

British Frozen Food Federation



TL update 63

Sept 2012

All reasonable care is taken in the preparation of this newsletter, but no liability is accepted for any loss or damage caused to any person, company or organisation relying on any statement or omission in the contents

Highlights in this edition:

EC Launches a crusade against Food waste and a possible enquiry into Competition in the Food Supply Chain, as well as proposals to replace Tariff Suspensions with Autonomous Tariff Quotas for certain fishery products.

Contents

Acrylamide Advice Updated	2	Three new Salt Pledges for Foodservice Sector	18
Peanut Advice and Free Allergy Training from FSA	2	Salt Reduction Technologies – BRC / FDF Report	19
EC Consultation on Fruit and Vegetable Rules	3	EFRA Select Committee Report on DSM Moratorium	20
Trade Partnership on US and EU Organic Products	3	Freezing Controls for Parasites in Fishery Products	21
EFSA Opinion on Mineral Oil Hydrocarbons in Food	4	Food Hygiene (amendment) Regulations 2012	21
FSA Report on Food Risks on a Budget	5	Defra publishes the Green Food Report	22
WRAP Household Food waste Survey	5	WRAP Zero Waste Roadmap for Events	23
FDE Vision for Food Sustainability to 2030	6	RASFF Annual Report 2011	23
Sow Stall Compliance across EU Announced	6	European Waste Management Progress Report	24
EFSA Report of Schmallenberg Virus	7	Antimicrobial Resistance – National Strategies?	25
EUFIC Research on Shoppers Nutrition Knowledge	8	Scottish Annual Report on Shellfish Biotoxins	26
BIS and NAO Business Perceptions Survey	9	Country of Origin Labels One Year On	27
EU Organic Logo Regulation comes into force	10	Impact of Nutrition labelling on Obesity	27
EFSA Recommends Update of Poultry Inspection	10	Botulism Outbreak Report Published	27
FSA Updates E. coli guidance	11	The Power of Packaging – BBG Report	28
EFSA Publishes Risk Communication Guidelines	12	AHVLA Consults on Charging for Services	28
EU Chief Science Officer Backs GMO Cultivation	13	ATQ Proposals for Certain Fishery Products	29
EC Launch Crusade on Food Waste	13	Competitive Imbalances in the Food Supply Chain	30
Scotland to set up Independent FSA	15	IGD Report on Portion Size Research	31
Front of Pack Nutrition Research	16	Useful Links to Other Information Sources	31
Approved Article 13 General Health Claims published	17		

Note: TinyURLs™ are used in this newsletter to replace some long web addresses.

For more about TinyURL™ ('Making long URLs usable'), visit <http://tinyurl.com/>. TinyURL was created as a free service to make posting long URLs easier, and is a trademark of Gilby Productions

FoodDrinkEurope Acrylamide Advice

FoodDrinkEurope the Trade body representing Food businesses across Europe has published five revised pamphlets setting out the latest tools to help Europe's food and drink sectors mitigate Acrylamide formation in certain food products.

The pamphlets cover five food sectors:

- Biscuits;
- Crackers and crisp breads;
- Bread products;
- Breakfast cereals; and
- Fried potato products (such as potato crisps and French fries).

The pamphlets are readily available in 23 European languages on the FoodDrinkEurope <http://tinyurl.com/bn8sqht>

Principle updates to the pamphlets include:

- The introduction of information on the 'ALARA' principle ('as low as reasonably achievable') with regard to levels of Acrylamide in foods;
- An improved structure and more user-friendly pamphlets;
- The introduction of new mitigation tools which have proven successful on an industrial scale The organisation's food sector members have organised training sessions for industry and especially for SMEs.

The pamphlets, which were first published in 2007, are targeted at small and medium-sized food and drink companies. This is really important given that European SMEs often do not have the resources to access the latest findings in research, and as such, the pamphlets help to meet SMEs' needs by allowing small operators to tap into the latest research findings and tools on how to reduce Acrylamide formation in their products and adapt their own production systems to help mitigate the effects of Acrylamide as much as possible.

Speaking following publication of the updated pamphlets, Jesús Serafín Pérez, President of FoodDrinkEurope, said: "FoodDrinkEurope plays a key role in supporting members to help reduce Acrylamide in manufacturing. The organisation originally formed an expert group in 2003 to share research and disseminate information on how best to mitigate Acrylamide levels in food. The group first created the "acrylamide toolbox", a resource that provides operators with the latest findings and best practice needed to reduce Acrylamide in foods. This Toolbox was last updated in September 2011 and can be found through this link: <http://tinyurl.com/d4p33r3>

Peanut Allergy Advice and Training for Caterers

On 4 May 2012 the FSA wrote to enforcement parties concerning the information provided by caterers on peanut allergy labelling. The letter can be accessed through this link: <http://tinyurl.com/bnw5y9t>

The letter followed two recent deaths resulting from allergic reactions to peanuts after consumption of meals from takeaway establishments. The FSA has written to health professionals to request that they strongly advise peanut allergic patients always to ask about the ingredients even if they have previously eaten such a dish elsewhere or even in the same restaurant.

In the letter the FSA has note that due to the rising cost of ground almond powder, there is an increasing use of ground mixed nut blends, which often contain peanuts. The FSA is encouraging enforcement officers, as part of any routine inspection, to check whether businesses are aware of any possible changes in the composition of the ingredients they are buying and whether the necessary checks and processes are in place so that the information they supply on the allergen content of the meals they serve is accurate.

Also of interest, the FSA has provided a free online training module <http://tinyurl.com/ct2stxa> . It is aimed at enforcement, but, which can help food business operators in both factory and catering with their allergen management and labelling.

European Commission Consults on the Future of Fruit and Veg Rules

The European Commission has launched a public consultation on the future of the EU regime for fruit and vegetables. The responses will feed into a Commission report on the regime in May 2013. The report will look at the 2007 reform, with proposals for further changes if necessary, which would apply from 2014. The Commission has published a consultation paper and now invites comments and suggestions from consumers, producers, distributors, and official authorities. The deadline for contributions is 9 September 2012.

The paper raises a range of issues, including:

- Strengthening competitiveness, in terms of productivity and capacity of finding new outlets for products;
- Improving resilience of the sector, in terms of ability of producers to adapt and react to unexpected developments and market crises;
- Ensuring Production sustainability and resource efficiency;
- Increasing the share of value added for producers in the fruit and vegetables supply chain, for instance by improving the bargaining power of producers;
- Raising consumption of fruit and vegetables (fresh and processed);
- Controlling EU budget expenditure;
- Simplifying management of the EU regime in the fruit and vegetables sector.

The 2013 report will also look at the extent to which the sector has responded since 2007, for example participation in producer organisations.

EU Commissioner for Agriculture & Rural Development Dacian Cioloş stated: "While the ongoing CAP reform debate refers to the horizontal policy framework covering all farmers across the EU, we must not neglect our sectoral rules as these provide additional rules and mechanisms for a particular sector which complement the horizontal framework. And this report is a good opportunity to consider where improvements can be made."

For more information, and to participate in the consultation, see the following site: <http://tinyurl.com/dy8b2oj>

Trade Partnership for EU and US Organic Products

From June 1, 2012, organic products certified as organic in the European Union may be sold as organic in the USA without additional certification requirements – and vice versa - as a historic partnership on organic trade signed between the world's two largest organic-producers on 15 February 2012 enters into force. This "equivalency arrangement" will facilitate trade on a growing market and support jobs and businesses on a global scale. The organic sector in both regions is valued at roughly €40 billion combined, and rising every year.

The bilateral cooperation arrangement on organic equivalence was finalised between the European Commission, the US Department of Agriculture and the US Trade Representative. Formal letters creating the partnership were signed on 15 February 2012 in Nuremberg, Germany, by Dacian Ciolos, European Commissioner for Agriculture and Rural Development; Kathleen Merrigan, U.S. Agriculture Deputy Secretary; and Ambassador Isi Siddiqui, U.S. Trade Representative Chief Agricultural Negotiator. The letters can be found the link below.

During the last two years both sides have thoroughly reviewed each other's organic regulations and control programs. A series of technical discussions and on-the-spot missions in US and EU were part of the review. At the end of this review process, EU and US have concluded to mutually recognize each other's standard and control systems as equivalent. The Commission therefore adopted a regulation to list the United States as an "equivalent third country". At the same time the US Secretary of Agriculture transmitted its determination that the EU rules are equivalent to the National Organic Program.

"This agreement comes with a double added value. On the one hand, organic farmers and food producers will benefit from easier access, with less bureaucracy and less costs, to both the U.S. and the EU markets, strengthening the competitiveness of this sector. In addition, it improves transparency on organic standards, and enhances consumer confidence and recognition of our organic food and products," EU Commissioner for Agriculture & Rural Development Dacian Cioloş stated.

It is hoped that the new partnership will eliminate significant barriers, especially for small and medium-sized organic producers, who previously had to obtain separate certifications to two standards in order to trade products on both sides of the Atlantic. For more information, see <http://tinyurl.com/cgfbtxr>

The European Commission have also recently published a report on the application of Regulation (EC) No. 834/2007 of the Council on organic production and labelling of organic products. That report can be accessed through this link: <http://tinyurl.com/cnzsfpl>

EFSA Scientific Opinion on Mineral Oil Hydrocarbons (MOH)

Following a request from the European Commission, the European Food Safety Authority (EFSA) Panel on Contaminants in the Food Chain (CONTAM Panel) was asked to deliver a scientific opinion on mineral oil hydrocarbons (MOH) in Food. Mineral oil hydrocarbons occur in food both as a result of contamination and from various intentional uses in food production. In order to assess the need for possible regulatory measures as regards MOH in food, EFSA was requested to assess the risks related to their occurrence in food. More specifically, the opinion should evaluate whether new toxicity data are available and whether the current acceptable daily intakes (ADIs) are still applicable, explore whether certain classes (or subclasses) of MOH are more relevant due to their toxicity or to differences in the way they are metabolised by the human body, and identify the different background sources, other than from adulteration or misuse, of MOH occurrence in food. In addition a dietary exposure assessment was requested for the general population and for specific subgroups of the population (e.g. infants, children and people following specific diets); by taking into account the background occurrence of MOH in food. Included in the request was also to advise on MOH and food classes to be included if monitoring were to be set up for their presence in food.

Mineral oil hydrocarbons (MOH), or mineral oil products, considered in this opinion are hydrocarbons containing 10 to about 50 carbon atoms. MOH consist of three major classes of compounds: paraffin's (comprising linear and branched alkanes), naphthenic (comprising alkyl-substituted cyclo-alkanes), and aromatics (including polyaromatic hydrocarbons (PAHs).

The CONTAM Panel identified numerous sources for the occurrence of MOH in food. Among food contact materials, sources are food packaging materials made from recycled paper and board, printing inks applied to paper and board, MOH used as additives in the manufacture of plastics, e.g. internal lubricants in polystyrene, polyolefins, adhesives used in food packaging, wax paper and board, jute or sisal bags with mineral batching oil, lubricants for can manufacture and wax coating directly applied to food. Food additives, processing aids and other uses contribute to MOSH levels, together with release agents for bakery ware and sugar products, and oils for surface treatment of foods, such as rice and confectionery. MOH are used in feeds as binders for minor additives added as powder. Paraffinic waxes are authorised for use in e.g. chewing gum and coating of certain fruits, and in pesticide formulations. Further uses of MOH are as defoamers and as anti-dusting agents for cereal grains. Environmental contamination sources are lubricating oil from engines without a catalyst (mainly diesel), unburned fuel oil, debris from tyres and road bitumen. Further sources are machinery used for harvesting (diesel oil, lubricating oil) and food processing, e.g. lubricating oils in pumps, syringe type dosing and other industrial installations. In addition, solvents used as cleaning agents, may contaminate food products.

MOSH are present at different levels in nearly all foods. High values were found for 'Bread and rolls' and "Grains for human consumption – mainly Rice" as well as ' non-chocolate Confectionery, 'Vegetable oil', 'Fish products' (canned fish), and 'Oilseeds' The food groups 'Bread and rolls' and 'Grains for human consumption' showed some high values that could be due to the use of MOSH as release agents or spraying agents, respectively.

For the full report go to: <http://tinyurl.com/cvjfo36>

The Federation of Bakers has strongly refuted that mineral oil release agents are used anywhere in the UK. For the full article go to: <http://tinyurl.com/d67hh8a>
Bond Pearce, an Associate Member of BFFF has written a useful one page summary of the finding which can be found here <http://tinyurl.com/cm993ad>.

FSA Recommends Households Freeze Leftovers to Safely Reduce Waste

New research published today by the Food Standards Agency shows that some people are taking more risks with food safety as they try to save money and make their meals go further. The research showed that most of those questioned (97%) believed the cost of their typical shopping basket has gone up significantly in the last three years, with half of these (47%) trying to make better use of leftover food. However, some people are ignoring 'use by' dates more than they used to, while others are keeping leftovers for longer than the recommended limit of two days in the fridge.

The beginning of June saw the FSA's Food Safety Week, and the FSA is reminding people not to take risks with food safety, even as budgets are squeezed.

Bob Martin, suggests: 'Using leftover food is a good way of making our meals go further. However, unless we're careful, there's a chance we can risk food poisoning by not storing or handling them properly. During Food Safety Week we are encouraging people to view their fridge as their friend, and make the most of leftovers while staying safe.'

The FSA's advice on leftovers is:

- If you are going to store leftovers in the fridge, cool them as quickly as possible, ideally within 90 minutes. Cover them, get them in the fridge and then eat them within two days.
- Make sure your fridge is operating at the correct temperature – it should be below 5°C.
- You can also freeze your leftovers, but cool them first to minimise temperature fluctuation in your freezer. They can be safely stored in the freezer almost indefinitely, but the quality will deteriorate gradually with time, so it's best to eat them within three months.
- Make sure you defrost frozen leftovers properly before using them. If you're going to cook them straightaway use a microwave. If you don't have a microwave, defrost them in the fridge overnight.
- Eat leftovers within 24 hours of defrosting and do not refreeze again. The only exception to this is if you are defrosting raw food, such as meat or poultry, which can be refrozen once it has been cooked.
- Cook leftovers until steaming hot throughout.

We Say – the safest way to reduce food waste and still enjoy nutritious and high quality food is to BUY FROZEN.

