MINUTES OF THE FSA BOARD MEETING ON 16 JUNE 2021

Via Zoom from the Chair's Residence, Liverpool

Present:
Ruth Hussey, Interim Chair; Lord Blencathra; Fiona Gately; Margaret Gilmore; Colm McKenna; Peter Price; Timothy Riley; Mark Rolfe.

Officials Attending

Emily Miles	-	Chief Executive (CE)
Amie Adkin	-	Head of Risk Assessment (for paper FSA 21/06/07)
Justin Everard	-	Acting Director of Communications (For Questions for the Board)
Chris Hitchen	-	Director of Finance and Performance
Michael Jackson	-	Head of Regulatory Compliance Division (for paper FSA 21/05/02)
Maria Jennings	-	Director of Regulatory Compliance, People and Northern Ireland (NI)
Professor Robin May	-	Chief Scientific Adviser (CSA)
Rick Mumford	-	Deputy Director of Science, Evidence and Research
Michelle Patel	-	Head of Social Science (for paper FSA 21/06/06)
Steven Pollock	-	Interim Director of Strategy, Legal, Communications and Governance
Rebecca Sudworth	-	Director of Policy
Colin Sullivan	-	Chief Operating Officer
Professor Sandy Thomas	-	Chair of the Science Council (for paper FSA 21/06/09)
Dr Paul Turner	-	Chair of the Science Council Working Group 5 of Food Hypersensitivity (for paper FSA 21/06/09)

Apologies

Julie Pierce	-	Director Openness, Data, Digital, Science and Wales

1. Welcome and Introductions

1.1 The Chair welcomed everyone to the meeting noting apologies from Julie Pierce and noting that Colm McKenna would be joining the meeting ahead of FSA 21/06/07. This would be the first Board meeting for new Members Lord David Blencathra and Fiona Gately.

1.2 The Chair noted that the incoming Chair of the Food Standards Agency Professor Susan Jebb was watching the meeting, welcomed her, and invited her to say a few words of introduction. Professor Jebb said she was looking forward to getting involved and meeting Board colleagues and stakeholders when she took up her post from 1 July.

1.3 The Chair asked Board Members to declare any conflicts of interest emerging from the agenda. None were raised. The Chair asked if any Board Members had any additional business they would like to raise. No additional business was proposed.

1.4 The Chair invited Justin Everard, Acting Director of Communications, to read out the questions received from the public ahead of the meeting. A full list of the questions, with answers would be published on the FSA website in due course.

2. Minutes of 9 March 2021 Board Meeting (FSA 21/06/01)

2.1 The Chair asked if the Board had any comments on the Minutes of 9 March 2021 Board Meeting. No comments were received, and the minutes were agreed as an accurate record of that meeting.

3. Minutes of 26 May 2021 Board Meeting (FSA 21/06/01)

3.1 The Chair asked if the Board had any comments on the minutes of the Board meeting of the 26 May. No comments were received, and the minutes were agreed as an accurate record of that meeting

4. Actions Arising (FSA 21/06/03)

4.1 The Chair asked if there were any comments on the actions arising. No comments were received, and the Board indicated that they were content with progress on the actions.

5. Chair's Report (Oral Report)

5.1 The Chair said that, when the new Chair began their term on the 1 July, she would return to her previous role as Deputy Chair. A list of the Chair's engagements since the March Board meeting had been published on the FSA website. There was no Chief Executive's (CE's) report to the Board for this meeting due to the short period since the Report received at the 26 May Board meeting. There would be a report from the CE to the Business Committee immediately following this Board Meeting.

6. Annual Report from FSA's Chief Scientific Adviser (FSA 21/06/04)

6.1 Professor Robin May, the Chief Scientific Adviser (CSA) gave an overview of the report, thanking his predecessor in the role, Professor Guy Poppy, for delivering a thorough hand-over, enabling him to become quickly established in the role. He highlighted four recommendations outlined in the report relating to: the Scientific Advisory Committees (SACs); external calls for research; the

aspiration for face-to-face interaction with stakeholders; and engagement with other government departments.

6.2 Margaret Gilmore said that it was surprising that external researchers may not be aware of external research calls. The CSA said that all applications for external tenders must be received through a portal that was significantly different from the grant application portals that were used by most universities and research institutes. Academics had a tendency not to look to government departments as a source of funding but there were relatively simple measures that could be put in place to increase the visibility of these external calls in academia.

