
MINUTES OF THE FSA BOARD MEETING HELD ON 21 JUNE AT JURY'S INN HOTEL, LIVERPOOL FROM 09:00-11:25hrs

Present:

Heather Hancock, Chair; David Brooks; Ram Gidoomal; Rosie Glazebrook; Ruth Hussey; Stewart Houston; Colm McKenna; Paul Williams

Officials attending:

Rod Ainsworth, FSA Director of Regulatory and Legal Strategy
Nicky Elliston, Head of Private Office (for Welcome and Announcements)
Jason Feeney, FSA Chief Executive Officer
Chris Hitchen, FSA Director of Finance and Performance
Maria Jennings, FSA Director of Northern Ireland and Organisational Development
Patrick Miller, FSA Head of the Chief Scientific Adviser's Team (for paper FSA 17-06-06)
Julie Pierce, FSA Director of Openness, Data and Digital
Professor Guy Poppy, FSA Chief Scientific Adviser
Nina Purcell, FSA Director of Wales and Regulatory Delivery Division
Steve Wearne, FSA Director of Policy
Mark Willis, FSA Head of Chemical Contaminants and Residue Branch (for paper FSA 17-06-04)

WELCOME AND ANNOUNCEMENTS

1. The Chair welcomed everyone in the room and online to the meeting. There were no apologies for absence received. The Chair reminded Board members to declare any conflicts of interest prior to each discussion.
2. There were no items for Any Other Business.

MINUTES OF MEETING HELD ON 15 MARCH 2017 (FSA 17/06/01)

3. There were no amendments to the minutes and these were agreed as an accurate record of the 15 March 2017 Board meeting.
4. In response to a question from a Board member about the analysis of the acrylamide campaign, the Chief Executive Officer (CEO) said he and the FSA Director of Openness, Data and Digital had met with those conducting the independent external review of the FSA's Communications department recently and fed in their comments. He expected to receive the final report shortly.

ACTIONS ARISING (FSA 17/06/02)

5. There were no comments on the Actions Arising.

CHAIR'S REPORT

6. The Chair said a full list of the engagements she had undertaken since the March 2017 Board meeting was available on the FSA's website. Given the General Election

and Purdah restrictions, the Chair had only had one Ministerial meeting with Lord O'Shaughnessy, the Parliamentary Under Secretary for Health.

7. At the Department of Health, the Chair had met with Dame Sally Davies, Chief Medical Officer and Clara Swinson, Director General for Global and Public Health. In the absence of Ministers in Northern Ireland, the Chair had had constructive meetings with Richard Pengelly, Northern Ireland Permanent Secretary for Health, and Noel Lavery, Northern Ireland Permanent Secretary for Agriculture, Enterprise and Rural Affairs. At their 6 monthly meeting with the Chair and the CE of Food Standards Scotland (FSS), the Chair and the CEO had strengthened relations and alignment on regulatory reform.
8. The Chair had chaired the interview panel for Non-Executive Directors to the FSA Board and reported to Ministers. The appointment process had then been temporarily delayed due to the General Election and Purdah.
9. The Chair and the CEO had met with the Royal College of Veterinary Surgeons and, separately, with the British Veterinary Association; the Chair had also met with Nigel Gibbens, Chief Veterinary Officer. Discussions had taken place around animal welfare, the delivery of official controls, and the veterinary workforce both within the FSA and in the wider food industry.
10. The Chair had discussed regulatory reform with Lord Lindsay, Chairman of UKAS, and with Lesley-Ann Nash of Regulatory Futures in the Cabinet Office.
11. The Chair had delivered a speech at the Walker Morris annual food industry dinner in April. She had also met with Ian Wright of the Food and Drink Federation (FDF); Norman Bagley of AIMS; and Adam Leyland, Editor of the Grocer. The Chair had visited the 2 Sisters plant in Yorkshire, and with Moy Park, to discuss reinforcing the measures taken by producers to reduce campylobacter in chicken at retail. The Chair, CEO and other members of the FSA Executive Management Team had attended the FDF annual dinner the previous week. On 7 June, the Chair had delivered the 39th annual Campden BRI lecture on "The coming of age for the Food Standards Agency"; the transcript of which was available on the FSA's website.
12. The Chair and the FSA's Chief Scientific Adviser (CSA) had attended the first meeting of the new Science Council the previous week. There had been good attendance in the audience from journalists, academics and industry representatives. The FSA had tasked the Science Council with 3 questions to address, which would be covered in paper FSA 17-06-06. The members of the Science Council had demonstrated understanding of their remit and of the reasons behind the 3 questions being asked of them.
13. Finally the Chair congratulated Professor Laura Green, a member of the FSA Science Council, and Professor Chris Elliott, who had been recognised in the Queen's Birthday Honours.
14. The Chair warmly welcomed Jason Feeney in his new role as Chief Executive and invited him to present his first CEO report.