The research can be found on the FSA website at: <http://tinyurl.com/brp2fl9>

WRAP Retail Survey 2012 on Household food waste

An increase in the availability of smaller pack sizes, clearer date labelling and improved storage and freezing guidance are all helping consumers to reduce the £12 billion worth of food they waste, says new research from WRAP.

"Today's report points to some great progress that's been made," said WRAP Design & Waste Prevention Director Richard Swannell. "The steps retailers and manufacturers have been taking have made an important contribution towards helping reduce the amount of food we buy and waste."

The 2012 survey looked at 12,000 products across 20 different categories where food waste has traditionally been high, including bread, bacon, chicken, apples, carrots, potatoes, bagged salad, rice, pasta, yoghurt, eggs, cheese and milk. "We know from our research into food waste that the amount we're throwing away every year has fallen – but we're still wasting enough food to fill Wembley Stadium nine times. There is still more we could all do to reduce waste – and save money in these hard-pressed times - and the food industry can help us," said Richard.

The survey's findings included:

- Increased availability of smaller packs of potatoes, milk, cooking sauces, bread and bread rolls (e.g. the number of four-packs of rolls rose from 18% to 32%, and packs of two, from 5% to 13%)
- Nearly half of all packs (47%) are now re-closable. (e.g. the number of re-sealable cheese packs has increased to 35% (from 26%) and 73% of rice packs are now re-closable compared to 44%. 96% of all products surveyed carried storage guidance, helping consumers keep food fresher for longer
- New labelling being rolled out by retailers including Marks & Spencer, Sainsbury's, and now Waitrose, makes it clear consumers don't have to freeze goods on the day of purchase, but can do so any time up to the 'use by' date
- The use of 'display until' dates has fallen dramatically with less than a third of surveyed products carrying this. No 'sell by' dates were found on any of the products. Retailers are also finding new ways to make the important 'best before' and 'use by' dates easier to read – e.g. Sainsbury's prints dates on milk and fresh fruit and vegetables in a larger type size. These steps reduce confusion and help consumers know when to eat foods by
- More than 95% of all cheddar cheese packs surveyed now carry a 'best before' date (in 2009, 25% had a 'use by' date)
- 94% of chilled orange juice packs surveyed in 2011 carried a 'use by' date, but following discussions with WRAP, innocent has adopted a 'best before' date on all its smoothies and juices. British Soft Drinks Association and British Retail Consortium members have now agreed that all heat treated (pasteurised) fruit juices should carry a 'best before' date. This tells consumers they can use the product quite safely after the date on the label - important when around £220 million of cheese and £80 million of juices are thrown away each year because they are 'not used in time'

"We're continuing to work closely with the food industry through the Courtauld Commitment, trade associations, the Food Standards Agency and Governments, to provide clear recommendations, and the evidence they need to implement further changes," said Richard. "There are areas where we think retailers could continue to make improvements – for example, by removing 'display until' dates, increasing consistency of 'use by' or 'best before' date use and ensuring that consumers are given as long as possible to make use of the food (shelf-life). Increasing the proportion of products that carry freezing and defrosting guidance and the use of 'freeze before date mark' label could also make a big difference."

We say reduce waste and buy your food at its nutritious best – don't buy fresh and freeze it – buy it frozen!

Full survey can be found here: www.wrap.org.uk/retailsurvey

FoodDrinkEurope Vision for Sustainability Towards 2030

FoodDrinkEurope has recently published a report on its vision for Environmental Sustainability in Food Production to 2030.

The report which can be accessed through this link: <http://tinyurl.com/d7fjxuq> focuses on three main areas: sustainable sourcing, resource efficiency along the food chain and sustainable consumption and production.

On Sustainable sourcing initiatives such as the sustainable sourcing of palm oil and cocoa are encouraged. The report also asks the food industry to reduce greenhouse gas emissions and use more energy efficient, lower carbon technologies such as combined heat and power.

The report also covers the use of alternative refrigerants to HFC's and recognizes businesses including Unilever and MacDonalds for exploring sustainable alternatives. Water is a further resource that the report focuses on and encourages the use of "life cycle analysis" to realistically assess the water footprint of food and drink products. The use of Biofuels and making environmental information more easily available to consumers is also covered

Update on Sow Stalls

New Pig housing requirements were introduced by directive 2001/88 amending directive 91/630. They include, among others, the requirements for mandatory group housing for pregnant sows and gilts; permanent access to materials for rooting, and; new minimum requirement for flooring surfaces. The new requirements should be implemented by member states as from 1st January 2013. There have been deep concerns that many EU Member States would not be compliant by the deadline. However, progress made in other EU Member States mean that UK pig farmers will be competing in a more level playing field after it was announced that 18 other EU Member States will be fully compliant with the ban on sow stalls by the time it comes in to force on 1 January 2013.

Sow stalls have been illegal in Britain since 1999 but they will not be outlawed in the rest of the EU until the beginning of next year. The UK has been pressing the European Commission to ensure that the ban is enforced across the EU, ensuring a fairer environment for British pig farmers to compete in. Welcoming the news, which, was announced by the Commission at a meeting of EU Agriculture Ministers in Luxembourg on 19 June.

Britain's Food and Farming Minister Jim Paice said:

"I promised to push the Commission to be as robust as possible and I welcome the approach they and other Member States are taking to improve and enforce welfare standards across Europe. It's a pity that not everyone is going to be compliant by the deadline but from the perspective of the UK pig industry, all of our main competitors will be."

Denmark, Germany, the Netherlands, and Belgium have all informed the Commission that their industries will be fully compliant with the ban by the end of this year, while Poland expects 94 per cent of its industry to have done away with sow stalls by the time the ban comes in to force.

The European Commission updated the EU Agriculture Council on the predicted state of implementation by 31 December 2012. 18 EU Member States are expected to be compliant by 1 January 2013 as follows: Belgium, Bulgaria, Czech Republic, Denmark, Estonia, Germany, Hungary, Ireland, Latvia, Lithuania, Luxembourg, the Netherlands, Malta, Romania, Slovakia, Spain, Sweden, and the UK.

95 per cent of Austrian holdings are expected to be compliant by the deadline, 93 per cent of Finnish holdings, 93 per cent of Greek holdings, 94 per cent of Polish holdings, and 95 per cent of Slovenian holdings.

A briefing presented by the EU Commission to Ministers is available here: <http://tinyurl.com/dyual2y>

EFSA Report on the Schmallenberg Virus

This recently published scientific report provides an overall assessment of the impact of the infection on animal health, animal production and animal welfare of the "Schmallenberg" virus (SBV) first detected in Germany and named after the place it was first identified. In Europe, 3745 holdings have been reported with SBV, confirmed by laboratory testing across several Member States in mid May 2012. EFSA reviewed the epidemiological reports noting that SBV has been detected in cattle, sheep, goats and a bison. SBV antibodies have also been detected in deer. EFSA also confirms that new studies support the initial assessment undertaken by the European Center for Disease Control and Prevention, that it is very unlikely that SBV poses a risk to humans. In terms of transmission routes, recent entomological investigations identified SBV in samples of biting midges of the *Culicoides obsoletus* group. Currently there is no evidence of any other route of transmission other than transplacental.

In regions with SBV confirmed holdings, assuming a high prevalence of infection and post infection immunity, impact in the 2012-2013 calving and lambing season should be low. However, assuming SBV survived the winter of 2011, the models suggest that in unaffected regions with suitable temperatures for within herd transmission by vectors and high density of susceptible species (cattle and sheep) SBV infection is likely to spread. EFSA puts forward a number of recommendations to fill the knowledge gaps, these include but are not limited to: continuing serological investigations in affected regions and regions neighbouring affected areas, within herd and animal level impact investigation, monitoring the vector population (midges), setting SBV host vector transmission parameters, investigating other routes of transmission, host susceptibility, virulence and vulnerable period during gestation. The possible origins of the virus should be investigated as more information becomes available on the virus characteristics and infection epidemiology. Furthermore as the impact on animal welfare and animal production was not assessed due to lack of data. It is necessary to investigate the impact of SBV infection on return to service, milk yield and rates of dystocia.

For the full EFSA report go to: <http://tinyurl.com/czvc34u>

EUFIC Research on Nutrition Knowledge of Food Shoppers

Researchers from Aarhus University, Denmark, and the European Food Information Council (EUFIC) have analysed socio-demographic and attitudinal determinants of nutrition knowledge of food shoppers from six European countries: UK, Sweden, France, Germany, Poland, and Hungary. Main findings include social grade, country of residence and age to directly influence participants; nutrition knowledge. Furthermore, older people, women and respondents of a higher socio-economic status showed a more active interest in healthy eating. The use of expert sources (physicians, dieticians and health associations) had only a small effect on how low or high the measured nutrition knowledge of participants in this study was.

In a total of six European countries, respondents were recruited in major supermarkets in three regions of each country. Food shoppers were directly interviewed about the product choices they made at the point of purchase and invited to complete a questionnaire at home, which measured nutrition knowledge and understanding of nutrition labels. In total, there were 11,781 in-store interviews and 5,967 completed questionnaires.

Overall, the UK had the highest nutrition knowledge, which was expected due to its number of nutrition education campaigns. One exception was knowledge about the sugar content of foods, which was higher in Germany, Hungary, and Poland. The results from the at-home questionnaire showed that 97% knew that health experts recommend eating a lot of fruits and vegetables, but only 15% thought that a high amount of starchy foods (e.g. bread, pasta, rice, potatoes) should be eaten. Most shoppers knew that foods and drinks high in fat, sugar, and salt should be consumed less often, but many thought these should be avoided all together.

UK respondents were the most knowledgeable about calorie content of selected foods and drinks. When asked how many calories were in a stated portion size, they answered 50% of the questions right while other countries answered 30-40% right. For the answers that were incorrect, respondents mainly overestimated the number of calories including those in beer and wine. In comparison, shoppers scored higher when asked about fat, sugar, and salt content of certain foods and drinks, although there was confusion about types of fat. The UK, Germany, and Hungary scored the highest followed by Sweden and France, and then Poland. In particular, France had the lowest knowledge about trans fats and Sweden and France knew least about which foods were high in salt. On the other hand, Hungary and Poland had a high knowledge of sugar. Most believed that health experts recommend consuming less salt or sodium, but 14% indicated that they didn't understand the meaning of sodium.

Social grade, country, and age seem to directly influence nutrition knowledge. Attitude towards healthy eating and use of expert sources had a small effect on nutrition knowledge. Older people, women, and those of higher social grades had a higher active interest in healthy eating, also known as monitoring. Monitoring was lowest for people with high Body Mass Index (BMI) and who had children at home. In contrast, blunting, the extent to which people actively ignore nutrition issues, was highest for men and lower social grades. Expert sources of nutrition were used most by women, higher social grades, and people with higher BMIs but used least by older people. Though people with high BMIs reported using expert recommendations, they did not necessarily choose healthy foods. France had the highest use of expert sources.

In conclusion, consumers are aware of nutrition recommendations but less familiar with technicalities such as types of fat or the link between salt and sodium. Higher social grades have higher nutrition knowledge likely because of higher education. In general, all shoppers had trouble determining the calorie content of certain foods. Each country differed in its strengths and weaknesses - differences which are likely due to different cultures and foods as well as the number and type of nutrition-related public health campaigns. In each country there are also different industry and retail initiatives that can affect nutrition knowledge.

In light of recent developments in the food labelling landscape in the EU, these findings may help both policy makers and the food industry to better understand consumers and as such improve information and potential education of the public. Limiting factors of the research published include the self-selection of food shoppers (versus those that consume food bought by someone else) as well as the voluntary participation in completing the at-home surveys, which could be due to a naturally higher interest in nutrition and health issues.

The full report can be purchased through this link: <http://tinyurl.com/btxfvv9>

NAO Business Perceptions Survey

Fewer businesses felt that the overall level of regulation in the UK was an obstacle to their business success compared with three years ago, a survey conducted on behalf of the National Audit Office, the Better Regulation Executive and the Better Regulation Delivery Office has found.

Nevertheless, there is still work to be done in demonstrating to businesses that government understands their needs and is able to consult meaningfully with business on regulation and enforcement more widely.

The survey, the fifth commissioned by the National Audit Office, and the Department for Business, Innovation and Skills (BIS) found that there was no difference between responses in 2010 and 2012 in respect of the proportion of businesses stating that there is “too much” regulation. Half of all businesses still reported that there is too much regulation – significantly higher than the first time this question was asked in 2009.

There is evidence that the regulatory burden is decreasing, with the proportion of businesses agreeing that the level of regulation in the UK is an obstacle to their businesses’ success falling from 62 per cent in 2009 to 55 per cent in 2012. Within these figures, the proportion that strongly agreed regulation is an obstacle decreased from 35 per cent to 24 per cent. However, small businesses were more likely on average to agree strongly that the overall level of regulation is an obstacle (31 per cent).

Business perception of the government’s approach to regulation, as measured by agreement levels in response to a series of statements, is less positive in 2012 than it was in 2010. One-third (33 per cent) of businesses felt that, overall, complying with regulation had become more time consuming over the last 12 months. Small businesses (50 per cent) and medium-sized businesses (44 per cent) were more likely to report an increasing burden than were large businesses. The report also states that more than half of businesses expect the burden to stay the same or decrease.

Business and Enterprise Minister Mark Prisk said:

“Reducing the burden of regulation for business is at the heart of the Coalition Government’s ambition to make the UK one of best places to start and grow a business. This report suggests that businesses can now see progress, but there is clearly more to do. We are committed to this process.”

Key findings from the report:

- 41% of businesses say that the balance of regulation is about right
- 55% of businesses feel that the level of regulation is an obstacle to their business, but this is a reduction from a peak of 62% in 2009
- 46% of businesses think the burden of regulation will stay the same over the next 12 months
- One-in-nine businesses have made contact with a body or organisation to make a suggestion on improving the regulatory regime.

The report supports the Primary Authority scheme, as a means for businesses to get advice, and also the extension of the scheme to include trade associations, which is part of the Enterprise and Regulatory Reform Bill. Apart from the reforms in the recently published Enterprise and Regulatory Reform Bill, the Red Tape Challenge and Focus on Enforcement campaigns are also beginning to have an impact, as they continue to give businesses the opportunity to say exactly how they feel about regulations and how they are enforced.

