF/01/9	Code of Practice for the Prevention and Control of Salmonella on Pig Farms	8th Meeting	28th Feb 2001
ACAF/01/10	FVO Programme of Inspections 2001	8th Meeting	28th Feb 2001
ACAF/01/11	Food Standards Agency Review of Expert Committees	8th Meeting	28th Feb 2001
ACAF/01/12	Dioxins and PCBs in Fishmeal and Oil	8th Meeting	28th Feb 2001
ACAF/01/13	Feeding of Meat Products to Animals	8th Meeting	28th Feb 2001
ACAF/01/14	GM Sugar Beet – Proposed Bovine Feeding Study	8th Meeting	28th Feb 2001
ACAF/01/15	The Use of Fish Meal in Animal Feed	9th Meeting	4th May 2001
ACAF/01/16	The Use of Fish Meal in Animal Feed – Further Representations and Information	9th Meeting	4th May 2001
ACAF/01/17	ACMSF – Second Report on Salmonella in Eggs	9th Meeting	4th May 2001
ACAF/01/18	Second Round of Consultation on a Draft Code of Practice for Scientific Advisory Committees	9th Meeting	4th May 2001
ACAF/01/19	EC and Codex Developments	9th Meeting	4th May 2001
ACAF/01/20	An Update on the Work of Other Advisory Committees and the Food Standards Agency	9th Meeting	4th May 2001
ACAF/01/21	Codes of Practice for the Prevention and Control of Salmonella Contamination of Animal Feedingstuffs	9th Meeting	4th May 2001
ACAF/01/22	Food Standards Agency Poultry Target Strategy	9th Meeting	4th May 2001
ACAF/01/23	Open Forum	9th Meeting	4th May 2001
ACAF/01/24	An Update on Dioxins and PCBs in Animal Feed	9th Meeting	4th May 2001
ACAF/01/25	Draft EU Regulation on Animal By-products not Intended for Human Consumption	9th Meeting	4th May 2001
ACAF/01/26	ACMSF – Second Report on Salmonella in Eggs	10th Meeting	6th July 2001
ACAF/01/27	Organic Feedingstuffs Regulation	10th Meeting	6th July 2001

*Advisory Committee on Animal Feedingstuffs: Annual Report 2001*

NO. OF PAPER	NAME OF PAPER	MEETING INFORMATION	
		NUMBER	DATE
ACAF/01/28	An Update on Feed Additive Dossiers	10th Meeting	6th July 2001
ACAF/01/29	OECD Consensus Document on the Safety Assessment of GM Animal Feed	10th Meeting	6th July 2001
ACAF/01/30	Update of the Work of Other Advisory Committees and the Work of the FSA	10th Meeting	6th July 2001
ACAF/01/31	EC Developments	10th Meeting	6th July 2001
ACAF/01/32	Forward Work Plan	10th Meeting	6th July 2001
ACAF/01/33	Forward Work Plan	11th Meeting	25th Sep 2001
ACAF/01/34	EC Proposals on GM Food and Feed and the Traceability and Labelling of GMOs	11th Meeting	25th Sep 2001
ACAF/01/35	Proposed Exemptions to the EC Ban on Intra-species Recycling	11th Meeting	25th Sep 2001
ACAF/01/36	Proposed EC Legislation on Organic Feedingstuffs	11th Meeting	25th Sep 2001
ACAF/01/37	Food Standards Agency's Review of Scientific Advisory Committees	11th Meeting	25th Sep 2001
ACAF/01/38	The Use of Fish Meal in Animal Feed	11th Meeting	25th Sep 2001
ACAF/01/39	Imports of Meat and Other Animal Products	11th Meeting	25th Sep 2001
ACAF/01/40	Animal Feed Labelling	11th Meeting	25th Sep 2001
ACAF/01/41	EC Developments	11th Meeting	25th Sep 2001
ACAF/01/42	An Update on the Work of Other Advisory Committees and the Food Standards Agency	11th Meeting	25th Sep 2001
ACAF/01/43	Food Standards Agency Board Discussion on Animal Feeds and the Risks to Food Safety	12th Meeting	5th Dec 2001
ACAF/01/44	EC Proposals on Measures for the Monitoring and Control of Zoonoses	12th Meeting	5th Dec 2001
ACAF/01/45	On-farm Mixing of Livestock Feed	12th Meeting	5th Dec 2001
ACAF/01/46	ACAF Open Event in 2002	12th Meeting	5th Dec 2001
ACAF/01/47	Aflatoxins in Wild Bird Foods	12th Meeting	5th Dec 2001
ACAF/01/48	Position Paper on Imports of Meat and Other Animal Products	12th Meeting	5th Dec 2001
ACAF/01/49	An Update on the Work of Other Advisory Committees and the Food Standards Agency	12th Meeting	5th Dec 2001
ACAF/01/50	Update on the Food Standards Agency's Implementation of ACAF's Recommendations on Feed Labelling	12th Meeting	5th Dec 2001
ACAF/01/51	EC and Codex Developments	12th Meeting	5th Dec 2001
ACAF/01/52	The Food Standards Agency Review of Scientific Advisory Committees	12th Meeting	5th Dec 2001

