FSA Board Meeting - June 2025: Agenda and Papers

Crowne Plaza, Central Square, Holliday Street, Birmingham, B1 1HH

The agenda for this meeting includes:

- Next steps for National Level Regulation
- Market Authorisation Modernisation
- Evaluation of the Meat Charging Discount Regime
- Annual Report of Incidents, Resilience and Prevention 2024/25
- Glycerol in slushie ice drinks
- Annual Science Update from FSA's Chief Scientific Adviser
- FSA Strategy: Annual Update on Progress Indicators
- Report from the Director of FSA in Northern Ireland

09:00 Chairs Introduction and Chairs Report

Professor Susan Jebb presents the minutes and actions from the previous FSA Board meeting in March 2025 and presents the Chair's report.

FSA 25/06/01 - Minutes of 26 March 2025 Board Meeting

FSA 25/06/02 - Actions Arising

09:20 Chief Executive's Report

Katie Pettifer presents the Chief Executive's report to the FSA Board.

FSA 25/06/03 - Chief Executive's Report

09:50 Immediate next steps for National Level Regulation (FSA 25/06/04)

Andrew Ashworth presents a paper outlining extensive stakeholder engagement and next steps for National Level Regulation.

FSA 25/06/04 - National Level Regulation

10:10 Market Authorisation Modernisation (FSA 25/06/05)

Rebecca Sudworth presents a paper setting out the FSA's proposals for further reforms to the market authorisation service for regulated food and feed products.

FSA 25/06/05 - Market Authorisation Modernisation

10:45 - Break

11:05 Evaluation of the Meat Charging Discount Regime (FSA 25/06/06)

Dr James Cooper provides the Board with an update on the outcome of the work to consider the operation and purpose of the current discount regime.

FSA 25/06/06 - Evaluation of the Meat Charging Discount Regime

11:40 Annual Report of Incidents, Resilience and Prevention 2024/25 (FSA 25/06/07)

Junior Johnson provides an overview of the work the FSA does in managing and responding to incidents.

FSA 25/06/07 - Annual Report of Incidents, Resilience and Prevention 2024/25

12:10 - Glycerol in slushie ice drinks (FSA 25/06/08)

Rebecca Sudworth and Dr James Cooper will present this paper.

FSA 25/06/08 - Glycerol in slushie ice drinks

12:45 - Lunch

13:30 Annual Science Update from FSA's Chief Scientific Adviser (FSA 25/06/09)

Professor Robin May presents his fifth annual report to the Board as the FSA's Chief Scientific Adviser.

FSA 25/06/09 - Annual Science Update from FSA's Chief Scientific Adviser

13:50 FSA Strategy: Annual Update on Progress Indicators (FSA 25/06/10)

Rachel Cooper presents a paper to the board to update on the progress of the FSA Strategy and Three Year Corporate Plan.

FSA 25/06/10 - FSA Strategy: Annual Update on Progress Indicators

14:10 Report from the Director of FSA in Northern Ireland (FSA 25/06/11)

Anjali Juneja and Andy Cole give an annual update to the Board on the work in Northern Ireland to deliver the FSA priorities.

FSA 25/06/11 - Report from the Director of FSA in Northern Ireland

14:30 Report from the Chair of the Audit and Risk Assurance Committee (INFO 25/06/01)

The Chair of the Audit and Risk Assurance Committee (ARAC), Anthony Harbinson, presents a report from the ARAC meeting that took place on 10 June 2025.

INFO 25/06/01 - Report from the Chair of the Audit and Risk Assurance Committee

14:40 Report from the Chair of the Business Committee (INFO 25/06/02)

The Chair of the Business Committee, Timothy Riley, presents a report from the Business Committee meeting that took place on 9 June 2025.

INFO 25/06/02 - Report from the Chair of the Business Committee

14:50 Reports from the Chairs of the Food Advisory Committees (oral reports)

The Chairs of the Northern Ireland Food Advisory Committee (NIFAC), Anthony Harbinson, and the Wales Food Advisory Committee (WFAC), Rhian Hayward, deliver oral updates from the recent meetings of the two Committees.

14:55 - Any Other Business

15:00 - End of Meeting

Questions to the FSA Board

We are keen to ensure, as far as is practical, that questions are addressed in the discussion at the Board meeting. Notwithstanding discussions on the day, all questions will receive a written reply within 20 working days of the meeting.

Please note questions are listed below in the order in which they were received.

Question 1

From: A Private Individual who wishes to remain anonymous

The proposal suggests that ministers empower the FSA/FSS to take market authorisation decisions. However, it remains unclear how — or even whether — this mechanism will be operationalised in a transparent, and reviewable way. We are particularly concerned, given that the FSA has, in the past, declined to publish critical information that directly impact regulated product (ref: FOI IC-177160-S0R7). In 2019, the EU introduced sweeping changes to the EU food law transparency framework (EU) 2019/1381 relating to the European Food Safety Authority (

EFSA) — including rules on risk communication, access to studies, and public consultation. However, this has not been transposed into GB law.