CHIEF EXECUTIVE'S REPORT (FSA 17/06/03)

15. The CEO drew attention to the work being done to help FSA staff, our most important asset, better understand the strategic priorities as set by the Board in March 2017. The CEO and Directors held face to face sessions with staff to allow them to clarify and challenge Directors and obtain a better understanding of future expectations. Staff feedback had been positive and these sessions would now become a regular feature with the next round due in September.
16. The CEO highlighted the development of additional features to the Food Hygiene Ratings Scheme (FHRS) in Northern Ireland and Wales. These were, respectively, requiring those businesses that provide food by means of an online ordering facility to display a valid rating on such a platform, and requiring takeaways to provide a bilingual statement on publicity materials directing customers to the food hygiene rating website.
17. In addition to the numerous engagements he had undertaken with the Chair, the CEO mentioned meeting with the British Retail Consortium (BRC) the next day and then with the FDF the following week. He said he was meeting regularly with industry representatives to discuss, take views and consult on Regulating our Future (RoF) and the impact of the UK exiting the EU.
18. In response to a question from a Board member, the CEO confirmed that there were broad similarities in the direction of travel between the FSA and FSS on regulatory reform. We did not both want to be re-inventing the wheel at the same time so there was a regular exchange of information and learning. In some circumstances FSS could pilot and test proposals more quickly than the FSA. It was helpful to have alignment between all four countries of the UK whilst recognising the independence of FSS.
19. On the Efficacy of Recalls Project, the CEO said there had been a dearth of information and intelligence when we had started the Project last year. We had therefore undertaken a lot of research to ensure that when we took action, it would be at the right elements of the system, and deliverable. The CEO agreed to share interim findings from the Project with the Board ahead of the scheduled paper on it for the September 2017 Business Committee.

ACTION: Acting FSA Chief Operating Officer

20. With regard the rebalancing of resources across the Agency, the CEO confirmed for the Board that we were consciously no longer deploying the same effort on campylobacter reduction as we had done two years ago. However, we were not walking away from the issue; rather it was now for industry to drive innovation to reduce levels further and for us to ensure that this was happening.
21. The FSA Director of Policy said we had been reducing programme expenditure on campylobacter because we now had a mature understanding of the science and evidence related to it. The Oxford Martin School at the University of Oxford would

shortly be publishing an independent assessment of campylobacter which we would use to consider taking any further action.

22. We had also reduced the number of staff involved. As the Board had agreed during its last discussion on campylobacter, our focus now was on interventions with smaller producers. We had redeployed staff to undertake policy analysis in relation to the UK's exit from the EU.
23. The CEO agreed to provide the Board with information as to whose market data we were using for the sampling plan of the UK-wide baseline study on antimicrobial resistance (AMR) on Campylobacter in retail chicken and Salmonella in retail pork.

ACTION: FSA Director of Policy

24. Regarding the use of sensors by industry, the FSA's CSA explained for the Board that retailers were using sensors in their delivery chains to detect changes in temperature which would allow microbes to grow. This allowed retailers to adjust a product's use by date accordingly thereby reducing waste. Sensors which changed colour if there was chemical contamination or microbial growth could also be put in products. However as this was a high volume, low profit scenario, widespread use of sensors in this way was still far off.
25. A Board member asked what stage the Review of the Risk Assessment Unit was at and whether the Board could view or comment on the report. The FSA's CSA explained the Review was looking at the function of risk assessment in the FSA and whether it was sustainable for the Agency to continue doing rapid, medium and long term risk assessment. The Review would feed into the wider consideration of approaches to risk that the Board would discuss in due course.