## Annex III: Register of Members Interests

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	None
	Animal Medicines Training Regulatory Authority	Chairman		
Dr I Brown	None	None	None	None
Mrs G Davies	None	None	None	None
Mr J Cheetham	None	None	None	None
Dr A Chesson	Various scientific advisory committees	Member	Range of companies including some in the food sector on a non-profit basis (eg. support for studentships).	Head of Biological Chemistry at Rowett Research Institute (RRI). The RRI has a commercial subsidiary, Rowett Research Services, which undertakes work for profit for a range of companies including some in the food sector.
Mr P Foxcroft	Prosper de Mulder	Executive Director (non-shareholding)	None	None
Dr J Heritage	Ray A. Krok Foundation	Visiting Professorship in Pediatrics, East Virginia Medical School, USA	None	None
Mrs F Hodgson	Conservative Women's National Committee	Vice-Chairman	None	None
Mr R Moore	None	None	None	None
Mr A Peddie	National Farmers Union Scotland	Member	None	None
	Scotlean Pigs	Director	None	None
	Scotlean Pigs Feed Committee	Chairman	None	None
	Pig Disease Eradication Fund	Board Member	None	None

*Advisory Committee on Animal Feedingstuffs: Annual Report 2001*

MEMBER	PERSONAL		NON-PERSONAL	
	COMPANY/ ORGANISATION	NATURE OF INTEREST	COMPANY/ ORGANISATION	NATURE OF INTEREST
Dr H Raine	ABNA Ltd	Director of Food Assurance	None	None
	United Kingdom Agricultural Supply Trade Association (UKASTA)	Chairman & Director	None	None
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	European Food Safety Inspection Service	Director	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.
	Campden & Chorleywood Food Research Association Technology Ltd	Director		

# Annex IV: Feed Labelling Review – Summary of Recommendations

## Ingredient Listing

- 1) The Committee recommends that suppliers to feed manufacturers of ingredients which contain more than one material must provide the necessary details of composition, also in descending order by weight (para.17).
- 2) The Committee recommends that the Food Standards Agency reviews whether farmers and others could be misled by terms used in the description of feed materials (para. 18).
- 3) The Committee concludes that the proposal to declare the inclusion of each feed ingredient by percentage as a mandatory requirement is unnecessary. It recommends that the proposal should be rejected (para 19).
- 4) The Committee recommends the removal of the restriction, imposed under the European Community's Directive 79/373/EEC, on manufacturers providing percentage information on feed ingredients if they wish (para. 21).
- 5) The Committee fully endorses the Commission's proposal to remove the option to declare feed ingredients by category (para. 21).
- 6) The Committee recommends that the EC should be asked to amend the relevant Directives to require all additives to be indicated in the statutory statement on a compound feed. This should be either by category of additive, or by specific mention of the individual additive when used for its specific effect on the animal or resulting animal products. The EC should explore in particular the consistent declaration of all added trace elements, indicating clearly the total levels in the feed (para. 24).
- 7) The Committee supports declaring each ingredient of a compound feed according to one of the five bands, provided that each ingredient continues to be shown in descending order by weight of inclusion (para. 26).

## GM Labelling

- 8) The Committee recommends that, with the existing EC legislative concepts, a system of labelling for compound (manufactured) feeds comparable to that for food, insofar as ingredients must be identified as "genetically modified" where appropriate (para. 41).

9) The Committee recommends that companies releasing new GMOs onto the market should be required to supply details of the analytical techniques, including their sensitivity, which could be used in the detection of the relevant genetic event (para. 50).

10) The Committee believes that the methods of detection and the setting of valid but limited tolerances should be an important part to any future EC regime on GM animal feeds and that the European Standardisation body (CEN) might have a part to play in this (para. 50).

11) In relation to the European Commission's debate on the traceability and labelling of GMOs and derived products, the Committee supports the principle of transparency to allow the ultimate consumer to make choices about foods produced using GM technology. However, it cautions that the Government, in its negotiating role, should take account of the practical difficulties of assuring traceability and labelling of all animal feed materials (para. 60).

12) The Committee recommends that the Government maintains its pressure to have the draft EC proposals covering the authorisation and labelling of animal feeds that contain GMOs or material derived from GMOs published and consulted upon without further delay (para. 61).

13) The Committee recommends that any use of the term "GM-free" (or "free from modified genetic material") should relate to total freedom of any linkage with any genetically modified organism, whether this has been used in the derivation of a vitamin or enzyme, or in any other way. There might nevertheless be a threshold of 1%, provided this degree of precision is possible (para. 62 ).

14) The Committee recommends that the ingredients of GM origin in a feed should be labelled in the ingredients lists by law, with the implication that those not so labelled are not of GM origin (para. 65).