For more information go to the BIS website <http://tinyurl.com/d26mswn> or to download the full report follow the link to the National Audit Office website <http://tinyurl.com/ct4uclt>

Organic Logo Regulation comes into Force

The two-year transition period for the organic food sector to comply with new EU labelling rules has reached its end. As from 1 July 2012, the EU organic logo is obligatory on all pre-packaged organic food products produced in EU Member States which meet the necessary standards. The logo stays optional for non-packed and imported organic products. Other private, regional or national logos continue to be allowed to appear alongside the EU label.

The "Euro-leaf" EU organic logo was introduced on 1 July 2010, but in order to help operators adapt to the new rules, and to avoid waste of existing packaging, a 2-year transition period was allowed before it was compulsory on all products. The visual field of the logo should also show the code number of the control body and the place of farming of the agricultural raw materials. A recent EuroBarometer report on "European Attitude towards Food Security, Food Quality and the Countryside", to be published shortly, includes information on the EU organic logo and provides the encouraging indication that, since its introduction in July 2010, the logo has already gained recognition among a quarter (24%) of EU citizens.

The idea of fostering the organic farming sector by introducing a compulsory EU organic logo was backed by Member States in 2007. EU consumption of organic products has seen a steady rise in recent years and now accounts for roughly 2% of the EU market. Production has also increased considerably in the past decade – with roughly 5% of EU agricultural area and more than 2% of farms (more than 200 000 farms) now certified as organic.

In February, the EU also signed an organic equivalence agreement with the USA, which will reduce bureaucracy for organic producers in the EU and the USA (IP/12/138). In May, the Commission presented a report on the existing organic farming regulation 834/2007, aimed at opening an Inter-institutional debate with all stakeholders and thus creating the opportunity to explore new ways in which to further improve the EU organic policy framework.

For further information, photos and other material on the EU organic logo, please go to: <http://tinyurl.com/5ta8va>

EFSA Reviews Risks in Poultry Meat Inspection

In May 2010 the European Commission asked EFSA to deliver a series of scientific opinions and reports on public health hazards – biological and chemical – to be addressed by meat inspection. The Authority was also requested to provide a summary of comparable data on specific food-borne hazards in the Member States that would enable risk managers to adapt meat inspection procedures to national requirements. EFSA's experts were asked to consider the implications for animal health and welfare of any proposed changes to current inspection practices.

The most recently published opinion is with regard to poultry meat inspection; it suggests that traditional poultry meat inspection may not suffice to fully address the most relevant biological hazards to public health: *Campylobacter* spp., *Salmonella* spp. and ESBL/AmpC gene-carrying bacteria. EFSA's opinion, which provides a scientific basis for the modernisation of poultry meat inspection, proposes that risk-based interventions coupled with the improved use of information shared between farms and abattoirs (known as Food Chain Information) would be more effective. Such information would also play an important role in identifying animal health and welfare issues. Finally, the Authority concludes that chemical substances found in poultry meat are unlikely to pose an immediate or acute health threat to consumers.

In addition to identifying and ranking the main risks for public health from the current poultry meat inspection system, EFSA was asked to: assess the strengths and weaknesses of the current inspection methodology; recommend methods that take into account the hazards not addressed by current meat inspection; and recommend adaptations of methods and/or frequency of inspections based on the hazard rankings and harmonised epidemiological indicators.

The food-borne hazards *Campylobacter*, *Salmonella*, and bacteria carrying extended spectrum β -lactamase (ESBL)/AmpC genes, (due to their prevalence and impact on human health) were identified as priority targets in the inspection of poultry meat at abattoir level. EFSA confirms that current inspection methods do not enable the detection of these hazards and, more broadly, do not differentiate food safety concerns from considerations related to meat quality, prevention of animal diseases or occupational hazards.

The main recommendations regarding biological hazards are to:

- Introduce a comprehensive food safety assurance system, including clear targets for what should be achieved in poultry carcasses and, where appropriate, with respect to a particular hazard for poultry flocks;
- Utilise a variety of control options available for the main hazards, at both farm and abattoir level, in order to meet these targets (some of these measures have been described and assessed in earlier EFSA opinions);
- Collect and analyse Food Chain Information at farm and abattoir levels to enable risk categorisation of flocks and classification of abattoirs according to their capacity to reduce carcass contamination.

EFSA notes that meat inspection is a valuable tool for surveillance and monitoring of specific animal health and welfare conditions. If as according to EFSA's recommendation, visual *post-mortem* inspection is removed, other approaches should be applied to compensate for the associated loss of information with regard to animal disease and welfare conditions. Extended use of Food Chain Information has the potential to compensate for some (but not all) of the information on animal health and welfare that would be lost if visual *post-mortem* inspection is removed.

Dioxins, dioxin-like polychlorinated biphenyls, the antibiotics chloramphenicol, nitrofurans and nitroimidazoles were identified as chemical substances of high potential concern in poultry meat, based on pre-defined criteria. However, EFSA concluded that chemical substances in poultry meat are unlikely to pose an immediate or acute health risk for consumers. As the risk of occurrence of chemical substances for individual farms and poultry species varies due to the diversity of poultry farming in the EU, the experts recommend that:

- sampling of poultry carcasses should be based on the available Food Chain Information, including results from feed controls and the frequency of sampling for farms should be adjusted accordingly;
- control programmes for residues and contaminants should include new and emerging substances and should be regularly updated.

EFSA also proposes harmonised epidemiological indicators for the food-borne biological hazards highlighted by the opinion. The indicators would be particularly useful in the context of the proposed comprehensive food safety assurance system, enabling the categorisation of farms, flocks and abattoirs according to risk as well as the setting of targets for final chilled carcasses.

For the Scientific Opinion on the public health hazards to be covered by inspection of meat (poultry) go to: <http://tinyurl.com/bvnsc7y>

For the EFSA news summary go to <http://tinyurl.com/cfyoumy>

For the Technical specifications on harmonised epidemiological indicators for biological hazards to be covered by meat inspection of poultry <http://tinyurl.com/cs63t2p>

The Food Standards Agency has welcomed the European Food Safety Authority's scientific opinion on poultry meat inspection. The FSA has argued for some time that the current system of official meat controls does not address the most relevant meat-borne pathogens of today, which are microbiological and cannot be detected by the naked eye. In 2009 the Agency began a review of meat inspection, aimed at improving public health protection while delivering a more risk-based, effective and proportionate system for official controls on meat.

EFSA's views, and the views of European member states, stakeholders and international trade partners, will be considered by the Commission before proposing changes to the current regulations. This is a lengthy process and there will be no immediate changes to the current inspection regime.

Four sets of opinions and reports remain outstanding, they cover will cover bovine animals over six weeks old; bovine animals under six weeks old; domestic sheep and goats; farmed game and domestic solipeds, these are expected in 2013. The EFSA opinion on pig inspection was published in October 2011.

Version 3 of FSA E. coli Q&A Published

The Food Standards Agency has published the third edition of the Q&A on its guidance document E.coli O157: control of cross-contamination. The guidance is to clarify the steps for food businesses to take to control the risk of food becoming contaminated by E.coli O157 and what businesses should be doing to protect their customers. The new version of the Q&A addresses a number of issues that have arisen since the publication of the second edition in November 2011.

Among the issues addressed are:

- an update on the extension of Remedial Action Notices as an enforcement power
- advice on the use of the same food preparation sink for raw and ready-to-eat foods
- clarification of when worktops are considered to be non-food contact surfaces
- whether a change of use from raw to ready-to-eat foods is possible for 'complex equipment'
- advice on the cleaning of probes

The Agency has also published two 'decision trees'. These provide examples of actions that could be taken by enforcement officers when considering the hand washing and disinfectant controls put in place by food businesses to prevent E.coli cross-contamination. The guidance can also be used by local authority food safety officers when inspecting businesses in their area.

The Agency have committed to continue to respond to all enquiries about the guidance, and has set up a dedicated mailbox at Controllingecoli@foodstandards.gsi.gov.uk to receive any enquiries.

The guidance was originally developed, following a public consultation and Professor Hugh Pennington's report in response to the serious outbreaks of E.coli O157 in Scotland in 1996 and Wales in 2005, which were attributed to cross-contamination arising from poor handling of food.

Some of the key measures highlighted in the guidance to control E.coli are:

- Identification of separate work areas, surfaces and equipment for raw and ready-to-eat food.
- Use of separate complex equipment, such as vacuum-packing machines, slicers, and mincers for raw and ready-to-eat food.
- Hand washing should be carried out using a recognised technique. Anti-bacterial gels must not be used instead of thorough hand washing.
- Disinfectants and sanitisers must meet officially recognised standards and should be used as instructed by the manufacturer.

The full guidance can be found at the link below, along with a factsheet for businesses, which, summarises the guidance. The guidance will be updated as new issues emerge. <http://tinyurl.com/bskhcvz>

EFSA Launches Risk Communication Guidelines

As part of a joint initiative with national food safety agencies, EFSA is publishing new risk communications guidelines: "When Food Is Cooking Up a Storm – Proven Recipes for Risk Communications". A recognised need for practical guidance coupled with a desire from all participating countries to share learning and experience to strengthen risk communications within the European food safety system has resulted in these guidelines.

EFSA's Director of Communications, Anne-Laure Gassin explains "Communicators in public health authorities across Europe often face the daunting task of assessing what to communicate, when and how best to do so. The aim of these guidelines is to provide a framework to assist communications practitioners with this type of decision-making, looking at the different communications approaches in a wide variety of situations that can occur when assessing and communicating on food-related risks and concerns in Europe."

Communicators from EFSA, national food safety authorities across Europe as well as the European Commission work together in the Authority's Advisory Forum Communications Working Group (AFCWG). The guidelines were initiated as part of an overall aim to share best practices in risk communications. A key aim of the AFCWG is to promote co-operation and coherence in risk communications – one of the key priorities laid down in EFSA's Communications Strategy - particularly between risk assessors in Member States and EFSA.

For the Full report go to: <http://tinyurl.com/cnd374b>

EU Chief Science Officer Backs GMO Cultivation

Genetically modified organisms (GMOs) are no riskier than their conventionally farmed equivalents, the European Commission's Chief Scientific Advisor Anne Glover has been quoted as saying, and she is calling for countries impeding GMO use to be put to proof.

"There is no substantiated case of any adverse impact on human health, animal health or environmental health, so that's pretty robust evidence, and I would be confident in saying that there is no more risk in eating GMO food than eating conventionally farmed food," she said, stating that the precautionary principle no longer applies as a result.

Glover said she was not promoting GMOs, and added that "eating food is risky", explaining: "Most of us forget that most plants are toxic, and it's only because we cook them, or the quantity that we eat them in, that makes them suitable."

She maintains that scientific evidence needed to play a stronger role in policymaking, firing a warning shot at countries that have banned GMOs. "I think we could really get somewhere in Europe if when evidence is used partially, there were an obligation on people to say why they have rejected evidence," she said. GMOs and other scientific advances must be explored in order to head off the increasing scarcity of energy and other resources and competition for land use, Glover suggested. "If we are using land to produce biofuels, we are not producing food, and that that means we have to intensify food production," she said.

Glover, a former professor of biology at the University of Aberdeen, served as chief scientific advisor for Scotland before from 2006-2011. She joined the Commission on 1 January. Glover said that discomfort around the subject of GM crops in the 1980s and 1990s was "a generation ago, we've moved on and the challenges are completely different".

She said that the precautionary principle was appropriate when applied properly, but added: "We should not ... somehow tie our hands behind our back in such a way that we will be so precautionary that we will wait for everyone else to use our knowledge before we use it. That would be my worry, because knowledge is an international currency, and we are amongst the slowest in taking advantage of the knowledge we create, and that cannot be right."

For the full interview go to: <http://tinyurl.com/dyy246e>

The European Commission proposed allowing national cultivation bans for GMOs in July 2010, in a bid to break a deadlock in EU GM crop approvals which has seen few varieties approved for cultivation in more than 12 years. The proposal, however, has been subject to bitter divisions in the Council since then, with recent attempts by the Danish presidency to find a compromise agreement making little headway.

To date, seven EU countries have introduced national "safeguard" bans on growing Monsanto's MON 810 insect-resistant maize: France, Germany, Austria, Greece, Hungary, Luxembourg and Bulgaria. In January, German biotech firm BASF Plant Science announced that it was moving its plant biotech research activities from Germany to the United States and would cease all work to develop GM crops specifically for the EU market.

European Commission Crusade against Food Waste

The European Commission wants to help consumers cut food waste by making 'best before' and 'use by' dates clearer on the packaging. But measures to green up our diets will not stop here, with policymakers' attention turning to the entire food chain.

With almost 80 million European citizens living beneath the poverty line and 16 million depending on food aid, the European Parliament has launched a crusade against food waste: <http://tinyurl.com/d6zqebh> The European Parliament wants to cut food waste in half, warning that fresh and packaged foods tossed out every day pose a threat to Europe's environment and efforts to reduce global poverty.

The European Commission estimates that up to 140 million tonnes of food and plant rubbish are produced each year in the EU, amounting to 300 kg per person – two thirds of which is edible.

Up to 50% of edible and healthy food is wasted in EU households, supermarkets, restaurants and along the food supply chain each year, amounting to 140 million tonnes or 300kg per person per year.

In a resolution adopted in January, the European Parliament called on the European Commission to halve food waste by 2025, by adopting a comprehensive range of measures, including encouraging consumers in restaurants to take home the food they don't eat and pack them in a "doggy bag" and the potential for tax exemptions to encourage supermarkets to organise donations to food charities instead of discarding it. The adopted text can be found through this link: <http://tinyurl.com/bwsmyhz>

The Parliament's calls have found a favorable echo with the European Commission who are looking at clearer labelling rules for consumers. Chantal Bruetschy, head of unit for innovation and sustainability at the Commission's health and consumer department (DG Sanco), said clearer labels would avoid edible food from being dumped, "without compromising food safety". Speaking at a workshop on food waste, she said many consumers throw away food because they feel it is no longer safe to eat. Labelling is often misinterpreted due to the lack of understanding on the distinction between the 'best before' date (quality criteria) and the 'use by' date (safety issue), and that the Commission would clarify this in close cooperation with member states.

Bruetschy cautioned, however, about re-writing EU food labelling laws altogether, saying there is "no need to re-open the legislation on 'food information for consumers'," only adopted last year.