CHEMICAL CONTAMINANTS PRINCIPLES (FSA 17/06/04)

26. The Chair welcomed Mark Willis, the FSA's Head of Chemical Contaminants and Residues Branch, to the table and invited Steve Wearne, the FSA's Director of Policy, to introduce the paper.
27. The Director of Policy said this was a rare opportunity for the Board to discuss the risks posed by chemical contaminants in the round. Assessment of those risks showed that most chemical contaminants had a chronic effect, as opposed to an acute impact. The absence of an immediate impact in health terms from exposure to chemical contaminants presented additional challenges to risk management and risk communication.
28. There were two main areas in this paper for the Board's discussion and decision:
 - the current framework and roles and responsibilities, at global, regional and national levels, and in particular the respective responsibilities of the Board and Executive; and
 - the principles and enablers used to manage chemical contaminants risks.

-
29. A Board member asked how big the risk from chemical contaminants was, and how much resource was allocated to work in this area in comparison to resource in other areas of work such as campylobacter reduction. The Director of Policy replied the range of chemical contaminants in food was much broader than microbiological contaminants. Therefore we undertook a different type of regulatory activity; rather than focusing on a limited range of microbiological contaminants, we scanned a broad range of chemical contaminants to identify where intervention was required. As the impact of chemical contaminants was chronic rather than acute, it was difficult to compare the risk from chemical contaminants, with the risk from microbiological ones such as campylobacter.
 30. The effects of lead and arsenic in food were well known, and we were able to manage exposure due to food adulteration or a chemical incident. However, for most chemical contaminants we had to look at the effects of high levels of exposure on animals and extrapolate for low levels in humans to determine the risk. This was difficult to do but it was an important part of the regulatory system.
 31. The FSA's CSA said because the impact from chemical contaminants was chronic exposure over a life time, it was difficult to measure the risk. It was also difficult to say that a specific chemical contaminant had been the cause of death.
 32. This made the FSA's joint working with others, such as the Health and Safety Executive (HSE), who had experience in communicating risk on sensitive issues very important. The work of the Science Council on risk communication would also have to consider how people perceived risk; although microbiological contaminants affected a larger number of people, more people feared the risk from chemical contaminants.
 33. A Board member acknowledged that it was difficult to assess the scale of the impact of chemical contaminants, but said that it was important to enable the Board to make judgement calls on resource priorities. She appreciated that given the chronic impact of chemical contaminants, it was difficult to assess the risk accurately but she would like to see updates on attempts to do so going forward, as well as on attempts to quantify the risk to human health.
 34. The Board member also asked how current resources had been allocated to work on chemical contaminants and if it was based on historical evidence; without knowing the scale of the impact, how did we know we had the current allocation of resources right.
 35. The Director of Policy replied that we needed to understand global food risks and work with partners to identify new and emerging risks. This meant it was less about balancing risks from chemical contaminants against risks from microbiological contaminants, and more about identifying risks to food safety in the round in the external environment and then deciding where to allocate resources. Our work would have to be less retrospective as the risks were not static, rather they were ever changing. We had to adopt a prospective approach to understand the risks in order to allocate resources.
 36. The Chair of the Welsh Food Advisory Committee (WFAC) said the Committee had been interested to know if we had the balance right currently across all the risks we

dealt with within the Agency. The Chair said there was nothing to suggest that there were fundamental issues about how resources were currently allocated.