Our experience with the FOI, calls into question the FSA's willingness to uphold transparency, hence my question:

- Will reasons for authorisation decisions, and the supporting evidence (including external risk assessments), be published in full?
- How will the FSA be held accountable if there is a perception of regulatory capture or a loss of impartiality?

The delegation of authority is not inherently problematic — but doing so without enforceable transparency standards and safeguards, risks further eroding public trust.

Answer 1

The FSA are committed to transparency in our market authorisation process. We publish a register of validated applications on our website, and we publish all risk assessments in accordance with legislative requirements. All proposed authorisations are subject to public consultation.

Our recent reforms which came into force in April of this year, established public registers on our website which provide accessible information on authorisation decisions. These reform proposals will not change our commitment to transparency.

The proposals are subject to ministerial agreement and would also be subject to public consultation to ensure that stakeholders views are taken into account as they are further developed.

Question 2

From: Dr Mark Tallon, Managing Partner, Legal Products Group Ltd

Please provide a response to the current questions regarding novel foods submissions:

1. Please can the board provide an update on the current status of CBD novel food submissions that now are in the risk management phase given it has been over 12 months since some submissions completed the safety assessment.
2. When will these be sent to ministers for authorisation?
3. When is the likely time frame these final decisions are made so that companies can make a decision on next steps should the current ADI set by the FSA remains in place despite consideration of label warnings that should resolve concerns over vulnerable groups.

Answer 2

Thank you for your question to the FSA Board about progress on CBD applications for which safety assessments have been published. As was confirmed at the FSA Board meeting on 18 June, the FSA expects to consult on the first recommendations for authorisation of CBD food products as novel foods in the coming months. The timing of decisions will depend on the outcome of the 12-week consultation, and the final decisions on authorisation will rest with Ministers.

The consultation on this is likely to focus on a smaller group of applications for CBD isolates but many of the factors under consideration will be relevant for CBD food products more widely. Depending on the outcomes of the consultation, the work the FSA has done during risk

management on these applications should pave the way for a more routine approach for subsequent consultations on similar applications for CBD isolates and synthetic CBD.

The FSA has taken a proactive and pragmatic approach to the regulation of CBD. Many of the decisions we are taking in risk management have no international precedent and as such we have need to take extra time to ensure that the correct conclusions have been reached and our recommendation to ministers are sound. Due to the intersections with drugs policy and legislation, it has also been necessary to work with others across government to ensure a consistent approach.

We are grateful for the constructive way in which the CBD industry has worked with us as we bring the CBD market into compliance, and we understand your desire for more certainty about the regulatory position.

The FSA has recently updated its policy with respect to the reformulation and relabelling of CBD food products on the public list and updated its guidance accordingly. We engaged with the CBD industry over this policy change to the public list ahead of the launch of our new business guidance. This engagement was met positively by industry representatives and the new advice to businesses should give stakeholders certainty on the standards that the FSA now expects them to meet.

We are now encouraging businesses to reformulate and relabel their products (where required) to meet the FSA's standards with respect to the provisional acceptable daily intake (ADI) of 10mg/day. We have also encouraged businesses to include the FSA's consumer advice for vulnerable groups on product labels. This approach allows businesses to do the right thing for consumer safety while progressing towards full regulatory compliance.

The FSA recommends that consumers limit their consumption of CBD in line with the provisional ADI. This is based on the best available scientific evidence and advice from our Scientific Advisory Committees, who have concluded that no harm is expected for the general consumer population when consuming CBD at 10mg a day.

Question 3

From: Charlotte Flores, Research Associate, Bryant Research

What is the potential impact of the UK-EU SPS agreement on the FSAs ongoing and upcoming regulatory plans and initiatives for novel foods?

Answer 3

As outlined in the 19 May UK-EU Summit common understanding document, an SPS Agreement will involve alignment with EU law across areas in scope (including sanitary, phytosanitary, food safety and consumer protection rules, the regulation of live animals and pesticides, organics, and marketing standards), unless an exception based on specified criteria is agreed. Market authorisations of regulated products, including novel foods, will fall within the scope of negotiations.

The FSA is committed to our mission to ensure that food is safe and what it says it is as part of an SPS Agreement. Officials will continue to work as transparently as possible with our stakeholders, including industry, as we engage closely with other Government departments across the UK and input public health considerations into the negotiations and will update once further details are available.