6.3 Margaret asked about the impact of COVID-19 mitigation measures on levels of foodborne disease and how quickly data could be analysed to identify effective measures. The CSA said it was difficult to know what the data looked like for last year as so much was received through GP surgeries where attendance had been very low over the previous year due to the pandemic. It was unclear whether this indicated a drop in foodborne disease or simply a drop in GP surgery attendance. He said as restrictions were lifted and the situation returned to normal, it would become clearer what the impacts from the pandemic were on foodborne disease.

6.4 Margaret asked about whether there was a risk that some aspects of trade deals negotiated following EU Exit could undermine work around anti-microbial resistance (AMR). The CSA said that the FSA was engaged across government and internationally on AMR issues. It was key that standards across the entire food-chain were upheld globally. The CSA also highlighted meetings he and the CE had held with Responsible Use of Medicines in Agriculture (RUMA) with engagement ongoing.

6.5 Margaret noted that food labelling responsibilities were distributed across a number of departments and in different ways across the nations of the UK. She asked what an optimal structure for these responsibilities within government would look like. The CSA said that a cross-departmental workshop was being convened for July to discuss both short and long-term term labelling ambitions.

6.6 Mark Rolfe welcomed the comments in the report that highlighted the continued need for access to laboratory capacity. The CSA said that this was an ongoing conversation across government to ensure that the best technology and expertise to deliver the FSA's science was available.

6.7 Timothy Riley said that it would be good to see more focus on health economics and asked how data from this, along with other sources could be used to inform consumers. The CSA said the FSA had good links across government to economic data and opportunities for data sharing to present information to consumers.

6.8 Lord Blencathra asked a question about the use of digital innovations and the potential for accelerated working or financial saving from utilising these innovations. The CSA said that ideally, the more data that was available, the

better. However, as with all things, there was a trade-off between the cost of gathering additional data and the benefit it may provide. He also pointed out that data harvesting and analytics were powerful ways to produce conclusions without necessarily needing to increase the amount of more resource-intensive laboratory research. This approach was in line with that being taken across government. The CSA noted that DNA sequencing technology was a fast-moving field with powerful applications to food safety. A major cross-departmental funding bid with Defra and DHSC colleagues in this area was currently under consideration by Treasury and, if funded, would produce insights into the epidemiology of food-borne pathogens.

6.9 Peter Price said that the CSA had attended a recent meeting of the Welsh Food Advisory Committee (WFAC). WFAC had noted that a number of Welsh research and education institutions were available as sources for external research. The CSA said that there was engagement with research institutions in Wales and across the UK, noting that restriction on travel had meant he had been unable to travel thus far to Wales personally to engage with stakeholders there.

6.10 Peter recommended the development of a more user-friendly digital platform to increase the visibility of research calls. The CSA accepted that the visibility of research calls generally was low, and this was exacerbated in areas where there were relatively fewer research institutions. The key to improving this would be through engagement.

6.11 Peter mentioned issues around food affordability, noting that this was a frequent area of concern for WFAC. He asked how information from consumer tracking could be used to address these issues. The CSA said that the FSA was committed to transparency in evidence and keen to ensure that FSA data would be published.

6.12 Fiona Gately asked about the extent of involvement with industry scientists. The CSA said that there was industry representation on the SACs. He accepted restrictions on travel over the past 12 months had meant that there had been less engagement than would have been liked but it was intended that this would increase. The FSA had also, through the consumer insight team, engaged in sharing behavioural consumer data with retailers to guide science.

6.13 The Chair noted the need to develop and maintain relationships with the new UK Health Security Agency as well as public health agencies and health departments across the UK.

7. Strategic Priorities for FSA Policy and Regulation (FSA 21/06/05)

7.1 Rebecca Sudworth gave a summary of issues addressed in the paper noting the application of guiding principles across the FSA and the focus on industry and consumer engagement.

7.2 Lord Blencathra asked about the absence of focus on obesity, acknowledging that nutrition was not part of the FSA's core remit in England but highlighting the overlap between food safety and nutrition where poor nutrition had an impact on public health through obesity. He asked what scope the FSA had for influencing work in this area.

7.3 Rebecca explained that the FSA had a responsibility for the consumer's wider interest in relation to food and that the FSA would work in partnership across government to achieve this. The CE said that, later in the year, the Board would be considering a paper on the FSA's strategy and this would be the place to consider the issue. The Novel Foods authorisation process allows consideration of nutritional impacts where a novel food is designed to replace a traditional food.