37. The Chair commented that as well as the work Professor Poppy had referenced earlier, the Science Council had been tasked with providing the FSA Board with advice on how to establish and communicate risk and uncertainty. All of this work needed to come together to take forward any specific decisions on rebalancing priorities and the resources allocated to them. The FSA's CSA agreed the Science Council's work would enable the Board to make objective decisions which would depend on the Board's risk appetite.
38. A Board member supported a central set of principles and noted that it was important for the Board to understand how, in communications about food consumption, the balance between risk and benefit had been captured.
39. The Director of Policy said we understood there could be unintended consequences from risk communication about food consumption for example advising people not to overcook food to avoid chemical contaminants thereby increasing the chance that people undercook food thereby increasing the risk from microbiological contaminants.
40. Risk communication around chemical contaminants was often complex. We could advise people to change their diet or to prepare or store their food differently but this could lead to different risks which could have a potentially larger impact.
41. A Board member noted recent media stories about arsenic in rice and metal in fish and said she was not convinced that consumers had a low interest in chemical contaminants. Mark Willis said consumers were concerned about chemical contaminants but were unable to name any individual contaminants despite the vast range that the FSA managed. We had given specific advice on arsenic and mercury but most consumers did not want to know the details; they just wanted to be assured that we and industry were doing our job properly.
42. The new FSA website was being designed to give consumers that reassurance as well as targeted advice. In addition to planned communications on the website, we also undertook responsive communications using traditional media channels and social media.
43. The Chair of the Northern Ireland Food Advisory Committee (NIFAC) said the Committee had been interested in whether we were doing enough to collaborate with scientific institutions, academics and consumers across the UK, or if there was more we could be doing.
44. The Director of Policy said, as the regulator, it was the FSA's responsibility to identify the risks and manage them; so while we could work with others, we could not devolve that responsibility to them. Mark Willis said we did have good relations with the food industry across the UK and globally. We worked with others on developing codes of practice and sharing data, and we had a good network with retailers willing to share our messages.

-
45. A Board member asked how the role of the Board would work in practice; would the Board make judgements on an annual basis, or on each issue as it arose. The Chair said the list of principles proposed in the paper should help identify the priorities for the Board and Agency; those principles could of course be reviewed periodically by the Board. The Board could also choose to bring an individual issue to the table for discussion.
46. The Chair noted that the Board had a role to play in risk communication. The Board required line of sight on any proposed increase in non-urgent proactive communications about a complicated and sensitive area, to understand why more intervention was considered necessary, and to decide whether it was the right issue to communicate on, and whether it was being contextualised in the right way. The Board would not expect to be involved in pre-authorising communications about crisis situations, or in providing information about specific issues on the website, this being different from a proactive communication campaign. She asked for clarification that the comment in paragraph 3.6 of the paper that no new consumer engagement activity was planned was in fact correct, given that paragraph 5.1 talked about building on the existing consumer communication of chronic risks. The Director of Policy confirmed that no activity was in fact planned and that if it was to be proposed, it would come forward for discussion.
47. The Chair and the Board confirmed that the first responsibility for the Board that was listed at paragraph 3:2 was actually two separate and equally weighted issues. The Board would not only want to take decisions on priorities when new risks arose because of the consequences for resources, but also when new risks arose and resource allocation was secondary.
48. The Director of Policy said the Board would have to make decisions about risk communication to fulfil the FSA's responsibility under the Food Standards Act 1999 to provide advice and information to consumers on risks that could materially impact their diet to help them make informed decisions about food.
49. The Director of Finance and Performance said the Board would receive more information on resources ahead of the next budget year at which time they would have to take a medium term view given the UK's exit from the EU and potential changes in policy roles for the FSA.
50. In concluding the Chair said:
- The Board's role in relation to chemical contaminants was to:
 - Take decisions on priorities and direction if and when new risks or issues related to a chemical contaminant arise
 - Take decisions on priorities and direction where substantial commitment of additional resources was required to further understand the issue and/or mitigate the risk
 - Consider significant changes to FSA policies or positions, as illustrated in the paper
 - Decide whether an issue significantly affected consumers' capacity to make informed choices

- To agree to any proposals for non-urgent proactive communications about chemical contaminants
- Seek and gain assurance relating to the work of the executive in the area of chemical contaminants
- The Board would come back to look at risk assessment and communication once the Science Council had completed its work, and the work commissioned by the CSA was also available
- The Board would consider priorities and then resources for chemical contaminants in the medium term, as part of the business plan for the following year
- The UK's exit from the EU would be an important consideration in any adjustments to resource allocation.

