

Annex 1 Written Comments Received from Companies

NB The comments listed in this Annex were received by the Food Standards Agency in response to notification of their individual results from the companies concerned and reflect their views.

From: Aryt Food, Hamont Achel, Belgium

We at Aryt Food have been producing halal products for years. During this period we have only obtained our injection mix from professional mix-suppliers that have supplied us with written specifications in which they confirm that there is only pure poultry protein / chicken protein in the injection mix. We have to be able to confide in this, and unfortunately it now turns out we cannot. We cannot take any responsibility for illegal actions from other companies and we find that companies like these, should be held responsible for fraude, and not we. In June of this year we have decided to change our mix supplier once more, this time using a product that does not contain any proteins whatsoever. This decision was made because we wanted to be in control of the quality, and not rely on third parties anymore. This way we can be sure that we will not have to deal with this issue ever again, and we are sure of the quality of the product.

From: De Kippenhof BV, Ermelo, Netherlands

At the time that we received your letters stating that you were doing surveys on our chicken breast meat, we had already optically noticed that the product was wetter than normal and we had ordered extra measures to check this.

Your latter dated 9-11-2001 in fact confirmed what we already found in our own analyses.

Investigations have shown that the raw materials that we had imported were extremely wet, which indicates that they had most likely been, which indicates that they had most likely been injected already. We have found values till

60%, but we must admit 55% is extremely poor and we have not found a result like this before.

We have therefore taken following actions:

- End of July we have terminated our relationship with the supplier of those raw materials
- We have set up a higher frequency of analyses on incoming raw materials from new suppliers
- We take corrective action immediately in case of irregularities.

This has proven no more meat-percentages.

We are convinced that this problem has been solved and we hope this will enable you to amplify your survey.

Should you have any questions, please do not hesitate to contact us.

From: Gebr van der Ven, Lierop, Netherlands

We are a packing/trading company, with our own poultry EEC number (NL 5664 EEG). We pack or deal poultry products for Export (mainly former Eastblock). The chickenbreastfillet with added water, we never deal! in January 2001 we obtained three pallets of chickenbreastfillet from Aryt Food. We packed it and sold it to a trader in England. That is also the only added water produce we ever sold whole year! This means that we sold it, going from the point, that it is a correct product. Now we are very surprised of the results of the survey.

From: F. Slegtenhorst B.V., Zevenhuizen, Netherlands

The conclusion that the meat content mentioned on the label is not showing the real meat content is wrong and based upon poor use of scientific tools:

1. The percentage of meat content mentioned on the label using the nitrogen factor of 3.7 as also mentioned on the label is correct. The nitrogen factor of 3.7 is commonly used in Holland.
2. In case you use another nitrogen factor than the factor mentioned on the label you can expect to find another calculated percentage of meat content

in the sample than mentioned on the label. That does not prove that the information on the label is wrong.

3. Using the wrong nitrogen factor of 3.85, already knowing from the study of the AMC that the average nitrogen found by the AMC for this type of product is 3.82, is not correct.
4. "Average" means that some analyses show a higher percentage where other analyses show lower percentages. If you take your job seriously you should determine the range of possible factors and thus the range of possible percentages of meat content before you can judge the information on the label.

From: Superkip, Oss, Netherlands

Superkip supports the FSA investigations and it's findings, it is only through this piece of investigation that supplier's intent on deceiving their customers and in turn the customers are exposed!

On receipt of the FSA report regarding min meat content and added hydrolyzed proteins in chicken breasts fillets. Superkip has demonstrated to the FSA that all reasonable steps are taken to ensure that our product is produced and labelled to the highest standards in accordance with the current European Legislation.

Superkip is a reputable company, which is approved by the Dutch government supporting a full HACCP system as well as being BRC higher level approved. We have production methods in place at the factory to ensure that our product is produced to the highest standards. However on receipt of this report and further investigations through our HACCP system we have found that a number of raw materials used at the factory were deficient in meat content prior to production, this in turn has given a negative reading in some of our products.

We at Superkip would like to assure all of our customers that controls are now in place to check raw materials used in our factory for min meat content levels prior to production.