7.4 Maria Jennings explained that, in Northern Ireland, though the FSA had responsibility for nutrition and worked with partner organisations to deliver the 10 year obesity prevention strategy, the FSA led on a small number of the outcomes. These focussed on issues around reformulation and the provision of guidance to caterers. The FSA in Northern Ireland also led on nutrition labelling. The Chair noted that the FSA was not responsible for the whole obesity policy in Northern Ireland but had an opportunity to contribute, in support of other agencies, to improve health outcomes.

7.5 Margaret Gilmore asked if there could be summary prepared for the Board on where the FSA's remit could give scope to contribute to and influence the cross-government obesity agenda, in particular to consider what was possible within the powers, remit and budget the FSA currently had. Rebecca agreed that this would be helpful and could form part of the future Board discussions on strategy. The Chair agreed that a paper on this would be useful.

7.6 Peter Price noted the overlap between food standards and food safety and suggested that using the terms separately could create an impression that they are always separate issues. The term 'food standards' had within it the scope to include anything within food that could be harmful and could therefore be said to include food safety issues. This would also cover consumers' wider interests in relation to food that the FSA considered in relation to nutritional composition. Using this terminology could help bridge the gap between the FSA's current remit with regard to nutrition and any potential changes that might occur in the future that could see the FSA taking a greater role in that area.

Action 1 - **FSA Strategy Director to prepare a paper on whether and where the FSA's current remit could give scope to contribute to and influence the cross-government obesity agenda.**

7.7 Lord Blencathra asked about labelling requirements for on-line food vendors. Rebecca said that all food businesses were obliged to provide the relevant information around food composition including allergen content. This could be done in various ways but the requirement to provide it was clear and the FSA provided guidance for how this could best be done. Changes to labelling requirements were underway with legislation around pre-packed for direct sale (PPDS) allergen labelling although this did not apply to online sales.

7.8 Timothy Riley asked how innovative approaches could be used to allow the FSA to act as an example when working in partnership with other departments or organisations. He mentioned work around ultra-processed foods as an area where the FSA would need to collaborate with other organisations and had an opportunity to demonstrate innovation. Rebecca said that for consideration of the regulatory regime it would be important to collaborate across government on a range of issues. Ultra-processed foods were not a legally defined category but food additives could be captured by novel foods legislation and the FSA would share methodologies with partners across government in its approach.

7.9 Margaret noted that the FSA had fed into government considerations about folic acid fortification and the strategy for this had not yet been published. Maria Jennings explained that there was now four-country support for mandating folic acid and that health departments were progressing legislation which would be seen later in the year.

7.10 Margaret suggested that further consideration be given to how the FSA could contribute to easing of issues arising from the Northern Ireland Protocol (NIP). Rebecca said that the FSA would ensure that clear information was provided to both businesses and consumers to ensure that the issues that could potentially arise from the implementation of the NIP were well understood, and the impacts mitigated. Support was also being provided to Local Authority (LA) delivery partners in Northern Ireland.

7.11 Fiona Gately said that there was strategic work to be done on the guiding principles, including ensuring that the language used was not misleading to businesses about the robustness of the regulatory regime. Rebecca said that it was useful to reflect on the language used to ensure precision.

7.12 The Chair considered the requests that the paper made of the Board, saying the Board wanted to be actively engaged and looked forward to further strategic discussions.

8. Annual Report on Horizon Scanning Programme (FSA 21/06/06)

8.1 Michelle Patel delivered a presentation covering information sources, signal reading, drivers for change, and the pathway to impact.

8.2 Margaret Gilmore asked if enough was being done around issues such as Gene Modification (GM) technology and cultured meat to be able to properly advise consumers. The CSA said there was a lot being done already to communicate complex scientific issues to consumers, including an FSA Explains video on GM. If lab grown meat were to clear the approvals process and become available to consumers, a similar approach would be taken with that. Timothy Riley said that there would be value in publishing more materials related to other issues raised in the paper to help consumer understanding of complex issues.

8.3 Margaret raised the question over whether cultured meat could be described as 'meat'. The CSA said that research was being carried out on what information people would like from labels and what terms are useful to consumers to help them understand what it was they were buying. Michelle explained that the social science team had conducted a piece of work on the social acceptability of gene editing (GE) and GM and this would be published alongside the Defra consultation results in the summer.