WELLBEING OF FUTURE GENERATIONS (WALES) ACT 2015 (FSA 17/06/05)

51. Ruth Hussey declared an interest as the Chair of the Parliamentary Review of Health and Social Care in Wales.
52. The Chair invited Nina Purcell, the FSA's Director of Wales and Regulatory Delivery Division, to introduce the paper.
53. The Chair of WFAC said the Committee had been pleased that the FSA was looking at this Wales specific policy requirement. She said there were two opportunities for the FSA to align areas of its remit with the Act.
54. The first was for the FSA, as a public body, to act in a sustainable way and to ensure that decisions the FSA took, took account of the impact they could have on people living in Wales in the future. The Act put in place 5 sustainable development principles: long term; prevention; integration; collaboration; and involvement. Public bodies were required to think about these principles in the way they did business and the Chair of WFAC was confident that the FSA had already adopted many of these principles.
55. The second was for the FSA to contribute to the 46 national indicators which measured progress towards the achievement of the 7 Well-being goals. The essence of the Act was to drive public bodies harder to achieve those goals. The FSA could contribute to meeting indicators on issues such as: individual well-being; climate impact; human health; and the environment. The Act required organisations to demonstrate that they were making improvements for the future, rather than simply complying with the requirements of the Act now.
56. The Chair of NIFAC said the Public Health Agency in NI had a very close working relationship with Public Health Wales. He said there was a lot the FSA could learn from the Act and it was important that the Agency was aligned with it. Wales were ahead of the curve on this work and it was for NI and England to learn from them in this area.

57. The Chair said the annex to the paper set out very well the alignment between the FSA's remit and the goals of the Act. The Board could have confidence that the way the FSA chose to operate was having a positive impact on the lives of people in Wales and it was important to reinforce that for colleagues in Wales.
58. The Director of Policy said the Act had caused the FSA's Executive Management Team to reflect on how it did business. The 5 sustainable development principles were integrated into the FSA's open policy making approach but Directors appreciated the Act was more of a spur to make improvements, as opposed to a means of checking that things were already being done.
59. The list of indicators highlighted the issues that impacted on an individual's well-being. The FSA was working towards improving the well-being of individual staff members by making them feel valued and supported at work through new flexible contracts and better physical working space. We would then be able to measure how valued people felt and the impact of this on their well-being.
60. In concluding, the Chair said that the Board were very happy to endorse the conclusions in the paper in the knowledge that the FSA was operating in accordance with the sustainable development principles.

DEVELOPING OUR APPROACH TO IDENTIFYING RISKS AND ISSUES ACROSS THE FOOD SYSTEM (17/06/06)

61. The Chair welcomed Patrick Miller, the FSA's Head of the Chief Scientific Adviser's Team, to the table and invited Steve Wearne, the FSA's Director of Policy, to introduce the paper.
62. The Director of Policy said this was a joint paper with the FSA's CSA, Professor Guy Poppy, and he would pass to him to update on discussions at the Science Council last week. The Director of Policy said this paper was unusual in that it was a prospective look at the initiation stage of new activity. The paper detailed how we had arrived at this stage and how it supported our ambition to be an excellent, accountable, modern regulator.
63. Our current and developing approaches to surveillance and horizon scanning provided us with capabilities to identify specific new and emerging risks in the near- and medium-term. But they did not, on their own, deliver an informed and integrated view of the global food system and of systemic risks and issues over the next five to ten years. The Science Council would have a central role in helping the FSA to understand and to implement the work needed to build our networks and capabilities in these areas, and our strategic and science-based approach in the face of future developments.
64. The CSA said a formal record of the previous week's Science Council meeting would be available in due course and he would share some early comments with the Board. He had worked with the Chair of the FSA Board and the Chair of the Science Council, Professor Sandy Thomas, to set the Science Council three specific questions which were closely linked :

- To advise the FSA Board on how it can be confident that the FSA has access to the right science capability and capacity.
- What does the Council advise to be best practice in establishing and communicating risk and certainty? This was important because the UK's exit from the EU could see the FSA entering new areas of responsibility in assessing and communicating risks.
- What should the FSA do to improve its horizon scanning and its understanding of global food systems risks and opportunities?

We were fortunate to have Professor Sandy Thomas, formerly Head of Foresight at the Government Office for Science, as Chair of the Science Council as she was exceptionally qualified to offer the Board assurance and advice in this latter area.