Question 4

From: Andrea Martinez-Inchausti, BRC

Our members have noticed an increase number of approaches by companies trying to sell them new innovative ingredients, often not aware of the legal restrictions and at times blatantly mentioning ways of circumventing the law. E.g. for ashwagandha, a number of suppliers have contacted members claiming they are getting around the legal issues by classifying their ingredient as a supplement, when they are clearly not. Another area where this is happening is on 'natural alternatives' to additives being proposed. This is related to the UPF agenda. Many of these ingredients are functioning as an additive and therefore they are unapproved additives. Our members are responsible companies with regulatory resources and push back on these proposals, but there is a proliferation of products containing them on the market, which creates a two tier approach, which put our members at a commercial disadvantage. Is FSA prioritising clarity of messaging, clear guidance to enforcement authorities and focusing on an early understanding of what ingredients are going to be an issue?

Answer 4

We would like to thank the BRC for raising their concerns about some food companies not complying with legislation relevant to new, innovative ingredients, including novel foods and food additives legislation.

Before placing a food product on the market, Food Business Operators (FBOs) should ensure that they comply with all relevant food legislation, including, but not limited to, general food law, novel food requirements and food supplements legislation (if a product is being marketed as such). FBOs must know the identity of the ingredients which are incorporated into their intended product as well as the intended use of each component. For example, the FBO must know whether the intended use of a given part is for use in food, food supplements, or both.

The FSA has an advisory role to enforcement authorities (Local Authorities in this instance). Decisions to take enforcement action on the basis that a product is an unauthorised novel food or an unauthorised food additive, ultimately lies with individual enforcement authorities, based on the specifics of each case. When the FSA becomes aware of products using ingredients that are not authorised, we share that information with enforcement authorities.

On the examples of ingredients mentioned in the question, our approach is as follows:

1. The FSA has a role in relation to food supplements safety, which includes responding to food incidents with risk management advice. The FSA also has responsibility for supplement specific policy in Northern Ireland and works closely with all other UK departments that have policy responsibility for food supplements (DHSC in England, Welsh Government in Wales and Food Standards Scotland).

The FSA has published advice and guidance on food supplements and this includes the definition of a food supplement, namely: "A food supplement is defined as 'any food, the purpose of which is to supplement the normal diet, and which is a concentrated source of a vitamin or mineral or other substance with a nutritional or physiological effect, alone or in combination and is sold in dose form' (Food Supplements Regulations 2023)."

The FSA's advice to enforcement authorities and FBOs on ashwagandha outlines the forms in which it is considered 'novel' and when it is considered 'not novel'. We also mention that FBOs need to consider relevant legislation that defines when a product is a food and when it is a food supplement. If there are concerns about ashwagandha as an ingredient being classified as a food supplement, then this should be reported to the relevant local authority for investigation. Businesses who market food supplements will need to fully comply with the legal requirements specifically for food supplements, alongside all other relevant food legislation.

2. The ‘FSA LINK’ platform (which replaced ‘Smarter Comms’) is one way we advise enforcement authorities on issues with unapproved food additives being sold as permitted food ingredients. An example is Zein (maize protein) which was used as a glazing agent on chocolate. The FSA informed enforcement authorities and businesses that this was an unpermitted food additive which could not be used on food.

Question 5

From: David Owen

In light of video evidence showing an FSA-approved Veterinary Officer (VO) at the Old Arley slaughterhouse witnessing clear incidents of animal abuse without intervening, will the FSA consider taking disciplinary action against the VO involved? Furthermore, will the FSA consider introducing measures to make such a failure to act in the face of animal cruelty a criminal offence, given the VO's legal and ethical responsibility to uphold animal welfare standards?

Answer 5

The legal responsibility for meeting animal welfare regulations lies with the Food Business. One of FSA's senior vets reviewed the footage and other evidence and concluded that the Official Veterinarian took appropriate action in their communication with the slaughter operatives and enforcement action was subsequently taken against the business. The FSA works closely with Official Veterinarians to respond to all incidents where Animal Welfare is compromised.

Question 6

From: Carolyn McKay

It has recently come to our attention that the abattoir located in our village, Old Arley, has become a member of the Association of Independent Meat Suppliers (AIMS) and may have engaged their support in reapplying for a slaughter licence. As you are aware, the Food Standards Agency previously revoked this facility’s licence due to serious animal welfare breaches and ongoing non-compliance with required improvements. We would be grateful if you could provide the following information: How many FSA slaughter licence revocations or rejections have AIMS successfully appealed on behalf of their members?

Answer 6

We understand this question to be referring to the withdrawal of an establishment's approval, rather than the revocation of an individual's Certificate of Competence (which are sometimes called slaughter licences), and have provided a response on this basis. There is no obligation for a Food Business Operator to inform the FSA if they are being represented by an industry body or not, and therefore the FSA would not have a record of which plants are members of an industry body, including AIMS.