8.4 Margaret asked about how foresight could be used in making legislation to ensure that when it was made or amended, it took account of issues that could emerge. Rebecca Sudworth said that ensuring an effective regulatory regime entailed considering what the regulatory questions of the future would be. Gene editing was an example of an area where the FSA was working, with Defra to consider how a future regulatory regime could work.

8.5 The Chair said that the Board welcomed the establishment of the horizon scanning capability and were pleased to see practical actions emerging from it. Rick Mumford added that the work had been made possible, in part, because of the work of the Science Council Working Group on Horizon Scanning. The Chair said that there were recommendations in the Cambridge report and a formal response from the Executive on those recommendations would be welcome.

Action 2 - **Michelle Patel to prepare a response to the Cambridge report recommendations for the Board.**

8.6 The Chair said the Board noted the overall strategic assessment, noted the necessary work and confirmed its support for the approach.

9. Annual Review of Risk Assessment (FSA 21/06/07)

9.1 Rick Mumford explained by means of introduction that this paper followed from the two papers, received by the Board in 2020, on the other aspects of the risk analysis process: Risk Management and Risk Communication. This paper covered steps taken since EU Exit as well as the preparatory work covered in the previous two papers.

9.2 Amie Adkin then gave an overview of the paper covering the capacity and capability for carrying out repatriated workstreams following EU Exit;

recruitment issues; the accuracy of workload expectations and the high level of Cannabidiol (CBD) product applications; third country market access; and the role of the SACs.

9.3 Mark Rolfe asked about the recruitment of toxicologists and about the short to medium term impacts of having insufficient resource. Amie explained that there had been more than one round of recruitment for toxicologists. The first of these took place in February, leaving the FSA two short of the total number being sought. A further round of recruitment was underway and in-house training was also being considered, joining up across government, academia, and industry to try and increase the size of the pool from which toxicologists could be recruited.

9.4 Mark asked about regulated products and whether there was confidence that the processes and resources were available to be able to effectively regulate businesses while allowing them to innovate. Margaret Gilmore asked about the numbers of novel foods applications received. Rebecca Sudworth said that there were now 28 products that were beginning the risk assessment process, four of which were CBD products. She noted the importance of being able to deliver this process in a timely way to avoid blocking innovation.

9.5 Margaret noted that Northern Ireland businesses were reliant on European Food Safety Authority (EFSA) risk analyses. She asked how this was managed for GB businesses seeking to sell their products in Northern Ireland. Amie said that in the context of providing risk assessment to support incident alerts, while there had been a reduction in traditional incidents, there had been an increase in incidents relating to processes post EU Exit and FSA was ensuring there was sufficient risk assessment capacity.

9.6 Colm McKenna asked how the FSA remained apprised of EFSA's risk assessment regime and whether there were contingencies for where their assessment diverged from the FSA's. Rebecca said that under the Internal Market Act, anything that was approved for sale in one part of the UK could also be sold in the other nations. Under the Northern Ireland Protocol, products for sale in Northern Ireland must meet EU regulatory requirements. The UK was starting from a point of regulatory alignment. Mechanisms were in place to track changes in regulatory requirements emerging from the EU..

9.7 The Chair said that the Board had reviewed the delivery of the risk assessment function within the FSA and considered and endorsed the next steps for the ongoing development of risk assessment beyond 2021.

10. Food Hypersensitivity Update (FSA 21/06/08)

10.1 Rebecca Sudworth introduced the paper outlining some of the challenges encountered during the period from the pandemic restrictions. Sushma Acharya summarised the update covering work around pre-packed for direct sale (PPDS) goods; precautionary allergy labelling (PAL); a potential Food Allergy Awareness Scheme; and the allergy symposium.

10.2 Rebecca noted a question to the Board from Mr Paul Carey, the father of Owen Carey who tragically died from an anaphylactic reaction having eaten a meal in a restaurant in 2017. The Chair and CE had met with Mr Carey and discussed his proposals and his views had also been received through correspondence.

10.3 Colm McKenna asked about the representation of patients in the stakeholder community. Sushma said that stakeholder panels used in this work had included representation from food hypersensitive consumers as well as clinicians. The recently established expert panel consisted of representatives from industry, LAs and research organisations. Evidence from the FSA's research that encapsulated the patient's experience was used by the Food Hypersensitivity Programme.