EU action on greening the food sector won't stop at waste and should soon be extended to address the entire supply chain – from farm to fork. According to the European Commission, the food and drink sector contributes to some 23% of global resource use, 18% of greenhouse gas emissions and 31% of acidifying emissions.

In September last year, the EU executive presented its roadmap to a resource efficient Europe, setting out a 2050 vision for a leaner economy that consumes fewer natural resources. It identified the food chain as one of the areas where further action is needed to reach the EU's broader sustainability goals. Find the roadmap through this link: <http://tinyurl.com/bsww3qk>

Two forums have also been set up that include national authorities, (FSA and DEFRA), large businesses (Unilever, Nestle) and industry representatives (FoodDrinkEurope): The High Level Forum for Better Functioning of Food Supply Chain and the European Food Sustainable Consumption and Production Round Table. Their work will feed into the planned Commission Communication on Sustainable Food currently timetabled for adoption in 2013.

The key causes of food waste are seen as overrunning production and production of defects in manufacturing; stock inefficiencies and marketing strategies such as 2-for-1 deals in retail; lack of consumer awareness, shopping planning and consumer date label confusion; lack of variable portion sizes in catering; inadequate storage throughout the supply chain and poor packaging design.

The Commission has also produced its top ten tips for reducing food-waste <http://tinyurl.com/6p5msfp> in which it advises consumers to:

- Buy smartly & plan weekly meals. To make a shopping list and not to shop when hungry, also to buy loose fruits and vegetables to control quantity.
- Check the use-by and best-before dates. Saying that the best-before label shows the date until when the product retains its quality but is still safe to consume after that date.
- Store food properly or in the fridge at 1-5 degrees C°.
- Use stock rotation to bring older items in cupboards and fridge to the front
- Serve small portions.
- Use leftovers the day after, or freeze for another occasion.
- Compost green food-waste.

The Food Standards Agency picked up many of these topics in its own June Food Safety week – launching its love your fridge campaign <http://tinyurl.com/cctksvd> alongside WRAP's Love Food Hate Waste Initiative <http://tinyurl.com/cscj72y>

What all these initiatives fail to do is recognise the role that frozen food can play in reducing waste and overcoming most of the causative issues such as durability, portion control the ability to take advantage of "offers". The best tip of all – Buy Frozen!

Scottish Ministers Agree an Independent Food Standards Agency

Following the UK Government's decision in 2010 to move responsibility for nutrition and food labelling in England from the Food Standards Agency to the Department of Health and the Department of Environment, Food and Rural Affairs; the Scottish Government commissioned the Scudamore Review. Ministers asked Professor Jim Scudamore to lead an independent review to assess the feasibility of establishing a stand-alone Scottish Food Standards Agency including a Scottish meat inspection delivery body, maintaining the Food Standard Agency (FSA)'s existing statutory objective to protect consumers.

Professor Scudamore and the Panel took written and oral evidence from 40 stakeholders and met seven times, before the publication of the final report in April this year

The Panel recommended that:

- Food safety should not be divorced from nutrition and labelling. Advice on food safety, nutrition and labelling should be independent, evidence based, consumer focused and transparent.
- Advice on food safety, nutrition and labelling should be provided by an organisation, which should remain at arms length from Central Government.
- Both an administratively enhanced Scottish FSA and stand-alone Scottish FSA are viable options and both options could serve Scottish long-term interests, the majority of the Panel felt that the stand-alone option would offer the best outcome for Scotland's long-term interests.

Scottish Ministers as a result have now agreed to create a new Scottish body for food safety, food standards, nutrition, food labelling and meat inspection. In announcing the news Scottish Public Health Minister Michael Matheson said:

"The changes in England removed significant capacity in the FSA's nutrition and labelling functions for Scotland and needed to be addressed. I thank Professor Jim Scudamore and his colleagues for their months of work to develop this comprehensive report which we have been considering since publication in April."

On behalf of the FSA Board, Jeff Rooker, Chair of the Food Standards Agency, said:

'The FSA Board respects the decision the Scottish Government has taken to propose a free-standing, independent FSA for Scotland. We will work with the Scottish Government to meet their objectives while ensuring that consumers' interests in relation to food continue to be protected. The FSA Board is particularly mindful that this decision will directly impact on almost 200 of our staff based in Scotland, for example in meat plants as well as those in the FSA's Aberdeen office, and will have an effect on how the rest of the organisation works. We will work closely with the Scottish Government to ensure that the concerns of our staff are appropriately addressed. Until any alternative legislative amendments come into force, the FSA will continue to carry out its duties as at present. Food safety throughout the UK remains the FSA's number one priority.'

Some of the points highlighted in the Scudamore report include:

- One of the FSA's responsibilities is delivering official controls for the meat industry. Red meat abattoirs and processing plants have permanent inspections, which follow prescriptive European regulations. Currently these are delivered at a UK level and total costs in Scotland are around £7.7m per year. In future, costs may be fully recovered from food business operators. The Panel found there was a very difficult relationship between the Scottish meat industry and FSA, with complaints over the pricing structure and concern over the calibre of official veterinarians and training.
- Scotland has unique and complex problems in relation to diet, obesity and certain food borne diseases the Panel considered that food safety should not be divorced from nutrition and labelling and standards.
- The creation of a stand-alone option to fulfil the FSA's functions for Scotland will require primary legislation, agreements on competent authority for EU matters, as well as memoranda of understanding and service level agreements for issues on which it made sense to work at a UK level.
- It would be important to retain relationships with the FSA UK, DH and Defra to ensure that efficient handling of food incidents; expertise; consistency of policy across the UK; and to ensure that influence within Europe could be maintained.
- The elements of the Meat Inspection Service that are relevant to Scotland should be transferred to the FSA in Scotland to be under the operational control of the Director of the FSA in Scotland.

- Since the machinery of government changes, it was felt by the panel that UK leadership has been lost in respect of nutrition and labelling in EU. As well as diluting the UK voice, the changes have also meant that when government policy differs in different parts of the UK, the Scottish position may not be well-represented in European negotiations led by the Department of Health.

The Scudamore report can be accessed along with the announcement from the Scottish Government via this link: <http://tinyurl.com/8xzn247>

Voluntary Front of Pack Nutrition Labelling and FLABEL Research

The Department of Health (DH) and the Food Standards Agencies (FSA) of the devolved administrations have been consulting on Voluntary Front of Pack Nutrition Labelling. The UK Government are looking to provide FoP nutrition labeling guidance:

- That is consistent with the requirements of the FIR
- That can be used across the widest range of food and drink products;
- That is consistent, as evidence suggests that this is important in driving consumer recognition and use;
- That consumers find most useful in making healthier choices.

The guidance is structured around three strategic elements:

- The UK effort to achieve Strategic Health Outcomes, such as tackling obesity and reducing salt and saturating fat consumption.
- Research and evidence of who and how nutrition labels are used; what consumer preference is for such labels, and; how well they are understood. Some key evidential conclusions are:
 - Consistency is key to impact and understanding
 - Having said that most forms of voluntary nutrition labelling can be understood by the consumer
 - Consumers prefer non directive labelling i.e. prefer the information to judge for themselves not just “this is bad” instruction
 - Consumers like integrated labels – where the information is all in one place
 - Any kind of nutrition label is better than non for healthy consumer choices
 - Colour can help consumers make complex decisions
- The Regulatory framework provided by the Food Information Regulation on voluntary front of pack nutrition labels and additional forms of expression that say:
 - Repeated voluntary nutrition information on FOP is permitted on either: energy-only, or energy + fat, saturates, sugars & salt
 - Information can be provided ‘as sold’ or ‘as consumed’
 - Information must be provided per 100g/mls and can additionally be presented per portion
 - % Reference Intakes (%GDA) information can be given on a per 100g/ml or per portion basis
 - Not a requirement for non-prepacked foods but governments can mandate this if they choose
 - Additional forms of expression and presentation are permitted, subject to certain requirements.
 - Government can recommend additional forms of expression but Not mandate them

The decision to reopen the debate on FOP nutrition labels at this time was influenced by the publication at the end of last year of the EU funded project on Food Labelling to Advance Better Education for Life or FLABEL. This was a pan European study to examine the different aspects of nutrition labelling and its potential as a useful source of nutrition information, influencing consumer behaviour and dietary intakes

FLABEL had two key research objectives:

- To determine how nutrition information on food labels can affect dietary choices, consumer habits and food-related health issues by developing and applying an interpretation framework incorporating both the label and other factors/influences.

- To provide the scientific basis on use of nutrition information on food labels, including scientific principles for assessing the impact of different food labelling schemes, to be shared with the EU institutions, the food industry, especially SMEs, and other stakeholders.

The research consortium aimed to achieve the following:

- An EU-wide map of nutrition information on food labels, showing to what extent nutrition labelling is currently available in different parts of the EU.
- Knowledge on:
 - how consumers actually become aware of and read the food labels,
 - which labels are most appealing and informative, and
 - how to best strike a balance between simple and complete nutrition information, facilitating an informed choice.
- Information on actual nutrition label use in the “real world”. Based on in-store observations and retail scanner data, leading to insights into how nutrition labels may shape behaviour and affect consumption patterns.
- Evidence on how consumers form opinions about the healthiness of products, and how the nutrition label information interacts with other information in this process, including media, advertising and school education.
- Evidence on how nutrition labels are used to positively influence children’s dietary intake, based on the role nutrition information on food labels plays in food decision-making in families with children.
- Research-based best practice proposal for nutrition labelling, tested in a real-world store environment.
- Set of best practice methods for assessing the effect of nutrition labelling that can be used in the evaluation of labelling policies.

The results from the project, which took place over 3 years are available via a free webinar, presented by Prof. Klaus Grunert from Aarhus University, Denmark, FLABEL’s Scientific Advisor can be accessed via: <http://www.flabel.org/en/> where more information about the study is also available including two leaflets; one that introduces the project and the second covers the main project results.

Article 13 General Function Health Claims Published

COMMISSION REGULATION (EU) No 432/2012 of 16 May 2012 establishing a list of permitted health claims made on foods, other than those referring to the reduction of disease risk and to children’s development and health has been published in the Official journal of the European Union.

The Regulation authorising 222 Article 13.1 general function health claims was presented and adopted at the Standing Committee on the Food Chain and Animal Health on 5 December and since that time has been passing through the scrutiny process within the European Parliament and Council. The Regulation can also be accessed through this link <http://tinyurl.com/coubojm>

The Regulation authorising Article 13.1 claims will apply in six months’ time from 14 December 2012; rejected claims will not be permitted from that date. Only 222 of the 4000 considered in detail were approved. It is not clear that products with rejected claims that are legally produced before the deadline date of 14 December will be allowed to be sold through until their expiry date or stocks are exhausted. This may cause issues for those products, making such claims with a shelf life of longer than the 6 months allowed including frozen foods. A practical, proportionate and consistent approach is being sought on enforcement of this point.

The Union Register containing the complete list of authorised health claims has been updated and is available on the website of DG Health and Consumers at <http://tinyurl.com/cczvtpf> .

Three New Responsibility Deal Pledges Launched for Salt in the Catering Sector

The Department of Health has announced three new salt pledges, specifically focused on the catering sector, to encourage more companies to make their commitment to improving public health through salt reduction. Seventy-seven businesses have signed up to the Responsibility Deal 2012 salt reduction targets, but there is still a long way to go to achieve the 6g of salt a day goal.

With one in six meals eaten outside the home the catering sector has a vital role to play. The three pledges, which focus on training and kitchen practice, reformulation and procurement are tailored to the diverse business models in the foodservice sector and give every business the opportunity to go further and faster in reducing salt in the food we eat outside the home.

1. Training and Kitchen Practice

“We recognise that achieving the public health goal of consuming no more than 6g of salt per person per day will necessitate further action across the whole industry, Government, NGOs and individuals.

We will support and enable consumers to reduce their dietary salt intake. We will do this by reducing the amount of salt used in our kitchens by at least 15%, within a specified 2-year period by taking the following actions in respect of: kitchen practices; salt availability; and, chef training.

• **Restaurant kitchen practice**

We will adopt the following kitchen practices:

- vegetables and boiled starchy carbohydrates such as rice, potatoes and pasta will be cooked without added salt;
- our chefs will be provided with specific ingredient and salt quantities as well as equipment to control salt dosage so that we offer known and consistent salt levels in the foods we prepare.

• **Salt availability**

We will take active steps to encourage behaviour change among consumers to reduce the use of discretionary salt (e.g., by ensuring that salt is made available only at customers' direct request).

• **Chef training**

We commit to train all of our chefs/staff on:

- the importance of salt reduction for heart health and for helping consumers meet recommended dietary intakes;
- awareness of foods or ingredients (such as stock, soy sauce etc.) which are high in salt or contribute significantly to the intake of salt;
- how to reduce the levels of salt in their dishes/items and encourage changes in consumer palates;
- developing menus which are lower in salt and include lower salt options.”

2. Reformulation

“We recognise that achieving the public health goal of consuming no more than 6g of salt per person per day will necessitate further action across the whole industry, Government, NGOs and individuals.

We will support and enable customers to reduce their dietary salt intakes by: within 6 months – establishing the salt levels in products as they are offered to the final consumer for our top-selling products; by the end of 2014 – providing the salt content for each product on our website and menu information guides made available on request in our catering establishments.

Building on this we will: prioritise our reformulation activities to maximise the total amount of salt removed from our products and the impact on our customers health. For some businesses this may mean a focus on their top-selling products (in terms of sales volume) for others a reduction across their menu/product range. It is for

businesses to determine the best approaches taking into account the scope for further reduction and issues of taste, quality and safety.”

3. Procurement

“We recognise that achieving the public health goal of consuming no more than 6g of salt per person per day will necessitate further action across the whole industry, Government, NGOs and individuals.

We will support and enable customers to reduce their dietary salt intake by taking the following actions in respect of procurement of products: by the end of 2012, we will meet the salt targets for at least 50% of the products we procure (by volume of products). We will aim to increase this over time and report on progress year on year.”

The continuing decline in the average amount of salt eaten in England from the recent 2011 urinary salt survey – down a further 0.5g since the last survey in 2008 to 8.1g a day – clearly shows that the huge effort by the food industry to reformulate products to reduce salt is paying off, with real benefits for public health.