Since 2011, the FSA has withdrawn 21 approvals. In that period there have been two successful appeals against FSA decisions to withdraw or refuse approval.

Question 7

From: Diana Tumova

The upcoming SPS agreement between the EU and the UK.

Could you please list EU regulations where full alignment will be expected, and which are within and outside the scope? Could you specify the time given to businesses to prepare for the upcoming changes and planned support?

What will be the estimated timescale of the published regulatory overview related to the EU-UK agreement?

Answer 7

As outlined in the 19 May UK-EU Summit common understanding document, the SPS Agreement covers sanitary, phytosanitary, food safety and general consumer protection rules applicable to the production, distribution and consumption of agrifood products, the regulation of live animals and pesticides, the rules on organics as well as marketing standards applicable to certain sectors or products. In addition, the SPS Agreement may include a short list of limited exceptions to dynamic alignment based on specified criteria.

It is too early in this process to provide the information that you have asked for. The UK Government is yet to enter formal negotiations with the EU that will set out the exact detail of alignment with EU rules and how these will be implemented. Until then, businesses should continue to comply with existing rules, including the Border Target Operating Model (BTOM).

Question 8

From: John Mettrick, Chair, Abattoir Sector Group

The limitations of the current delivery of the meat inspection system are well known. But despite significant technological and scientific advances there has been no significant reform in recent years. In its early years, the Agency was one of the global leaders pressing for change, but its voice is now non-existent. UK Devolution, leaving the EU and recent international trade changes appear to have been viewed more as a brake on change rather than as opportunities. Will the Board reignite the FSA's leadership in providing modern risk-based controls?

Answer 8

The FSA Board discussed divergence after industry consultation in 2022, and the decision was to slow down any further work on legislative change for the delivery of Official Controls to ensure progress was aligned to any wider policy and legislative changes. Any future review of the delivery of meat inspection controls will require close cooperation with the EU following the completion of the current SPS negotiations.

Question 9

From: John Mettrick, Chair, Abattoir Sector Group

Does the board agree that the abattoir network, comprising of all sizes across the UK, makes a vital contribution to national food security, and as such the FSA must be seen to address the challenges and opportunities that all abattoirs face?

Answer 9

The meat industry is a vital part of the food supply chain, and part of our national food security. The FSA recognises challenges faced to the sector and will continue to work with industry representatives to identify areas for support as well as seizing opportunities for improvements and efficiencies. The Board paper and discussions on charging for official controls reflected the range

of benefits that a diverse network of abattoirs brings and effective support is at the centre of the FSA's approach.

Question 10

From: Elizabeth Lewis, Secretary General, AIC, BAFSAM, BETA and UK Pet Food (Joint Question)

AIC, BAFSAM, BETA and UK Pet Food are fully supportive of the FSA plans to have an accurate and transparent GB Register of Feed Additives which can be readily modified and amended. However, the update of the GB Feed Additive Register on 1st April 2025 resulted in the removal and revocation of a number of additives in use by the feed industry without prior notice, communication, consultation or (where applicable) transition periods. These actions are entirely without precedent in the industry's long and collaborative engagement with FSA and caused significant market disruption. We are concerned that the process has not been consistent with the stated aim of the FSA to support business and help deliver growth and investment while maintaining high standards of food safety. The issue has also raised concerns within industry over the governance of decision-making by the executive, particularly over the need to consult with industry when changes to regulation severely impact the functioning of the market. Feed industry representatives would ask the Board to consider if there is a need to review governance procedures in light of this?

Answer 10

Thank you for your question to the FSA Board.

Transparency is a guiding principle for the FSA, and we apologise for the concern and frustration that our failure to communicate in a timely manner in this instance has caused your members.

In preparation for the initial legislative reforms to the market authorisation process coming into force in April, the previous regulated products registers (including the feed additives register) were replaced with new registers. Following the removal of statutory instruments, ministerial decisions are now the legal basis for feed additive authorisations, and the new registers have now become the primary source of information for all stakeholders on the regulated products authorised for market in Great Britain.

As authorisations were transferred to the new registers, checks highlighted existing, but previously unidentified, issues with some authorisations. It was not feasible to delay publication of the new register while these issues were resolved and so it was decided to omit entries where a problem was identified, until authorisation status could be clarified. We recognise this approach could have been much better communicated. Many of these issues have been resolved and teams within the FSA and FSS have been working at pace to resolve remaining issues and address them through regular updates to industry, and to the register itself.

Please note, this was an extraordinary situation. We are committed to transparency in our approach to reforms of the market authorisation process. We publish all safety assessment outcomes in accordance with legislative requirements and all proposed authorisations are subject to public consultation.

We value the working relationships we have with your organisations and have taken the feedback on board. Our Director of Policy met with you recently to discuss the issues and how communication can be improved, and we hope that a similar situation in future is prevented.