65. The CSA said we had asked the Science Council for feedback on the first two questions within six months, and had given them longer on the third question. Although many other bodies did already carry out foresight work and horizon scanning, and we would synthesise and draw upon their work, nothing else took a UK consumer-led view of the whole food system.
66. The Chair said nothing was set in stone. It would be for the Science Council to share its views with the Board on how, over the medium-term, we could develop the capability to take an informed and integrated view of the global food system, and therefore of the systemic risks and issues we would need to anticipate and respond to over the next five to ten years. The Chair said she was delighted that we were going to look at risk through a global understanding of the food system as this would help the FSA better understand its role and, equally important, the boundaries of our role.
67. In response to a question from a Board member, the CSA said while the Science Council did only meet in open session twice a year, members of the Council were willing to meet on a regular basis between meetings to enable progress to be made. The CSA was confident that the Council and the Agency had the ability and capacity to allow that to happen. The Chair informed the Board that Professor Sandy Thomas would be attending the March 2018 Board meeting.
68. A Board member welcomed the direction of travel and asked if we were able to draw on the work of the private sector in this field. The CEO said we had a renewed emphasis on industry relations with a focus on data access and sharing of information. We were working on building a climate of trust and he believed industry was increasingly confident that it could do business with us without exposure to commercial risk. The CSA also noted members of the Science Council would bring their expertise to the fore, such as Professor John O'Brien, formerly CEO of the Food Safety Authority of Ireland, and a senior scientist at the Nestlé Research Centre in Lausanne.
69. A Board member said in the context of scarce resources, it would be important for the FSA to focus on benefiting from expertise and knowledge from across the UK and globally. The CSA agreed and noted that, in work on surveillance for example, the FSA was ahead of the curve in comparison to other countries. The CEO assured the

Board that the FSA would look to collaborate as much as possible with others globally as part of our drive to have more of a prominent international standing.

70. A Board member said it would be important to listen to the expertise of the Science Council and maintain good relations with them. The Chair replied that she felt her attendance at the first Science Council meeting, together with the CSA, had set the right tone. The Board would meet informally with Science Council members in December. Professor Sandy Thomas would write an annual report and attend a Board meeting annually; and by looking at the Board papers on the agenda today, one could see multiple references to the Science Council. The Council understood that in addition to the information they would give the Board on risk assessment, decisions taken by the Board would take other factors into consideration too. The Chair was confident of good relations with the Science Council.

REPORT FROM THE CHAIR OF THE AUDIT AND RISK ASSURANCE COMMITTEE (ORAL REPORT)

71. The Chair invited Colm McKenna, the Chair of the Audit and Risk Assurance Committee (ARAC), to present his oral report.
72. The Chair of ARAC said it had been a busy period for the Committee. It had met on 25 May to review the Annual Report and Accounts, and again on 13 June to recommend them for sign off. The National Audit Office (NAO) process had meant that sign off could not have waited for today's meeting and so ARAC had exercised the authority delegated to it on behalf of the Board to recommend sign off of the Accounts to the CEO.
73. In line with recommended good practice, ARAC members had met in private with the NAO on 25 May and with the FSA Deputy Head of Internal Audit on 13 June.
74. The Board had been given the opportunity to comment on the draft Annual Report and Accounts. The FSA had received a positive report with no issues from the NAO over the last 12 months. In the context of reduced funding the FSA had displayed exemplary financial prudence over the last 12 months. The Chair of ARAC congratulated the CEO, Directors and FSA staff for this achievement.
75. The Annual Report and Accounts was a complex set of four accounts representing Westminster, Wales, Northern Ireland and a consolidated account.
76. The Chair of ARAC then fed back to the Board on the agenda of the ARAC meeting of 13 June. Julie Pierce and Phillippa Tasselli had presented on the Evolve IT project. ARAC had been satisfied that the risks were being well managed. Tremendous progress was being made on this project and, with strong Director involvement, ARAC was confident that the project would deliver on time and on budget.
77. ARAC had received an update on the Local Authority Enforcement Monitoring System (LAEMS). Progress had been made in this area though not finally concluded and ARAC were keen to see agreed actions completed.

