

**ADVISORY COMMITTEE ON THE MICROBIOLOGICAL SAFETY OF FOOD**

**MATTERS ARISING FROM THE 18 OCTOBER 2018 MEETING**

The attached schedule records action taken on matters arising from the Committee's ninety-third held on 18 October 2018 and previous meetings.

**Secretariat  
June 2019**

**RECORD OF ACTION TAKEN ON MATTERS ARISING FROM THE MINUTES OF  
THE NINETY-THIRD (ACM/MIN/93)**

<b>ACM/MIN/93 Para</b>	<b>Topic and action required</b>	<b>Action taken</b>
Para 4	<p><b>Minutes of 92<sup>nd</sup> meeting</b></p> <p>Members approved the minutes of the 92<sup>nd</sup> meeting as a correct record subject to the following amendments.</p> <p>Secretariat to amend:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Paragraph 8.13. Change the word “significant” to “notable”</li> <li>• Stephen Wyllie suggested an amendment to paragraphs 7.22 and 7.23 which he would send to the Secretariat. Once these amendments had been made the minutes would be regarded as correct and posted on the Committee’s website.</li> </ul>	<p>Actioned.</p> <p>Actioned.</p> <p>Actioned.</p>
Para 10.2	<p><b>Outcomes from 25 January 2018 Horizon Scanning Workshop</b></p> <p>Following clarification provided on how the numerical scoring that accompanied the horizon scanning ranking was made, the secretariat was asked to use the highest numerical ranking in terms of urgency to decide topics to go on the workplan.</p>	<p>Actioned. Work plan has been updated.</p>
Para 11.2	<p><b>Changes to pesticides maximum residue levels: potential impact on food safety</b></p> <p>Members agreed to establish group to analyse industry’s written comments on the implications of changes to the maximum residue levels for quaternary ammonium compounds, chlorate and biocidal actives. Outcome of group’s work will be reported back to the Committee at a future meeting.</p>	<p>Actioned. Update on group’s activities to be provided under agenda item 10 (Committee updates).</p>

**RECORD OF ACTION TAKEN ON MATTERS ARISING FROM THE MINUTES OF  
THE NINETY-SECOND (ACM/MIN/92)**

<p>Para 7.23</p>	<p><b>Microbiological risks associated with raw pet food</b></p> <p>As microbiological results for raw pet food in an US FDA study and Utrecht University study (highlighted in paper ACM/1270) revealed significant number of listeriosis cases, a member asked if PHE's enhanced surveillance covering listeriosis was picking up cases linked to raw pet food. Request to be made to PHE if they could include raw pet food in the scope of its enhanced surveillance of listeriosis cases.</p>	<p>Work in progress. PHE surveillance and Gastrointestinal bacteria reference unit currently reviewing their surveillance questionnaire.</p>
------------------	--	--

**RECORD OF ACTION TAKEN ON MATTERS ARISING FROM THE MINUTES OF  
THE NINETY-FIRST (ACM/MIN/91)**

<p><b>ACM/MIN/91 Para</b></p>	<p><b>Topic and action required</b></p>	<p><b>Action taken</b></p>
<p>Para 6.3</p>	<p><b>First Draft of ACMSF Report on <i>Campylobacter</i></b></p> <p>Joy Dobbs, David McDowell and Ann Williams to suggest a few lines on the catering section (chapter 8) acknowledging risk associated with eating pink duck. Secretariat to check whether there is information from the PHE study which could be included in the report.</p>	<p>Actioned.</p> <p>All of the points raised on report were addressed and report was revised before it was issued for public consultation.</p>
<p>Para 6.3 (second bullet)</p>	<p>Query on Chapter 3: Epidemiology of <i>Campylobacter</i> in humans. It was pointed out that surveillance data did not reflect disease in the population. Member concerned about text in report to provide appropriate information that could be included in the report. Secretariat to request this and send to Sarah O'Brien for inclusion in report.</p>	<p>Draft final report will be presented under agenda item 8.</p>
<p>Para 6.3 (third bullet)</p>	<p>"There had been a change to more sensitive laboratory testing, which may mean that in future years more cases would be detected". Wording to reflect above statement to be incorporated in report. Sarah O'Brien to include this in chapter 3 (Epidemiology section).</p>	

<p>Para 6.3 (fourth bullet)</p>	<p>Chapter 1 (<i>Campylobacter</i> biology and tools for detection). Query on the number of places where “heat/heat resistance” has been mentioned in the report. A member of the <i>Ad Hoc</i> Group responded that whilst heat resistance needed further exploration there was not sufficient evidence to say that the advice of cooking for 70°C for 2 minutes needed to change. Secretariat to liaise with the author of the chapter about putting the heat resistance text into context in the report.</p>
<p>Para 6.3 (fifth bullet)</p>	<p>In relation to information paper ACM/1267 (<i>Campylobacter</i> trends 2015-2017), Prof Sarah O’Brien confirmed that she was unaware of data in paper when she was drafting chapter 3. Chapter would be updated along with the data on raw milk. Sarah O’Brien to update chapter.</p>
<p>Para 6.3 (sixth bullet)</p>	<p>A member commented that it would be helpful to include a definition of DALYs and QALYs as a way of measuring illness burden. Sarah O’Brien to action.</p>
<p>Para 6.3 (seventh bullet)</p>	<p>Chapter 7 (Risks in the food chain: Red meat, raw milk and fresh produce). A member pointed out that the information on raw fruit and vegetables showed there had been a 10% increase in consumption between 2007 and 2015; this was a step-change in consumer behaviour. However, the data in the report mainly pre-dated that change and the data was not from UK-based surveys. This change in behaviour should be highlighted and the Group should consider making a recommendation for further work on this. Peter McClure to action.</p>
<p>Para 6.3 (eighth bullet)</p>	<p>Chapter 9: “how new knowledge influences risk assessment”. A member pointed out that from Chapter 2 it was clear that although a vast amount of whole genome sequence (WGS) data on <i>Campylobacter</i> had been collected, this did not seem to have influenced risk assessment although it was used in source attribution. He asked whether the full value of research into sequencing <i>Campylobacter</i> was being achieved, as it was not evident in chapter 9. Prof O’Brien agreed that no-one really knew how best to use WGS and although there was a lot of activity on source attribution this hadn’t fed into quantitative microbiological risk assessment. A research recommendation might be needed on this. Working group to add this as a general</p>

	recommendation to chapter 9.	
Para 6.3 (ninth bullet)	A member pointed out that Chapter 9 (How new knowledge influences risk assessment) was difficult to read and questioned whether the title was the right one. Working group to review and discuss at next teleconference/meeting.	