More information on each of the pledges can be found by following these links:

Training and Kitchen Practise: <http://tinyurl.com/cpgn2bo>

Reformulation: <http://tinyurl.com/btk7yve>

Procurement: <http://tinyurl.com/c2dse48>

FDF / BRC Report into Salt Reduction Technologies

The Food and Drink Federation (FDF) and British Retail Consortium (BRC) have published a report prepared by Leatherhead Food Research Association into technologies that enable food businesses to reduce the salt in their products in order to meet the 2012 Responsibility Deal salt targets. The report reviews options both currently in use and emerging techniques and ingredients. It suggests that future reductions in salt are likely to be more difficult to achieve and smaller. Noting that “potential future methods exist but need either considerably more scientific development, including establishing their safety for consumption, or have yet to be tried in actual foods.”

Beyond the current techniques for salt reduction the report identifies clearly that for some product groups further reductions for many reasons will be technically very difficult. Eight product categories are identified that present the most significant challenges: meat and meat products; bread particularly speciality and morning goods; cheese particularly cheddar and soft cheeses; extruded and pelleted snacks; cakes, pastries and fruit pies; pesto and other thick sauces; all other puddings and canned fish.

Among the technical challenges that need to be overcome in these categories are:

- -Impact on Flavour
- - Effects on microbiological safety
- - Shelf life and preservation
- - Customer acceptance of alternative non “clean declaration” ingredients
- - Impacts on quality, texture, aroma, volume and viscosity
- - Processing ability and efficiency

The report makes recommendations for overcoming some of the key challenges:

- -Amongst alternatives suggested in the report are potassium salts, and a recommendation asks the Department of Health to reconsider its current advice against using potassium salts as a sodium replacement.
- - Concern is also raised on the rigour of food safety due diligence work such as shelf life on some of the development ingredients by the ingredient suppliers; industry- wide guidance is recommended in this area

- - The use of nanotechnology is an identified opportunity, but understanding of how to get the technology approved as a novel process is seen as a barrier to bringing it to market

The lobby group on Salt: Consensus Action on Salt and Health (CASH) have criticised how FDF and BRC have represented the report describing it as a “dinosaur-like approach”

The news report in Food Manufacture can be accessed through this link: <http://tinyurl.com/bselgc3>

The full FDF / BRC report can be accessed via the FDF website along with the press release: <http://tinyurl.com/chpd6t3>

EFRA Select Committee Enquiry Report in DSM Moratorium

On 4 April the Food Standards Agency announced that the European Commission had requested that the UK impose a moratorium on the production of desinewed meat (DSM) from cows and sheep from the end of April. In addition, DSM produced from pigs and poultry must be reclassified as mechanically separated meat (MSM) from 26 May. The Commons Select Committee with oversight for the department, the select Committee for the Environment, Food and Rural Affairs (EFRA) undertook a short inquiry and published its findings on 24 July 2012.

MPs call on the UK Government to make "every possible effort" to reverse the Commission's decision, which will have serious impacts on the UK's food industry and for consumers.

- The full report can be accessed through this link: <http://tinyurl.com/bs2dy9h>
- More information on the enquiry can be found at : <http://tinyurl.com/cowjbn0>

Launching the report, Anne McIntosh MP, EFRA Committee Chair said,

"Our producers have been badly let down by both the European Commission and the UK Government. The Commission's actions are irrational and wrong. The Government was caught unawares and has so far failed to protect UK producers."

The European Commission demanded in March that desinewed meat, which closely resembles minced meat and is used in many processed meat products, must be classified as "mechanically separated meat." Under EU rules, this meant that it could no longer be obtained from the bones of cattle, sheep and goats. The UK Government has made clear that there are no food safety risks associated with the use of desinewed meat.

"The Commission's decision to outlaw this meat without producing any scientific evidence to suggest that it is a risk to public health was totally disproportionate," added McIntosh.

The report highlights the impact that the Commission's decision has had on the UK meat industry. One producer of desinewed meat, Newby Foods Ltd, has been forced to make almost half of its workforce redundant. Consumers are also expected to pay a price as desinewed meat, traditionally used in value ranges, is replaced by more expensive cuts of meat. The Committee's inquiry found that although similar processes are used elsewhere in the EU, only the UK has been forced into a ban after being threatened with "safeguarding measures" by the Commission.

"The Commission plans to inspect other Member States later this year but in the meantime UK producers remain the only ones forced to reclassify this meat in the face of threats from the Commission. The Government failed to prevent the moratorium from being introduced. Now it must put pressure on the Commission to bring forward visits to other Member States so that there is a level playing field for our producers.

We are now in the absurd situation where we could see this meat imported from elsewhere in the EU to take the place of domestically produced meat," added Anne McIntosh.

MPs conclude that it is unacceptable that the UK Government cannot offer any reassurance that such an event would not happen again. The Committee calls on the Food Standards Agency to improve its communication with the rest of Whitehall. The Committee also criticises the European Commission for failing to provide oral evidence to the Committee's inquiry, saying

“We were keen to take evidence from the European Commission, whose decision to request a moratorium had had such profound consequences for British businesses. On 17 May the Committee Chair wrote to Paola Testori Coggi, head of the Commission's Directorate General for Health and Consumers, requesting that an official from

the Commission give oral evidence to the Committee's inquiry. Despite our best efforts to obtain evidence from the Commission, including the offer to take evidence by videolink, the Commission were unable, or, we suspect, unwilling, to provide a witness for this inquiry, although they did provide a written submission.³ The European Commission's decision to request a moratorium at extremely short notice has had devastating consequences for British producers. It is extremely disappointing that the Commission was unable, or unwilling, to provide oral evidence to this Committee. The Commission's failure to justify its actions and fulfil its duty to provide oral evidence to the National Parliament of a Member State demonstrates a worrying disregard for democratic accountability. "

In conclusion the Committee says "Our examination of the chain of events which led to the moratorium has highlighted the heavy-handed and disproportionate nature of the Commission's actions but has also exposed serious flaws in the handling of this issue by the FSA, Defra, and the Department of Health. It is, of course, our producers who are paying the price for these mistakes.

Food Standards Agency Relaxes Freezing Requirements to Control Parasites for Certain Fish

The Food Standards Agency has announced that from Monday July 30, certain farmed fish destined to be eaten raw in dishes like sushi no longer need to be frozen before use to protect consumers against parasites.

The Food Standards Agency has announced that from today, certain farmed fish destined to be eaten raw in dishes like sushi no longer need to be frozen before use to protect consumers against parasites.

Fish parasites are mainly a problem in certain species of wild fish and can cause illness in humans if eaten. All fishery products must be inspected to remove visible parasites before being sold. Cooking will kill them, but freezing kills any parasites that may remain undetected in fish products intended to be consumed raw or almost raw.

After research commissioned by the Food Standards Agency in Scotland showed there is a negligible risk of parasites from farmed salmon, the European Food Safety Authority (EFSA) reviewed the available evidence on the presence of parasites in wild and farmed fish.

Following the EFSA review, the European Commission and member states reviewed the hygiene legislation and agreed requirements in December 2011, which allow a risk-based approach to be taken when applying the freezing requirements for fishery products. These requirements are being implemented in all UK countries from today.

Linden Jack, Head of the Food Hygiene Policy Branch of the FSA said: 'The relaxation of these rules is good news for responsible fish producers who are making every effort to minimise the risk of parasites in fish. It will mean less of a regulatory burden on their business, without compromising consumer safety.

To read the European Food Safety Authority EFSA Scientific Opinion on Risk Assessment on Parasites in Fishery Products <http://tinyurl.com/cx27f7u>

Hygiene Amendment Regulations Introduces Special Health Mark Requirements

The recently published Food Hygiene (England) (Amendment) Regulations 2012 (SI No 2012/1742) and the parallel Regulations for the devolved administrations the format and requirements for a special health mark to be applied to carcasses and meat from animals subject to emergency slaughter, These Regulations amend the Food Hygiene (England) Regulations 2006 and come into force on 30 July 2012.

The Food Standards Agency have also recently issued a letter to heads of environmental services on the application of the national health mark to meat, meat products, preparations, minced meat and MSM derived from emergency slaughter animals can be found. The letter can be found through this link: <http://tinyurl.com/cluv4qd>

Copies of the Regulations from each of the devolved administrations can be found through this link <http://tinyurl.com/ctrb3sr>

The sectors of the meat industry that will be affected apart from slaughterhouses and cutting plants, which have already been applying the special mark, are meat processing plants producing meat products, meat preparations, minced meat and mechanically separated meat (MSM) derived from the meat of emergency slaughtered animals. The application of the special mark to meat products, meat preparations, minced meat and MSM derived from the meat of emergency slaughtered animals is a requirement of EU Food Hygiene Legislation (Regulation 853 / 2004 and 854 / 2004) which is now being enforced in UK through these domestic Regulations.

EU food hygiene legislation prohibits the placing on the market of meat from animals that have undergone emergency slaughter outside the slaughterhouse unless it bears a special health mark which cannot be confused with either the health mark or the identification mark. The legislation also specifies that such meat may be placed on the market only in the Member State where slaughter takes place and in accordance with national law. Meat is defined in the EU legislation as the "edible parts of animals including blood".

The FSA's view is that, as they are all forms of meat, meat preparations and products, minced meat and mechanically separated meat (MSM), as well as carcase meat, are all subject to these provisions. This will enable all meat or products or preparations of meat derived from animals subject to emergency slaughter to be identified. Details of special mark are included in the Guide to Food Hygiene and other Regulations for the UK Meat Industry (MIG) issued in December 2006 to food business operators (FBOs) at abattoirs and cutting plants. The MIG provides advice on what FBOs should do to comply with the requirements of the EU Regulations and the format of the mark is described in the MIG. The MIG can be accessed at: <http://tinyurl.com/bqg33mx>

Defra Publishes Conclusions of the Green Food Project

The Natural Environment White Paper, published in June 2011, included a commitment to "bring together Government, industry and environmental partners to reconcile how we will achieve our goals of improving the environment and increasing food production". The Green Food Project is the realisation of this commitment. The conclusions of the Green Food Project, launched on 10 July 2012, have been jointly developed and owned by the Green Food Project Steering Group.

The project was put together to work out how to address the challenges of greater demand for food against protection and sustainability in the environment. It has been well known for some time that as global populations rise and diets and consumption levels change, there is a substantial challenge to the world food system. Globally, we are going to need to produce more food. However, there is also increasing awareness of environmental pressures and limits and the need to protect and enhance our valuable natural resources, particularly where they have been degraded. The need to produce more food, more sustainably, has become part of a larger debate about the idea of moving towards a greener economy. There are also wider discussions about patterns of consumption and demand across the world, given that approximately one billion people in the world suffer from hunger, a similar number from other forms of undernourishment, and approximately a further billion are overweight. The report publishes the early conclusions from the work, but identifies it as only the first step.

Lead by a project steering group, a small "synthesis" group of interested scientists, social scientists, statisticians and policy makers was used to help create a clear framework for the project. Taking into consideration fluctuating food commodity prices, the framework focussed on a number of specific issues:

- actions which might have the greatest potential to increase productivity
- actions that might have the greatest potential for an improvement in the state of the environment, either incrementally or through a step change, and which of these might have the most potential to support an increase or decrease in productivity;
- post production actions which could lead to higher value or less environmentally damaging food reaching the consumer including consumer behaviour
- The potential to mitigate trade-offs between increasing productivity and improving the environment.

- implications of taking action for existing initiatives and policies, and the kinds of policy interventions and decisions that would accelerate progress;
- The potentially radical developments that could affect the situation in coming decades and the likely key pressures or opportunities that might arise.

Several subgroups were also formed to look at specific areas these were, wheat, dairy, bread, curry, geographic location. The report of the Green Food Project and those of the sub groups, as well as the summary of responses to the online forum, were used to develop a number of conclusions, which will be implemented by the on-going activity of the Green Food Project Steering Group, the strategic conclusions are:

- The use of research and technology:
- Better coordinated knowledge exchange
- Attracting the right numbers and calibre of individuals into the workforce
- Giving the confidence to Invest
- Ensure that business structures operate fairly and effectively
- Valuing the ecosystem
- More sustainable land management
- Tackling consumption and waste

For access the reports of the green project subgroups and conclusions go to: <http://tinyurl.com/6pvjva7>

WRAP Zero Waste Road Map for Events

WRAP are seeking views from any organisation involved in staging or delivering events in order to develop a 2020 vision for zero waste events roadmap to highlight the impact that waste can have in making events more sustainable. It aims to work with the events industry to show ways in which the sector can reduce waste, increase re-use and maximise resources. Ultimately this vision is designed to change current practice and move to zero waste to landfill by 2020.

For more information go to the WRAP website: <http://tinyurl.com/bsh9xsc> where organisations are encouraged to give feedback via a link

RASFF Annual Report

The European Commission annual report for 2011 on the EU's Rapid Alert System for Food and Feed (RASFF) has been recently published; it shows that many food safety risks have been averted or mitigated and safety controls ensure our food is safe. RASFF is a mechanism that triggers a rapid reaction when a food safety risk is detected. All member states contributing to the RASFF system are swiftly informed of serious risks found in food or feed so that together they can react to food safety threats in a coordinated way to protect the health of EU consumers.

In 2011, 9157 notifications in RASFF related to non-compliances with EU food legislation were reported, of which 617 concerned serious risks. Most of the notifications were follow-ups (5345) rather than new (3812) notifications. This reflects an increased effectiveness of the system with a better targeting and a more extensive follow-up.

Out of the 3812 new notifications: 3139 concerned food, 361 concerned feed and 312 concerned food contact materials. Some of the most reported issues were aflatoxins in feed, dried fruits and nuts and migration of chemical substances from kitchen utensils from China.

One of the particular successes highlighted in the report is the strengthening of safety checks at EU borders. Almost half of the notifications related to food and feed rejected at EU borders. When such a product is identified, RASFF informs the non-EU country in question asking them to take corrective action and to prevent the

problem from happening again. When a serious and persistent problem is detected, the country in question is asked by the Commission to apply urgent corrective measures such as delisting establishments, blocking exports or intensifying controls.

In 2011 RASFF played a key role in managing two major food safety incidences: Fukushima and E. coli.