10.4 Colm asked if it was possible to hear further detail about the proposed Food Allergy Awareness Scheme. Sushma said that the work undertaken was to consult food hypersensitive consumers about what would be required of the scheme. Part of the development was to look at existing schemes to consider the potential for standard setting. Feedback was that the complexity of allergen management meant that it may be difficult to annex the scheme to an existing one and would need to consider a sufficiently broad range of factors to deliver the necessary reassurance. Research had also suggested that food hypersensitive consumers would be likely to continue to do their own due diligence in the presence of a scheme.

10.5 Margaret Gilmore said that she considered PAL to be an ineffective form of allergy labelling. Peter Price said he was concerned about the overuse of PAL to avoid the need to give proper consideration to the actual risks that there may be with a product. Sushma said that the FSA would be consulting food businesses and consumers on the appropriate use of PAL.

10.6 Margaret asked how the food allergy reaction reporting mechanism would work. Sushma said that the FSA had undertaken discovery work with clinicians, charities and consumers and found that consumers wanted to be able to report near-misses, where reactions had not led to hospitalisations for the purposes of informing policy, raise awareness and help others, which would help to fill a current data gap.

10.7 Peter said that the higher proportion of small businesses in Wales meant that reach of guidance and regulation would need to be gauged in order to include smaller caterers for it to have a significant impact in Wales. Sushma explained that work providing support to businesses about changes in the regulations had included businesses from Wales.

10.8 Peter said that that there was some overlap in the issues considered by the Food Hygiene Rating Scheme and the level of consumer understanding about what was being represented by any particular scheme would need to be clearly communicated to avoid an impression that a high FHRS score translated to effective allergen management. Sushma said that there would be key areas to explore and concentrate efforts in developing the Food Allergy Awareness

Scheme and areas of alignment with FHRS would be considered as part of that, taking account of the complexity around food hypersensitivity.

10.9 Fiona Gately asked what measures would be taken to monitor the effectiveness of changes for PPDS after October. Sushma explained that the work on PPDS would continue after October, a review of implementation would be taking place and the Board would be appraised of progress in future reports. Maria Jennings added that the FSA were providing advice and guidance to LAs to enable them to effectively enforce the new regulations.

10.10 Margaret added that cost to the NHS of adrenalin-pens, which was not insignificant, should also be considered as part of the cost of not taking sufficient action on food hypersensitivity.

10.11 The Chair said that the Board noted the progress on the Food Hypersensitivity workstreams and encouraged the team to continue to progress the work presented in the update.

11. Final Report of Science Council Working Group 5 on Food Hypersensitivity (FSA 21/06/09)

11.1 Professor Sandy Thomas noted the scope of the review and introduced the Chair of the Working Group Dr Paul Turner. Professor Thomas' opening comments touched on the retrospective look at the FSA research programme on allergy and intolerance; the interim report in September 2020; short and long-term research programmes; the support of the Science Council Secretariat and the FSA's Science and Policy teams.

11.2 Rick Mumford explained that the FSA's formal response to the report was included in the paper and noted that action was already in progress from the report's recommendations. Rick highlighted the increased levels of infrastructure in place since the interim report and noted the progress highlighted in paper FSA 21/06/08 on the Food Hypersensitivity programme. There had been an increase in science, and horizon scanning capabilities, as noted in FSA 21/06/06, also contributing to the effective completion of the Working Group's recommendations.

11.3 Mark Rolfe noted that the value of horizon scanning work, as well as that from science research, was only realised if acted upon. He welcomed that the implementation plan was being progressed but asked about the timeframe. Rick said that it was being worked on and that there would be a draft of the implementation plan ready this summer.

11.4 Timothy Riley said that 'willingness to pay' thresholds would be a key feature in decision making for where funding should be allocated as well as presenting a tangible demonstration of the FSA's value to others including Treasury. He asked if consideration had been given to how the FSA could work alongside other agencies to produce a composite measure of economic benefit and whether that could be incorporated. Rick said that within the Cost of Illness

modelling, there was ongoing work beyond foodborne disease, including food hypersensitivity, and food related illness more generally. For example, he said that the economics team were working with various partners, including Professor Richard Smith, a health economist from Exeter university, on chemical safety. The international community was also being drawn upon and best practice being shared widely. Dr Turner added that the management of food hypersensitivity in public health crossed the remits of various agencies and that partnership working was a feature of work in this area.

