

ADVISORY COMMITTEE ON THE MICROBIOLOGICAL SAFETY OF FOOD

MATTERS ARISING FROM THE 10 MAY 2018 MEETING

The attached schedule records action taken on matters arising from the Committee's ninetieth meeting held on 10 May 2018.

**Secretariat
October 2018**

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

ACM/MIN/92 Para	Topic and action required	Action taken
Para 4.1	<p>Minutes of 91th meeting</p> <p>Members approved the minutes of the 91st meeting as a correct record subject to the following amendments.</p> <p>Secretariat to amend:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Paragraph 8.1. Change the word “significant” to “notable”; • Paragraph 8.4. Amend the percentages; • Paragraph 8.7. Insert the word “significant” before the word “contamination” in the second sentence; • Paragraph 9.7. Secretariat to check if the second sentence could be made clearer; • Paragraph 9.20. Correct penultimate sentence to read “why do you still wash your chicken”. 	Actioned.
Para 7.23	<p>Microbiological risks associated with raw pet food</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>	Work in progress. PHE surveillance lead and Gastrointestinal bacteria reference unit colleagues are looking into this.
Para 8.11	<p>Epidemiology of Foodborne Infections Group</p> <p>Committee to receive presentation on the FSA’s surveillance strategy.</p>	Actioned. Presentation to be provided under agenda item 8.

<p>Para 9.4</p>	<p>Outcomes from 25 January 2018 horizon scanning workshop.</p> <p>FSA's suggestion for Committee to consider 2-dimensional approach to risk assessment which takes into account severity in addition to probability was welcomed (Committee agreed to setup a group to consider this to be chaired by Gary Barker). Acting Chair to consult secretariat on other members to be invited to join group and whether any additional experts should be co-opted.</p>	<p>Actioned. Group that has a mixture of ACMSF members and additional experts have been setup. First meeting (teleconference) is scheduled for November 2018.</p>
<p>Para 9.5</p>	<p>Secretariat to check if the Advisory Committee on Novel Food and Processes has discussed the use of bee pollen particularly for children in school and whether this should be added to the horizon scanning list.</p>	<p>Actioned. ACNFP secretariat has confirmed that ACNFP have not considered the use of bee pollen in food as it is not a novel food.</p>
<p>Para 9.6</p>	<p>Secretariat to condense list of horizon scanning topics and circulate to members to rank.</p>	<p>Actioned. Members have ranked the topics and these are available in paper ACM/1285.</p>
<p>Para 10.5</p>	<p>Committee Updates</p> <p>FSA's guidance on vacuum and modified atmosphere packed chilled foods</p> <p>Following discussion on the availability of new evidence and on the question of at what point should the Committee refresh its scientific reports, the Chair asked the secretariat to seek from literature new material in the last 10 years and obtain relevant information from the ongoing work (taking place at the Quadram Institute) and report back to the Committee.</p>	<p>Actioned. Members to be provided with an update on ongoing work via paper ACM/1282 (agenda item 7 refers).</p>
<p>Para 13.1</p>	<p>Public Questions and Answers</p> <p>Kaarin Goodburn from the Chilled Food Association raised several points about the FSA's vacuum packing guidance and new evidence available on shelf-life of vacuum packed foods. Chair and Secretariat to ascertain what information was available on this subject that could be considered by the committee.</p>	<p>Actioned. Update on available evidence on vacuum and modified atmosphere packed chilled foods to be provided under agenda item 7.</p>

Para 13.3	Chair agreed to consider Luisa Candido's (from Dairy UK) query on paper ACM/1273 (Changes to pesticides residues maximum residue levels: potential impact on food safety) that outlined a number of questions that will be sent to industry on the changes to pesticides residues MRLs. She asked for a specific question (relating to chlorine-based sources) to be amended.	Actioned. Letter was sent to industry in July 2018. Update on industry's responses to be provided under agenda item 11.
-----------	---	---

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

ACM/MIN/91 Para	Topic and action required	Action taken
Para 6.3	First Draft of ACMSF Report on <i>Campylobacter</i> 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.	Work in progress. Members' comments on the report have been passed on to the <i>Ad Hoc</i> Group and a revised draft is being produced.
Para 6.3 (second bullet)	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.	
Para 6.3 (third bullet)	"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>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.	