E. coli crisis was one of the most serious foodborne outbreaks in EU history with more than 50 casualties, mainly in Germany. A taskforce of specialists worked round the clock to identify the source of the outbreak, to facilitate the rapid exchange of information which allowed food safety authorities to respond efficiently and mitigate the health and economic impact of the crisis.

Fukushima incident: Following the release of radioactivity from the Daiichi nuclear plant in Fukushima in March 2011, the Commission asked EU Member States via RASFF to analyse the levels of radioactivity in feed and food imported from Japan. The Commission adopted a precautionary measure requiring pre-export checks to be carried out by the Japanese authorities on all exported feed and food from the affected zone, combined with random controls at the point of entry. The measures ensured a very high level of public health protection. RASFF was proven indispensable for an effective and rapid communication with Member States on the development of the situation, the measures to be taken, and the results of controls. The measures continue to apply in 2012 and are regularly reviewed.

A number of important lessons have been learned following the sprouted seeds crisis in 2011 and are set out in a second Commission document also recently published. Some key areas highlighted are:

- Enhance RASFF with the launch of iRASFF – an online notification platform which will help RASFF work faster and more efficiently than ever.
- Review existing standard operating procedures for crisis management while allowing for sufficient flexibility.
- Revise rules on traceability to increase the speed and efficiency for tracing back dangerous products and withdrawing them from the market.
- Provide dedicated trainings on food-borne investigations and outbreak management as well as hygiene in primary production for major trading partners (through the EU Better training for safer food programme and in cooperation with the European Food Safety Authority (EFSA) and the European Centre for Disease Control (ECDC)).
- Develop specific rules on seeds and sprout production.
- Improve coordination in crisis communication activities.

The RASFF Annual report can be accessed through this link: <http://tinyurl.com/k22a7>

The Sprouted seeds Lessons Learned paper can be found here: <http://tinyurl.com/ckw2cel>

European Waste Management Results Disappointing, but UK Doing Well

The Commission Environmental department has recently published a report on management of municipal waste across the EU, highlighting huge variation and a number of Member States whose efforts are falling short of expectations. The report found that many EU countries may be failing on a 2020 waste target for recycling municipal waste, which is set at 50% of all household waste. Some of the worst offenders are financially beleaguered Greece, Italy and Cyprus. Their failings include a lack of incentives to divert waste from landfills, which Environment Commissioner Janez Potočnik called “the worst waste management option”. Greece, which scored lowest in the study, only received a positive note for its access to collection services, but was criticised on 17 counts.

The report grades all 27 member states according to 18 criteria, including total waste recycled, pricing of waste disposal, and infringements of European legislation.

Austria, Belgium, Denmark, Germany, the Netherlands and Sweden have the best implemented and most well developed recycling systems, the report said, land-filling less than 5% of their waste.

On the basis of the report the ten worst performing states will be singled out for attention by the Commission this autumn, and action plans will be discussed with the national authorities. A statement from the Commission said

that these plans will include recommendations on how to improve waste management using economic, legal and administrative tools, as well as EU funds.

A recent study by the EU executive found that full implementation of the existing legislation on waste could save up to €72 billion a year, and create 400,000 jobs by 2020.

For the full report go to: <http://tinyurl.com/co6gyqs>

A reduction in household waste and an increase in recycling in has led to a decline in waste to landfill England of 11%. Provisional results from Defra, comparing figures between the financial year 2010/11 and the calendar year January to December 2011, show that the amount of rubbish going to landfill has fallen from 11.4m to 10.1m tonnes. More waste was recycled, composted or reused in 2011 (10.8m tonnes) than was landfilled (10.1m tonnes) and half the amount of waste was sent to landfill last year compared with ten years ago. Also 4.6m tonnes was used as feedstock for energy from waste plants in 2011 which was 18% of all waste compared with 15% the previous year and 14% the year before that.

This is accompanied by results revealing that household recycling is increasing at a slow rate - up from 41.5% in 2010 to 42.9% in 2011. Nearly 0.5m tonnes more of household waste was recycled in 2011 than in 2010. Little-by-little, households are also improving in curbing the amount of waste they produce with 0.9% reduction from 23.5m in the 2010 financial year to 23.2m tonnes last period. However factors such as reduced consumption due to the current economic climate may also be at play.

For more on waste visit the Defra website: <http://tinyurl.com/5vxpec7>

Figures released this week by the Scottish Environment Protection Agency (SEPA) show that England is nosing ahead in terms of recycling. In the period of October to December 2011, household Scottish waste recycled totalled 36.7% whereas 40% was recycled in England.

Europe Calls for Member States to Implement Strategies for Antimicrobial Resistance

A legislative dossier to establish an action plan against the rising threats from Antimicrobial Resistance (AMR) is currently under discussion and awaiting its first reading in the European Parliament.

Since the introduction of penicillin in the 1940s antimicrobial medicines, such as antibiotics, have become essential for the treatment of many microbial infections in humans and animals. In addition to the treatment of infectious diseases (e.g. pneumonia, tuberculosis, malaria, HIV/AIDS) and hospital-acquired infections (e.g. methicillin resistant *Staphylococcus aureus* (MRSA), antimicrobials are vital for reducing the risk of complications in relation to complex medical interventions, such as hip replacements, organ transplants, cancer chemotherapy and the care of premature babies. In addition, antimicrobials are used in veterinary medicine and for non-therapeutic purposes (e.g. disinfectants, preservatives, and food and feed additives).

Seventy years later, these applications are now seriously jeopardized by the emergence and spread of microbes that are resistant to affordable and effective "first-line" medicines, rendering the drugs concerned ineffective for the treatment of the infection. This resistance is a natural biological phenomenon but is amplified by a variety of factors. The inappropriate use of therapeutic antimicrobials in human and veterinary medicine, the use of antimicrobials for non-therapeutic purposes as well as the pollution of the environment by antimicrobials is accelerating the emergence and spread of resistant microorganisms. The consequences are severe.

The Commission report that a subset of drug-resistant bacteria is responsible for about 25 000 human deaths annually. In addition to avoidable death, this also translates into extra healthcare costs and productivity losses of at least EUR 1.5 billion.

The Council of the European Union has recently adopted conclusions on the impact of antimicrobial resistance (AMR) in the human health sector and in the veterinary sector, calling upon member states to develop and implement national strategies or action plans for countering AMR.

These national strategies or action plans should, amongst others, include the following elements:

- national guidelines on the treatment of humans and animals with antimicrobial agents;
- communication guidelines and programmes for education and training of professionals;
- enforcement of national legislation preventing all illegal sales of antimicrobials including illegal sales over the internet;

- limitation of the use of critically important antibiotics to cases where microbiological diagnosis and susceptibility testing has determined that no other type of antimicrobials will be effective;
- limitation of prophylactic use of antimicrobials to cases with defined clinical needs;
- limitation of prescription and use of antimicrobials for herd treatment of animals to cases with a clear clinical or epidemiological justification.

The conclusions also call upon the member states and the Commission to examine the conditions of prescription and sale of antimicrobials in order to ascertain whether practices in human and animals healthcare may lead to over-prescription, overuse or misuse of antimicrobials.

The European Commission has been invited to review a number of legislative acts in order to take antimicrobial resistance better into account. This applies notably to directive 90/167 laying down the conditions governing the preparation, placing on the market and use of medicated feeding stuffs in the EU and directive 2001/82 on the EU code relating to veterinary medicinal products. The Commission has responded that preparatory work for some of the actions to which it is invited has already been started.

The Commission non legislative document can be found through this link: <http://tinyurl.com/c8l6ejy>

The European Parliament draft report is here: <http://tinyurl.com/dypvyes>

Scottish Shellfish Biotoxin Annual Report

The Food Standards Agency in Scotland has published the 2011/2012 biotoxin monitoring programme annual report for shellfish harvesting areas across Scotland.

The report describes the official control biotoxin monitoring programme. The programme delivers testing required by European Union law.

From July 2011, liquid chromatography with mass spectrometry method replaced the previously used biological assay to detect lipophilic toxins.

The new method has the ability to characterise and quantify all regulated lipophilic toxins. It also provides the FSA in Scotland and industry with additional information that should provide an early warning system for developing toxic events.

The executive summary and a link to the full report are available here: <http://tinyurl.com/c8gl6a8>

And <http://tinyurl.com/d4yh7u9>

Defra Country of Origin Labelling Report 2012

A year on from the publication of *Principles on Country of Origin Information*, <http://tinyurl.com/5wgtzqm> a voluntary guide on country of origin labelling, this report carried out by Camden but commissioned by Defra looks at whether it has made a difference.

Under current food labelling regulations only certain products require the place of origin to be labelled on a mandatory basis, foods such as unprocessed beef and veal, and poultrymeat from outside the EU. The new food information regulation will extend this to pork, sheep and poultrymeat. For other foods food labelling rules require that details of the place of origin or provenance of a food are only needed if their omission might mislead the purchaser as to the food's true origin or where the origin is given but it is not the same as the primary ingredient; in this case the origin of the primary ingredient must be given or an indication that it is different.

The guidance was developed by key bodies representing food retailers, food manufacturers, commercial caterers and the hospitality trade, to represent best practice in the area of voluntary labelling of meat, processed meat products and milk, fresh cream, cheese and butter. They ensure that the term "British" can only be used for meat from animals born and reared in the UK, and that liquid milk and fresh cream are labelled with the country of origin of the milk.

This evaluation looks at the extent to which labels for these categories of product now comply with the guidance the baseline audit of 2011 and how labels have been changed. For the full report follow the link to the Defra website: <http://tinyurl.com/czpww5l>

EUFIC Review on Impact of Labelling on Obesity

In the face of continuing high rates of obesity across Europe, can nutrition labelling help consumers manage their dietary intakes to achieve a healthy body weight? To answer this question, EUFIC reviewed the scientific evidence published between 2007 and March 2012. The conclusion: most people can use the different nutrition labelling schemes available to identify more healthful (less calorific) choices, but they lack the motivation to factor nutrition information into their purchasing decisions. Price, taste and time constraints are key aspects to consider for more effective nutrition labelling.

The researchers screened two public online libraries, Pubmed and Social Sciences Research Network, for scientific publications related to nutrition labelling and obesity. Studies that most closely matched the topic mainly dealt with consumers' understanding and use of nutrition labelling, as well as its impact on purchasing decisions. Settings considered included retail stores and out-of-home eating. Additionally, the review briefly touched upon studies that modelled the potential impact of nutrition labelling on dietary intakes.

The key finding was that to date no scientific evidence exists from Europe to indicate an impact of nutrition labelling – positive or negative – on body weight. Most studies included have assessed if and how consumers understand and use nutrition labels. When prompted to identify the most healthful option from a given choice set of foods, the majority of respondents was able to do so regardless of the nutrition labelling system. Modelling studies confirm that choosing diets with a more healthful profile will result in better population health, while bringing about substantial reductions in health care costs.

However, in real-life situations (e.g. supermarkets, cafeterias), price, taste, and brand were far more important drivers for buying a specific food or drink product. Shopping under time pressure, a common phenomenon nowadays, seemed to further compromise the impact nutrition labels could possibly have. Potential ways forward include increasing people's motivation to read nutrition labels. This may be achieved by shifting consumers' mind-set towards a health focus. For those with a hedonic focus on foods or who struggle with technical nutrition tables, health claims and health logos may be alternative communication formats. Providing nutrition information on all products, in a consistent fashion, is likely to aid consumer acceptance and use. Whether this eventually will help prevent obesity, future research must show. One thing is certain: Studies into the potential impact of nutrition labelling on obesity need to include body weight measurements if they want to establish causal relationships. For the full paper go to: <http://tinyurl.com/bm3hprw>

Health Protection Agency Scotland Report on Botulism Outbreak

Health Protection Scotland, on behalf of the Incident Management Team, have recently published the final report into an outbreak of foodborne botulism in Scotland in November 2011. The outbreak affected three children from one family in the Forth Valley area. The cause of the outbreak was found to be a single jar of a commercially produced korma sauce. Botulism is caused by toxins produced by the bacterium *Clostridium botulinum*, which attacks the nervous system and can affect people of any age. The infection is not contagious and cannot be spread from person to person. Symptoms of foodborne botulism typically begin between 12 and 36 hours after ingestion of contaminated food, but may present in as little as six hours.

Dr John Cowden, Consultant Epidemiologist at HPS said: "People can be reassured that botulism is rare in the UK. Symptoms to look out for are a combination of blurred vision, difficulty swallowing and difficulty speaking – symptoms which rapidly get worse. They are then followed by general muscle weakness. Any person, child or adult, with these symptoms should seek urgent medical advice. Antitoxins have proved very effective in treating the condition if treated early, although full recovery may take several months."

The first child was admitted to hospital on 9 November 2011 and on 13 November, following epidemiological, environmental, microbiological and toxicological investigations, a jar of commercially produced korma sauce was

identified as the vehicle of intoxication. As a result the UK Food Standards Agency (FSA) took immediate action to withdraw the potentially affected batch from the supply chain and retail market and informed the European Commission (EC) via the Rapid Alert System for Food and Feed (RASFF). The FSA also alerted the public to the potential risks.

For a copy of the final report go to: <http://tinyurl.com/c5w8jtw>

British Brands Group Packaging Report

The British Brands Group has recently published a three in one research report covering three papers covering the role and purpose of packaging and how its use can influence consumer choice. The three distinct elements comprise:

- **Packaging in a Market Economy** - Using current academic, government, industry and other sources, Norwich Business School provides a comprehensive picture of the consumer, competition and economic importance of packaging, creating a picture of the crucial commercial role it plays;
- **The Effect of Branding on the consumer** - Through original consumer research, using techniques that indicate actual consumer response (not how consumers say they might respond), the Mountainview Learning report demonstrates how different brand elements affect consumer behaviour;
- **Confusion, Heuristics (mental shortcuts) and the Consumer** - This section examines the extent to which government policy, actual consumer behaviour and judicial practice is aligned in ensuring markets work well. Focusing in particular on consumer confusion from copycat designs, how it is dealt in the Courts and the tests that are applied.