15) The Committee recommends that the Food Standards Agency and the enforcement authorities monitor the pronouncements of retailers and other companies about the absence of GM material in animal feed. This is with a view to ensuring that consumer choice is not prejudiced by misleading information, and could involve asking companies to justify their claims (para. 66).

# **Annex V: T25 – ACAF GM Sub-group Comments on Specific Points Raised by ACRE**

## **Compositional and nutritional analysis – maize grain**

Compositional analysis of maize grain showed no important differences from other maize varieties in essential nutrients and anti-nutrients. Although insufficient information was provided on the development of the T25 hybrids to judge whether the comparators were appropriately chosen there are some statistically significant differences between the GM and non-GM varieties tested. However, these were not considered to pose a risk because all values fell within the accepted range for other commercial maize varieties.

## **Tests with broiler chicks**

The basis of this test is a comparison of growth rates between matched groups of birds fed either a conventional control feed or one containing the GM ingredient. In the absence of any significant difference in growth rate over the normal lifetime of a broiler (38-40 days), during which time the weight of the bird will have increased nearly 50-fold, it can be concluded that the test material is nutritionally equivalent to the control material.

The sensitivity of this test is set by the proximate analysis used to match control and test diets and, above a certain minimum, not by the number of birds used. In the case of T25, the growth response to nutrients delivered by the diet containing the transformed maize was the same as the response to the control diet. Consequently, it is possible from this experiment to conclude that no toxic elements able to modify the growth rate were introduced by the transformation event, and that the T25 maize was nutritionally equivalent and thus substantially equivalent to other maize varieties. However, it should be noted that the growth experiment would have been conducted with the use of maize kernel and does not provide data on the safety of maize silage.

## **Tests with rats**

The ACAF GM sub-group was critical of some features of the rat study. In particular, the origin of the PAT protein fed was not clear and the use of activity units and weight of PAT protein did not allow the level of exposure to be determined accurately. However, the data available did imply that the dose of PAT given to the rats is some 5000-fold greater than normal exposure. If this is the case (and it should be confirmed) then the study can be treated as a test of acute toxicity, and would allow a No Observed Adverse Effect Level (NOAEL) to be set.

### **Gastric juice tests**

The ACAF GM sub-group was generally satisfied with these studies, concluding that it was highly likely that PAT protein is degraded rapidly in the digestive tract and the possible stability of PAT was not therefore a concern.

### **T25 silage**

Considerable amounts of the vegetative parts of the maize plant are fed to ruminants, either as fresh grazing material or, more usually, conserved in the form of silage. The compositional data provided on silage from T25 were limited and came from only one growing season. Although there was nothing in this data to suggest that such silage differed from silage prepared from other maize plants, the GM sub-group considered that substantial equivalence should be confirmed before it may be concluded with confidence that T25 silage poses a negligible risk to animals. In their view this could be by the provision of sufficient additional analytical data to allow substantial equivalence to be concluded for silage as well as for the kernel. Alternatively data from a feeding study made with dairy cattle could be used to demonstrate the wholesomeness of the silage and a lack of any effect on milk production and composition. Milk production data is usually taken as a relatively sensitive indicator of body condition. If data in the form of a feeding study is provided, then a cross-over design is recommended in comparison with rations containing a conventional hybrid.

### **Molecular analysis of the construct**

The GM sub-group was aware of the molecular characterization of T25 and the recent refinements to that structure being assessed by the European regulatory authorities. The sub-group did not consider this to be a safety issue. Nevertheless, ACAF is awaiting the view of ACNFP on this matter in respect to food safety.

# Annex VI: Code of Practice for ACAF Members

## 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, DEFRA, 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 Feedingstuffs 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. **Failure to declare interests could lead to dismissal from the Committee.**

### **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. 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 on the website. 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.

## **Appendix I**

### **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.

## Appendix II

### 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.

Type of interest		Notification
<b>Consultancies:</b>	any consultancy, directorship, position in or work for the industry, or other relevant bodies, which attracts regular or occasional payments in cash or kind.	Membership or affiliation: to clubs or organisations with interests relevant to the work of the Committee.
<b>Fee- paid work:</b>	any work commissioned by industry or other relevant bodies for which the member is paid in cash or kind.	As above.
<b>Shareholdings:</b>	any shareholding or other beneficial interest in shares of industry. This does not include shareholdings through unit trusts.	As above.
<b>Membership or affiliation:</b>	to clubs or organisations with interests relevant to the work of the Committee.	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.

Type of interest	Notification	
	<b>£1000 or more from a particular company in the previous twelve months</b>	<b>less than £1000 from a particular company in the previous twelve months</b>
<b>Fellowships:</b> 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.
<b>Support by industry and other relevant bodies*:</b> e.g. <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• a grant from a company for the running of a unit or department for which the member is responsible.</li> <li>• 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.</li> <li>• the commissioning of research or other work by, or advice from, staff who work in a unit for which the member is responsible.</li> </ul>	As above	As above
<b>Trusteeships**:</b> 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.