11.5 The Chair said that the report was helpful, highlighting that Food hypersensitivity was a strategic priority for the FSA and the strategy would be developed with the incoming Chair. She noted the collaborative approach and the opportunity to champion the issue within government. The Board had considered the Working Group's report and agreed the proposed FSA response.

12. Annual Report on Food Standards (FSA 21/06/10)

12.1 Rebecca Sudworth gave an overview of the paper, explaining that it represented an update, outlining plans for a joint FSA report with Food Standards Scotland (FSS) giving an overview of whether and how food standards had changed.

12.2 Lord Blencathra said it was important that the report did not avoid difficult topics, and suggested the report include things within its forward look that could be outside the core remit of the FSA including calorie labelling and harm from alcohol consumption as well as issues such as adulteration and substitution. Rebecca said that the FSA had a commitment to transparency and ensured that the advice it generated was clear, candid and in the interest of consumers. A plan for the content of the report was under development.

12.3 Lord Blencathra noted clause 19 Section 2, Subsection e of the Agriculture Act was of particular relevance to the FSA relating to "food safety and consumer confidence in food". He suggested that the FSA respond to the Act as an opportunity to highlight to Ministers, the importance of issues relating to labelling, nutritional information, enforcement resources, and mandatory display of FHRS ratings. Rebecca said that the Secretary of State would invite contributions from relevant parties and, though not directly named in the legislation, the FSA would be an obvious party to consult in relation to the section of the Act quoted. The issues on which contributions were requested would be a matter for the Secretary of State.

12.4 Lord Blencathra asked whether the Board would see a draft of the report prior to its laying in parliament. The Chair said that the timings for this would be built into considerations of how final clearance of the report was given.

12.5 Margaret Gilmore asked whether there were any areas of disagreement with FSS anticipated and how divergences in regulation between Scotland and the rest of the UK would be managed. Rebecca said that consideration of where

standards had diverged would be a key interest to consider but she would not characterise different risk assessment conclusions as disagreements because demographic and cultural differences could mean that the risk level was not uniform across all areas.

12.6 The Chair said that the Board had noted the update by commenting on the forward look, clarity around the FSA's requirements, how to maximise the benefits of the four-country approach and collaboration with FSS, and the involvement of the Board in the process of producing the report.

13. Report from the Chair of Audit and Risk Assurance Committee (INFO 21/06/01)

13.1 Colm McKenna gave a summary of points included in his report, noting that two meetings of the Audit and Risk Assurance Committee (ARAC) had taken place over the period where the Annual Report and Accounts (ARAs) for Westminster, Wales and Northern Ireland had been considered as well as the consolidated accounts. Comments were made on drafts received at the first of those meetings and also shared with those Board Members who did not sit on ARAC. At the second meeting, the ARAs were approved for sign-off by the Chief Executive. The ARAs for Wales and Northern Ireland would be laid in their respective legislatures by the end of June. The FSA had completed all that it could to allow for the laying of the Westminster ARAs but would need to await the solution of a pension fund issue. It was expected this would happen before the end of September.

13.2 The May meeting had also featured consideration of the National Audit Office (NAO) Value for Money report on the food system where the FSA had been given key responsibilities to deliver the proposals. All FSA actions from that report had been completed.

14. Reports from the Chairs of the Food Advisory Committees (Oral Reports)

14.1 Colm McKenna said that the Northern Ireland Food Advisory Committee (NIFAC) had met ahead of the May Board meeting and had heard contributions from meat industry stakeholders on the Operational Transformation Programme. NIFAC had met again to consider the papers that had been discussed at this Board meeting and their comments had helped inform Colm's comments. NIFAC would meet again on Wednesday 23 June where they would discuss issues relating to food hypersensitivity and would feature input from officials, industry, and food hypersensitive consumers.

14.2 Peter Price said that WFAC had met ahead of this meeting to consider the Board Papers and their comments had helped inform his contributions. WFAC would be meeting again in July to consider the direction of travel in various programmes, with a focus on Local Authority partnership working. He noted an upcoming meeting with the new Deputy Minister for Mental Health and

Wellbeing in Wales which would be attended by the Chair, CE, and himself as well as the incoming FSA Chair.

15. Any Other Business

15.1 No other business was raised, and the meeting was closed. The next meeting would take place on 15 September with details to be confirmed.