A summary and the three reports can be found on the British Brands Group website at:

<http://tinyurl.com/d3gwje8>

Consultation on AHVLA Service Charging

Defra are seeking views on proposed changes to fees for statutory services currently delivered by the Animal Health and Veterinary Laboratories Agency (AHVLA) on behalf of Defra, the Scottish Government, the Welsh Government and the Northern Ireland Executive (the latter for CITES only). The seven statutory services where fees are being reviewed are:

- Bovine Embryos
- Bovine Semen
- Porcine Semen
- Poultry Health Scheme (PHS)
- *Salmonella* National Control Programme (NCP)
- Border Inspection Posts (BIPs)
- Control of Trade in Endangered Species (CITES)

This is a joint consultation between Defra and the devolved administrations, so any changes to fees will apply in England, Scotland, Wales and Northern Ireland (CITES only).

The current economic situation and the downward pressure on spending has prompted a review of the activity of the DHVLA. Defra maintain that whilst DHVLA already charges businesses for some services, the fees have not been revised for some time and the services users are therefore subsidised by the general taxpayer. The proposal therefore is to revise existing fees to businesses to achieve full cost recovery, in line with government policy. The purpose of this consultation is to seek views on this full cost recovery proposal and to seek further information on the impact of any fee increases on businesses, including small and micro businesses.

DHVLA have taken other steps to increase efficiency including:

- The rationalisation of administrative functions as a result of the introduction of a new IT system.
- A review of the management structure of Field Delivery services across AHVLA., In England, there are now four regions (reduced from eight)
- The rationalisation of AHVLA Laboratory services, with a planned reduction of 8 laboratories for testing.
- Centralisation of the Export Health Certification process to one of AHVLA's Specialist Service Centres in Carlisle.

The consultation document, the consultation questionnaire and impact assessments that have been prepared so far for the services above can be accessed via this link: <http://tinyurl.com/d3gwje8>

More information on the work of AHVLA can be found at: <http://www.defra.gov.uk/ahvla/about-us/>

The completed questionnaire can be e mailed to AHfeesconsultation@defra.gsi.gov.uk

Alternatively, you may send a hard copy of the questionnaire or any comments to:

AHVLA Fees Consultation team

Area 5A 9 Millbank

c/o Nobel House

17 Smith Square

London

SW1P 3JR

Autonomous Tariff Quotas for Certain Fishery Products

The European Commission have adopted a Proposal for a Regulation that intends to introduce Autonomous Tariffs Quotas (ATQ's) for several important fish species commonly imported into the EU for processing and will have a significant impact on fish processors as the current system of suspensions will disappear. The regulation would be applicable from 2013 to 2015 and would be reviewed every three years.

The proposal for a Council Regulation on trade related measures to guarantee the supply of certain fishery products to Union processors from 2013 to 2015 amending Regulations (EC) No 104/2000 and (EU) No 1344/2011 and repealing Regulation (EC) No 1062/2009 is available here:

BFFF have spoken with Alan Dell, of Defra, recently and have been reassured that the UK position is sympathetic to industry views. Defra will consider BFFF as a stakeholder in any discussions and as the dossier develops we will be involved. Discussions on the dossier are at an early stage and the industry position is that the current system of tariff suspensions should continue, they are easier to administer and are more transparent than the proposed ATQ's. There is also concern both from Defra and other member states that the Commission have produced the proposal with very limited consultation and that the motivation driving it is unclear.

The Commission claim that the proposed quotas will be sufficient to meet the demand of the processing industry but this is at odds with points made in the proposal around loss of EU revenue. If the proposal continues through the process without substantial change the debate will move away from keeping suspensions to become discussion on whether the allocated quotas are substantial enough to satisfy the needs of processors within the EU.

The proposed Regulation will repeal and / or replace the provisions of a number of existing legislative instruments:

- Council Regulation (EC) No. 1062/2009 opening and providing for the management of autonomous Community tariff quotas for certain fishery products for processing for the period 2010 – 2012.
- As part of the review of the Common Fisheries Policy Council Regulation (EC) No. 104/2000 on the Common Organisation of the markets in fishery and aquaculture products (Fish CMO) will be replaced. The current Regulation establishes the suspension of Tariff duties for seven fishery codes, these are not replaced in the new proposal and include species such as Cod, Alaskan Pollack, Surimi, Blue Grenadier and Shrimps and Prawns. Article 28 and Annex VI of Regulation 104/2000 lists the detailed products affected.
- Council Regulation (EC) No 1255/1996 temporarily suspending the autonomous common customs tariff duties on certain, agricultural, fishery and industrial products has a number of suspensions for fishery products that will be totally or partially replaced in the proposed Regulation. 1255/1996 will also be repealed.

A copy of the proposal can be accessed through this link: <http://tinyurl.com/cyf9prg>

Competitive Imbalances in the Food Supply Chain

In January this year the European Parliament adopted a resolution on the competitive imbalances in the food supply chain. In March the Commission responded, the positions are somewhat contradictory, but where it leads could have far reaching effects for everyone in the food supply chain and change the dynamics of doing business in the EU.

The Parliamentary Resolution, which can be accessed through this link: <http://tinyurl.com/ctoe9fa>, points out that the food supply chain, agriculture, the agri-food industry and food distribution account for 7% of total employment in the EU and are worth EUR 1400 billion per year – making it the EU’s largest manufacturing sector. The Resolution calls for the Commission to propose Legislation to guarantee fair and transparent relationships between producers, suppliers and distributors of food products; pointing out that since 2009, there has been an 11.6% drop in farm incomes at EU level, whilst total input costs for farmers increased by an average of almost 40% between 2000 and 2010. Parliament urges the Commission and Member States to address the problem of unfair distribution of profits within the food chain, especially with regard to farmers, stressing that the inequalities in power must change and that the European Commission should **launch a full sector enquiry**. Furthermore the Parliament asks that regulatory authorities take action against abusive buyers on the part of dominant wholesalers and retailers through defining unacceptable practices, so that they can be subject to specific regulation, supervision and sanctions. MEP’s produced list of practices about which producers have raised concerns in relation to the functioning of the food supply chain. These include the following:

- Retailers: (i) advance payment for accessing negotiation; (ii) listing fees; (iii) entry fees; (iv) pricing; (v) payment delays; (v) most favoured client clauses;
- Contractual conditions: (i) unilateral and retrospective changes to contractual conditions; (ii) unilateral breach of contract; (iii) exclusivity clauses/fees; (iv) imposition of a ‘forced’ contribution for private brands; (v) retaliatory practices; (vi) margin recovery; (vii) overriding discounts; (viii) imposition of payment for waste processing; (ix) inverted auctions; (x) unrealistic delivery terms; (xi) payment to cover (non-previously agreed) promotions; (xii) imposing unconditional return of (unsold) merchandise; (xiii) imposition on suppliers of costs related to product shrinkage or theft.

In response the Commission’s European Competition Network (ECN) has published a report (the report on competition law enforcement and market monitoring activities by European competition authorities in the food sector (<http://tinyurl.com/d34zzy9>) The Commission report indicates that competition law is actively enforced in the food sector across Europe and that this has benefited operators across the supply chain, including farmers. In the period between 2004 to 2011, more than 180 antitrust cases; 100 monitoring actions and nearly 1,300 merger decisions have been handled by competition authorities across Europe, mostly dealing with processing and, to a lesser extent, retail. More than 50 price fixing, market and customer allocation cartels, and the sharing of commercial information have been prohibited, as have exclusionary practices that worked against farmers or suppliers. The work continues with 60 antitrust cases ongoing.

The report claims that many factors other than lack of competition and abusive practises contributed to changing market conditions and suggest that producers increase their efficiencies, and form co-operatives to strengthen their bargaining power. The competition authorities do however concede that there is a need to strengthen controls, either through voluntary codes or regulation, on unfair practices.

We have yet to see if the Commission will launch the full food supply chain enquiry that the European Parliament requests, if they do, it’s important that the authorities have the opportunity to gain a comprehensive understanding of the complexities that exist in food supply chains, and in particular the differences between the supply chains for Retail and Foodservice.

Portion size of pre-packaged products is a focus for the debate on calorie intake, driven by the increasing number of people in the UK who are obese and overweight.

In March 2011 the government launched its Public Health Responsibility Deal and a year later launched a calorie reduction pledge, encouraging food businesses to help consumers decrease their energy intake. Portion size reduction is one of the mechanisms suggested to help achieve this, yet there is a lack of evidence that specific size reduction of pre-packaged food will lead to a decrease in overall energy intake.

This report summarises the current literature available in relation to portion size of pre-packaged foods and drink and consumption behaviour, including input from a stakeholder workshop which identified gaps in the evidence base. It also documents the informal aspects that can influence portion size from the perspective of industry.

The report concludes that there is a need for more evidence in relation to portion size of pre-packaged foods and drink and impact on consumption behaviour. Further research is required to improve the knowledge of food businesses in order to optimise portion size and avoid any unintended consequences.

The report makes recommendations for further research in priority areas. These include:

1. Determining whether portion size of pre-packaged products is the optimum mechanic to help consumers manage intake
2. Promotional dynamics: understanding how shoppers use foods purchased from promotions

It is anticipated that investigation of these areas will inform the debate on portion size of pre-packaged foods. The research will provide evidence on which businesses can base decisions about portion size and consumer communication. If these areas are explored further, industry can hope to gain a better understanding of optimising portion size, communication and ultimately helping consumers to manage their energy intake.

To download the free report from the IGD website go to: <http://tinyurl.com/d6xc3at>

Links to Other Information

Lots of other information not covered in full by the T&L Update is available through the links below:

1. FSA Publish Annual Incident reports for 2011 – report shows a year on year increase
<http://www.food.gov.uk/news/newsarchive/2012/may/annual-report-of-incidents>
2. Food and Veterinary Office Audit of South Africa – Audit no 2012-6463 to evaluate the control systems in place governing the production of fishery products intended for export to the European Union
http://ec.europa.eu/food/fvo/rep_details_en.cfm?rep_inspection_ref=2012-6463
3. EFSA reviews studies on pesticides and their effect on bee health
http://www.efsa.europa.eu/en/press/news/120601.htm?WT.mc_id=EFSAHL01&emt=1
4. Food Drink Europe Acrylamide Reduction Toolbox
http://www.fooddrinkeurope.eu/uploads/publications_documents/Toolboxfinal260911.pdf
5. Start up and development of small business”. Report by Lord Young, Enterprise Advisor to the Prime Minister, inc loans and finance <http://www.bis.gov.uk/assets/biscore/enterprise/docs/m/12-827-make-business-your-business-report-on-start-ups>
6. Food Standards agency note warning of peanut hazards in catering operations following two deaths by allergy sufferers <http://www.food.gov.uk/multimedia/pdfs/enforcement/enf-e-12-015.pdf>
7. Food Standards agency allergy management - free online training resources
<http://allergytraining.food.gov.uk/english/>
8. Commission Implementing Regulation (EU) No 468/2012 of 1 June 2012 amending Regulation (EU) No 28/2012 laying down requirements for the certification for imports into and transit through the Union of certain composite products – amendments to certification requirements: <http://eur-lex.europa.eu/LexUriServ/LexUriServ.do?uri=OJ:L:2012:144:0001:0014:EN:PDF>
9. Published in the Official Journal on 25 May: Commission Implementing Regulation (EU) No 433/2012 of 23 May 2012 laying down detailed rules for the application of Regulation (EU) No 1236/2010 of the European Parliament and of the Council laying down a scheme of control and enforcement applicable in the

area covered by the Convention on future multilateral cooperation in the North-East Atlantic fisheries
<http://eur-lex.europa.eu/LexUriServ/LexUriServ.do?uri=OJ:L:2012:136:0041:0093:EN:PDF>

10. Item A note on European Council on Foods for vulnerable groups – food intended for infants and young children and on food for special medical purposes, - now including complete diet replacement intended for weight loss. <http://register.consilium.europa.eu/pdf/en/12/st10/st10086.en12.pdf>
11. Commission Implementing Regulation (EU) No 505/2012 of 14 June 2012 amending and correcting Regulation (EC) No 889/2008 laying down detailed rules for the implementation of Council Regulation (EC) No 834/2007 on organic production and labelling of organic products with regard to organic production, labelling and control <http://eur-lex.europa.eu/LexUriServ/LexUriServ.do?uri=OJ:L:2012:154:0012:0019:EN:PDF>
12. Report from the Commission to the European Parliament and the Council on the application of Council Regulation (EC) No 834/2007 on organic production and labelling of organic products <http://register.consilium.europa.eu/pdf/en/12/st10/st10575.en12.pdf>
13. Commission Implementing Regulation (EU) No 508/2012 of 20 June 2012 amending Regulation (EC) No 1235/2008 laying down detailed rules for implementation of Council Regulation (EC) No 834/2007 as regards the arrangements for imports of organic products from third countries <http://eur-lex.europa.eu/LexUriServ/LexUriServ.do?uri=OJ:L:2012:162:0001:0045:EN:PDF>
14. Communication from the Commission to the European Parliament, the Council and the European Economic and Social Committee on the European Union Strategy for the Protection and Welfare of Animals 2012-2015 <http://register.consilium.europa.eu/pdf/en/12/st05/st05398-re01.en12.pdf>
15. Report from the Commission to the European Parliament and the Council on the impact of Council Regulation (EC) No 1/2005 on the protection of animals during transport <http://register.consilium.europa.eu/pdf/en/11/st16/st16798.en11.pdf>
16. European Food Safety Authority Scientific Opinion on electrical requirements for water bath stunning equipment applicable for poultry <http://www.efsa.europa.eu/en/efsajournal/doc/2757.pdf>
17. Report of the National Audit Office into the Effectiveness of Internal Audit of Central Government - Concluding that quality varies and the service offers poor value for money http://www.nao.org.uk/publications/1213/internal_audit.aspx?utm_source=GovDelivery&utm_medium=email&utm_campaign=naoorguk
18. European commission Proposal for a Regulation on serious cross border threats to health. <http://register.consilium.europa.eu/pdf/en/11/st18/st18509.en11.pdf>
19. Socio-demographic and attitudinal determinants of nutrition knowledge of food shoppers in several EU member states <http://www.sciencedirect.com/science/article/pii/S0950329312000730>
20. New EU Commission website on Plants – GMO's, biosecurity, pesticides etc. http://ec.europa.eu/food/plant/index_en.htm
21. Review of Regulation (EC) No 882/2004 on Official Controls - Working Group on the general application of Regulation (EC) No 882/2004 Brussels, 23 May 2011 Working Paper Nr 1 Vergaderdocument 21 June <http://www.row.minvws.nl/>
22. Department of Health publish annual updates for Public Health Responsibility Deal Partners <http://responsibilitydeal.dh.gov.uk/our-partners/>
23. Committee of Advertising Practise (CAP) guide to misleading advertising and how to avoid the most common issues as found by the advertising standards agency ASA <http://www.cap.org.uk/Media-Centre/2012/Misleading-Advertising.aspx>
24. CAP updated general advice on the advertising of food with health claims <http://www.copyadvice.org.uk/Ad-Advice/Advice-Online-Database/Food-General.aspx>
25. Business Your Business – Report on the help and support available to small and start-up businesses, by Lord Young May 2012 <http://www.bis.gov.uk/assets/biscore/enterprise/docs/m/12-827-make-business-your-business-report-on-start-ups>
26. Department of Health 2011 salt intake survey for England published June 21 <http://transparency.dh.gov.uk/2012/06/21/sodium-levels-among-adults/>