-
78. ARAC had also considered the Committee's forward agenda. The Chair of ARAC was keen to introduce a 3 year internal audit cycle as opposed to the current 1 year cycle. A 3 year cycle would include a focus on continuous improvement.
79. The Chair asked if ARAC had started to think about how they would get assurance on the future operating model to be introduced by the Regulating our Future (RoF) Programme. The Chair of ARAC said it would be considered as part of the Agency's strong business-as-usual risk management framework for example on the Corporate Risk Register.
80. The Chair of ARAC confirmed for the Chair that ARAC were confident that the FSA audit team was sufficiently involved in the RoF programme.
81. The CEO said the current LAEMS style of reporting would not be sufficient under the model brought in under RoF as it would not give sufficient oversight of LA activity; instead we would be developing a balanced scorecard approach. We were undertaking anticipatory work to get the necessary assurance for every component introduced under RoF. The Chair of ARAC noted that the introduction of a 3 year internal audit cycle would facilitate that approach.
82. In response to questions from a Board member, the Chair of ARAC confirmed that ARAC had been given assurance regarding the 'ransomware' attack last month and on the unplanned power outage at Aviation House.
83. The Director of Openness, Data and Digital said the 'ransomware' attack had not affected the FSA because we had put a lot of effort in over the past 12 months to get our patching software up to date. The Director of Finance and Performance said management of the power outage at Aviation House had broadly gone well with no major business impact. There had been lessons learnt and we had undertaken a refresh of our business continuity plans. He would be presenting a paper to ARAC to give them assurance on this in light of our move out of Aviation House at the upcoming end of our lease. The Chair of ARAC agreed to share that paper with Board members.

ACTION: Chair of ARAC

84. The CEO said part of the assurance that the Agency could manage unexpected events was the flexibility provided by the Evolve IT project and the Our Ways of Working programme which introduced new contracts for staff and encouraged working at other locations. The Director of Finance and Performance said the flooding over the festive season at Foss House in York had also tested us and we had managed it successfully in that business as usual had been able to continue and consumers had not been affected.
85. The Chair concluded by congratulating the Director of Finance and Performance and his staff for their hard work on the complex set of Annual Report and Accounts.

REPORTS FROM THE CHAIRS OF THE FOOD ADVISORY COMMITTEES (INFO 17/06/01–02)

86. The Chair of WFAC said she had brought the policy points made by the Committee out during discussion of each paper on the agenda.
87. The Committee had had a helpful presentation on the Food and You survey as they were seeking to better understand consumer needs in Wales. They had also considered feedback on the attitude tracker and the same two themes had stood out in both the survey and the tracker: affordability and food security. Some of the issues around those two themes were not within the FSA's remit; however the Committee had requested secondary analysis to consider consumer behaviour in relation to food safety when people were worried about affordability and food security.
88. The Director of Policy said the FSA's flagship consumer survey, Food and You, was of significant value to the work of the Agency and it was encouraging to hear of secondary analysis being requested from it. The Chair of WFAC made a link to the Well-being Future Generations (Wales) Act 2015, the goal of which was equity. The Committee would be able to probe whether when issuing communications, the FSA should not only target traditional groups but adapt messaging according to living circumstances and challenges being faced by consumers.
89. In response to a question from a Board member, the Chair of WFAC confirmed that the Committee had asked for a more detailed alignment of FSA Wales' business plan with national indicators as set out under the Well-being Future Generations (Wales) Act 2015. The real benefit of the Act was the encouragement to public bodies to drive improvements for the future and the Committee wished to see the impact of the legislation on the business plan.
90. The Chair of NIFAC said the Committee had also had a presentation on the Food and You survey and had expressed surprise over some of the figures in relation to food security and food hygiene practices in the home. The Committee had suggested that the data could be utilised with other existing data to facilitate work with the NI Department of Agriculture, Environment and Rural Affairs to deliver outcomes under the NI Programme of Government.
91. The Chair of NIFAC said the Committee was currently one member down and with another due to leave in the summer, the Chair of NIFAC was hopeful the Permanent Secretary for Health would sign off on appointments to allow for succession planning.
92. The Chair of NIFAC said the Committee had agreed to undertake its next off site visit to a fishery. Finally, he congratulated Professor Chris Elliott and NIFAC member Dr Elizabeth Mitchell on their recognition in the Queen's Birthday Honours list.

ANY OTHER BUSINESS

93. There were no items for Any Other Business.

DATE OF NEXT MEETING

94. The next meeting of the FSA Board would take place on Wednesday 20 September 2017 in the Hilton Hotel, Belfast.