27. Department of Health report into the Nutrient analysis of Eggs prepared by the Norwich Institute of Food Research <http://www.dh.gov.uk/health/files/2012/06/Nutrient-analysis-of-eggs-Analytical-Report.pdf> and summary report <http://www.dh.gov.uk/health/files/2012/06/Nutrient-analysis-of-eggs-Summary-report.pdf> find more on the DoH website <http://www.dh.gov.uk/health/2012/06/nutrient-eggs/>
28. EFSA Launch consultation seeking opinions on GM Animals <http://www.efsa.europa.eu/en/press/news/120621.htm> and guidance on environmental risk assessment of GM Animals <http://www.efsa.europa.eu/en/consultations/call/120621.pdf>
29. Latest FSA Research includes: aflatoxins in brazil nut shells and kernel and arsenic / trace metals speciation in fruit and vegetables <http://www.food.gov.uk/news/newsarchive/2012/july/research>
30. National Measurement office Annual report on Enforcement April 2011 – March 2012 <http://www.bis.gov.uk/assets/nmo/docs/eup/misc/enforcement%20end%20of%20year%20report%20final%202011-12.pdf>
31. Launch of “inspiring the future” giving inspiration careers talks in schools <http://www.bis.gov.uk/news/topstories/2012/Jun/inspiring-the-future>
32. Enterprise and Regulatory reform bill will include legislation to strengthen the UK copyright laws <http://www.bis.gov.uk/news/topstories/2012/Jul/modernising-copyright-to-strengthen-growth>
33. Focus and Enforcement – focus and feedback requested on enforcement and how it is experience in pubs <http://www.bis.gov.uk/news/topstories/2012/Jul/pubs-focus-on-enforcement>
34. Marine Stewardship Council July Newsletter http://www.msc.org/newsroom/updates/archive/msc-international-news-july-2012?utm_campaign=enews-international-in-english_msc-international-news-july-2012&utm_medium=email&utm_source=newsletter
35. UK and Dutch groups sue EU over health claim legislation http://www.nutraingredients.com/Regulation/Major-Dutch-and-UK-groups-sue-EU-over-health-claim-laws/?utm_source=newsletter_daily&utm_medium=email&utm_campaign=Newsletter%2BDaily&c=ci%2BNRUyqOg1Imkc2kXFVjA7KQ7o83m
36. Reach regulations on chemical safety to be reviewed http://www.euractiv.com/sustainability/reach-chemical-safety-review-ope-links dossier-512446?utm_source=EurActiv%20Newsletter&utm_campaign=dd41fee1df-newsletter_daily_update&utm_medium=email
37. Scottish FSA 2012 annual Report on shell fish monitoring and analysis <http://www.food.gov.uk/scotland/news-updates/news/2012/jul/shellfishar>
38. Seafish - voice of the seafood industry announces new board and strategic direction <http://www.seafish.org/about-seafish/news/seafish-announces-new-structure,-strategic-direction-and-plans-for-the-future>
39. FDF Announces first food engineering degree course developed with Sheffield Hallam university <http://www.fdf.org.uk/news.aspx?article=5893>
40. European Food information Council – EUFIC review of fruit and vegetable consumption in the EU <http://www.eufic.org/article/en/show/professionals/expid/Fruit-vegetable-consumption-Europe/>
41. Recent EUFIC Work on sweeteners inc approval of Stevia and the safety of aspartame <http://www.eufic.org/page/en/nutrition/Sweeteners/>
42. Up to date list of all the guidance available from the FSA <http://www.food.gov.uk/multimedia/pdfs/fsapublishedguidance.pdf>
43. Food and Farming – the Foresight Report - one year on – sustainability in food and farming - Professor Sir John Beddington Chief Government Scientific Advisor <http://blogs.bis.gov.uk/blog/2012/05/25/food-and-farming-one-year-on/#comment-35324>
44. Parliamentary Scrutiny Committee on European Regulation view on the UK position on the Common Organisation of markets in fishery products <http://www.publications.parliament.uk/pa/cm201213/cmselect/cmeuleg/86-vii/86vii07.htm>

45. Optimum Seafood Consumption report by the French Food Safety Authority ANSES
http://www.eufic.org/page/en/show/latest-science-news/page/LS/fftid/Boosting_benefits_minimising_risks_optimal_seafood_consumption/
46. FSA Update on Food products and ranges free from colours associated with hyperactivity in children
<http://www.food.gov.uk/news-updates/news/2012/july/burger-king-coca-cola>
47. Food and Veterinary Office (FVO) report on its latest inspection on fishery products in India. The latest report was published on 20 April 2012 and related to a visit carried out in November 2011
http://ec.europa.eu/food/fvo/act_getPDF.cfm?PDF_ID=9496
48. European Food Safety Authority Annual Report 2011
<http://www.efsa.europa.eu/en/corporate/doc/ar11en.pdf> and summary
<http://www.efsa.europa.eu/en/corporate/doc/ars11en.pdf>
49. MMO report : The UK Fishing Industry 2011, Structure and Activity
http://www.marinemanagement.org.uk/fisheries/statistics/documents/ukseafish/2011/structure_activity.pdf
50. FAO Global overview of avian influenza http://www.thepoultrysite.com/articles/contents/fao_birdflu.pdf
51. European Food Safety Authority EFSA report on the use of animal based measures to assess welfare in broilers <http://www.efsa.europa.eu/en/efsajournal/doc/2774.pdf>
52. Use of Ractopamine in Pigs and the evaluation of three different feeding regimes
<http://www.themeatsite.com/articles/1694/use-of-ractopamine-in-pigs>
53. European Commission Staff Working document – sources of external growth – the negotiating and enforcement agenda http://trade.ec.europa.eu/doclib/docs/2012/july/tradoc_149807.pdf
54. BIS publish governments one in one out policy fourth statement of new regulation
<http://www.bis.gov.uk/assets/biscore/better-regulation/docs/o/12-p96b-one-in-one-out-fourth-statement-new-regulation.pdf> and <http://www.bis.gov.uk/policies/bre/one-in-one-out/statement-of-new-regulation>
55. Progress update on the passage of the Grocery Code Adjudicators Bill and the Enterprise and Regulatory reform Bill
https://site2.exch500.serverdata.net/owa/?ae=Item&a=Open&t=IPM.Note&id=RgAAAAAXEvenzqwQ6l67SDNKKnaBwCWe%2bFkH10uRorRDmr5Sq90AAA8UbjAACWe%2bFkH10uRorRDmr5Sq90AAABHb7VAAAA&spid=_1342800332883_906483663
56. Customer information notes and OVS notes issued by Defra in July, including on importation of composite products, food and feed measures on imports from Japan and imports of eggs from third countries
<http://www.defra.gov.uk/animal-trade/cins/>
57. CIN – importation of composite products <http://www.defra.gov.uk/animal-trade/2012/ovs-note-201223-importation-of-composite-products/> <http://www.defra.gov.uk/animal-trade/2012/ovs-note-201223-importation-of-composite-products/>
58. OVS note on the import of consignments from Japan <http://www.defra.gov.uk/animal-trade/2012/ovs-2012-25/> and <http://www.defra.gov.uk/animal-trade/2012/ovs-note-201221-safeguard-measures-for-feed-or-food-from-japan/>
59. Imports of Eggs from third countries <http://www.defra.gov.uk/animal-trade/2012/ovs-note-201222-imports-of-eggs-from-third-countries/>
60. European Commission summary of animal disease outbreaks and when Jan 2012 – 8 July 2012
http://ec.europa.eu/food/animal/diseases/adns/adns_outbreaks_per_disease_en.pdf
61. FSA Announces the appointment of a new chief executive Catherine Brown – previously of AHVLA
<http://www.food.gov.uk/news-updates/news/2012/july/newce>
62. Lessons learned from the 2011 outbreak of Shiga toxin-producing Escherichia coli (STEC) O104:H4 in sprouted seeds http://ec.europa.eu/food/food/biosafety/salmonella/docs/cswd_lessons_learned_en.pdf
63. Extension of remedial action notices in England delayed again – note from FSA to heads of Environmental Health services. Other administrations in place Scotland: 1 April 2012; Northern Ireland: 11 April 2012; Wales: 1 May 2012 <http://www.food.gov.uk/multimedia/pdfs/enforcement/enfe12009.pdf>

64. Commission Regulation (EU) No 610/2012 of 9 July 2012 amending Regulation (EC) No 124/2009 of 10 February 2009 setting maximum levels for the presence of coccidiostats or histomonostats in food resulting from the unavoidable carry-over of these substances in non-target feed <http://eur-lex.europa.eu/LexUriServ/LexUriServ.do?uri=OJ:L:2012:178:0001:0003:EN:PDF>
65. FSA Letter to heads of environmental services on the application of a national health mark to meat, meat products, preparations, minced meat and MSM derived from emergency slaughter animals <http://www.food.gov.uk/multimedia/pdfs/enforcement/enf-e-12-023.pdf>
66. UK Statutory Instrument 1742 / 2012 The Food Hygiene (England) (Amendment) Regulations 2012 http://www.legislation.gov.uk/uksi/2012/1742/pdfs/uksi_20121742_en.pdf ; Wales http://www.legislation.gov.uk/wsi/2012/1765/pdfs/wsi_20121765_mi.pdf ; N Ireland http://www.legislation.gov.uk/nisr/2012/280/pdfs/nisr_20120280_en.pdf ; Scotland http://www.legislation.gov.uk/ssi/2012/75/pdfs/ssi_20120075_en.pdf
67. Food Standards Agency publishes latest research: <http://www.food.gov.uk/news-updates/news/2012/aug/research-july>
68. GS1 report on the impact of the Food Information Regulation in relation to distance selling http://www.gs1.org/docs/b2c/EU_FIR_Impact_Analysis.pdf
69. EIA Chilling Facts Report on HFC Free Cooling goes mainstream http://www.eia-international.org/wp-content/uploads/EIA_ChillFactsIV_FINAL_lo-res.pdf
70. Institute of Refrigeration Guidance Note 18 – Refrigerant selection and system design http://www.ior.org.uk/ior/_images/pdf/GN%2018%20Refrigerant%20Selection%20System%20Design%20and%20the%20role%20of%20HFCs.pdf
71. Defra Concordat on management arrangements for fishing quotas and licensing in the UK <http://www.defra.gov.uk/publications/2012/05/18/pb13771-fish-concordat/>
72. Seafish Aquaculture e alert July 2012 and marine legislation newsletter <http://www.seafish.org/publications-search>
73. Commission Implementing Decision of 24 July 2012 on recognition of the ‘Scottish Quality Farm Assured Combinable Crops Limited’ scheme for demonstrating compliance with the sustainability criteria under Directives 98/70/EC and 2009/28/EC of the European Parliament and of the Council <http://eur-lex.europa.eu/JOHtml.do?uri=OJ:L:2012:198:SOM:EN:HTML>
74. First Compact Anaerobic Digestion AD solution for food waste (inc animal by-products) http://www.edie.net/news/news_story.asp?id=22910 Energy from Waste – contract news http://www.edie.net/news/news_story.asp?id=22911&title=In+brief%3A+Energy%2Dfrom%2Dwaste+contract+news+
75. Department for Business, Innovation and Skills consultation on clarifying and simplifying consumer law. <http://www.bis.gov.uk/Consultations/consultation-rationalising-modernising-consumer-law?cat=open>
76. The report Legionella outbreaks and HSE investigations; an analysis of contributory factors was commissioned in 2011 and is available at http://www.hse.gov.uk/research/hsl_pdf/2012/hex1207 The safety notice Management of the risks from legionella in cooling towers and evaporative condensers can be read in full at: <http://www.hse.gov.uk/safetybulletins/coolingtowers.htm> HSE’s guidance on managing legionella risk is available to download free: <http://www.hse.gov.uk/legionnaires/what-you-must-do.htm>
77. Defra Food Statistics pocketbook 2011 <http://www.defra.gov.uk/statistics/files/defra-stats-foodfarm-food-pocketbook-120402.pdf>
78. Family Food Pocketbook 2010 Detailed statistical information on purchased quantities, expenditure and nutrient intakes derived from both household and eating out food and drink. <http://www.defra.gov.uk/statistics/files/defra-stats-foodfarm-food-familyfood-2010-120328.pdf>
79. Comparative Country of Origin Report 2012 carried out by Camden, commissioned by Defra http://randd.defra.gov.uk/Document.aspx?Document=10088_CoOLReport2012.pdf
80. Amendments to border inspection posts - Commission Implementing Decision of 27 July 2012 amending Decision 2009/821/EC as regards the list of border inspection posts (notified under document C(2012) 5187) <http://eur-lex.europa.eu/LexUriServ/LexUriServ.do?uri=OJ:L:2012:203:0068:0070:EN:PDF>

81. Veterinary Border Inspection Posts UK Contacts

http://ec.europa.eu/food/animal/bips/contact/contact_uk.pdf and Veterinary Border Inspection Posts – EU Contacts http://ec.europa.eu/food/animal/bips/bips_contact_en.htm

Members of the British Frozen Food Federation requiring further information about any item in this newsletter should contact Su Dakin, Technical Manager

Warwick House Tel: 01400 283090 / 283094 (dir) Fax: 01400 283098

Registered Office: Warwick House, Unit 7, Long Bennington Business Park, Main Road, Long Bennington, Newark, Nottinghamshire NG23 5JR A company limited by guarantee. Registered in England and Wales No. 7687541 VAT Reg. No. GB 115 5466 23