

2008 No.

FOOD, ENGLAND

COMPOSITION AND LABELLING

The Meat Products (England) (Amendment) Regulations 2008

Made - - - -

Laid before Parliament

Coming into force - -

2008

The Secretary of State makes the following Regulations in exercise of the powers conferred on him by section 16(1)(e) of the Food Safety Act 1990⁽¹⁾ and now vested in him⁽²⁾.

In accordance with section 48(4A) of that Act, he has had regard to relevant advice given by the Food Standards Agency.

As required by Article 9 of Regulation (EC) No. 178/2002 of the European Parliament and of the Council laying down the general principles and requirements of food law, establishing the European Food Safety Authority and laying down procedures in matters of food safety⁽³⁾ there has been open and transparent public consultation during the preparation of these Regulations.

Title and commencement

1. These Regulations may be cited as the Meat Products (England) (Amendment) Regulations 2008 and come into force on [] 2008.

-
- (1) 1990 c. 16. Section 1(1) and (2) (definition of “food”) was substituted by S.I. 2004/2990. Section 48 was amended by paragraph 21 of Schedule 5 to the Food Standards Act 1999 (1999 c.28), “the 1999 Act. Section 48 was also amended by S.I. 2004/2990. Section 53(2) was amended by paragraph 19 of Schedule 16 to the Deregulation and Contracting Out Act 1994 (1994 c.40), Schedule 6 to the 1999 Act and S.I. 2004/2990.
- (2) Functions formerly exercisable by “the Ministers” (being, in relation to England and Wales and acting jointly, the Minister of Agriculture, Fisheries and Food and the Secretaries of State respectively concerned with health in England and food and health in Wales and, in relation to Scotland, the Secretary of State) are now exercisable in relation to England by the Secretary of State pursuant to paragraph 8 of Schedule 5 to the 1999 Act. Functions of “the Ministers” so far as exercisable in relation to Wales were transferred to the National Assembly for Wales by S.I. 1999/672 as read with section 40(3) of the 1999 Act and thereafter transferred to the Welsh Ministers by paragraph 30 of Schedule 11 to the Government of Wales Act 2006 (2006 c.32). Those functions, so far as exercisable in relation to Scotland, were transferred to the Scottish Ministers by section 53 of the Scotland Act 1998 (1998 c. 46) as read with section 40(2) of the 1999 Act.
- (3) OJ No. L31, 1.2.2002, p.1, as last amended by Commission Regulation (EC) No. 575/2006 amending Regulation (EC) No. 178/2002 of the European Parliament and of the Council as regards the number and names of the permanent Scientific Panels of the European Food Safety Authority (OJ No. L100, 8.4.2006, p.3).

Amendment of the Meat Products (England) Regulations 2003

2. The Meat Products (England) Regulations 2003⁽⁴⁾ are amended as provided in regulations 3 and 4.

3. For paragraph (2)(b) of regulation 5 (name of the food for certain meat products) there is substituted the following provision —

“(b) any added ingredient to which sub-paragraph (a) does not apply, other than starch, protein or an ingredient specified in Schedule 3.”.

4. In Schedule 3 (added ingredients which are not required to be indicated in the name of the food in case of a meat product to which regulation 5 applies), items 6 and 7 and the note relating to those items are deleted.

Signed by authority of the Secretary of State for Health

2008

Name
Minister of State,
Department of Health

⁽⁴⁾ S.I. 2003/2075, amended by S.I. 2005/2626.

PARTIAL REGULATORY IMPACT ASSESSMENT

1. Title of the Proposal

- The Meat Products (England) (Amendment) Regulations 2008, implementing changes to European legislation resulting from revocation of Directive 77/99/EEC, and new related guidance⁵.

2. Purpose and Intended Effect

Objectives

- There are two overall objectives:
 - i. to bring labelling requirements for added starch and protein in certain meat products into line with European labelling requirements; and
 - ii. to issue new related guidance.
- For the purposes of this Regulatory Impact Assessment (RIA), protein means any protein of either animal (same species to the meat) or vegetable origin. The current name of the food requirements for the labelling of added ingredients of animal origin from a different species to the meat, including in so far as they relate to proteins, will remain. The guidance referred to in this RIA is that relating to starch and protein only.
- The objective of the proposed amendment to the Regulations is to bring labelling requirements for added starch and protein in certain meat products into line with European labelling requirements.
- The main objectives of the related guidance are:
 - to ensure clear information about the relevant meat products for consumers so that they can make informed choices;
 - to give a guide on compliance with the legal requirements of the proposed amendment Regulations;
 - to encourage a common understanding across industry and between enforcement authorities by:
 - giving a guide on compliance with the legislation; and
 - giving guidance on best practice; and
 - to reduce administration burdens on industry by giving guidance on best practice, including proposed threshold levels, as to when to indicate the presence of starch and protein in the name of the food.
- The proposed legislative change involves removal of the name of the food labelling requirements related to added starch and protein from regulation 5 (and the corresponding exemptions from Schedule 3) of the MPR

⁵ Guidance relating to added starch and protein can be found in the full Guidance document which covers all added ingredients for meat products falling within the scope of regulation 5 of the MPR. Consultation on the full Guidance will take place alongside the amending Regulations.

to bring them into line with amended European legislation. The general labelling provisions of the Food Labelling Regulations 1996 (as amended) (the FLR) will continue to apply, as will the Food Safety Act 1990.

- The proposed new legislation will apply to England only. Similar amendments are expected to legislation applying in Scotland, Wales and Northern Ireland. The guidance is UK-wide and will be applicable to all four countries.
- The aim of the Regulations and associated guidance are principally to provide the consumer with information concerning the name of the food for meat products that look like a cut, joint, slice, portion or carcase of meat or of cured meat.
- The changes to the European legislation that necessitate the amendment Regulations have already been effected and came into force on 1 January 2006. To avoid any further delays and the possibility of infraction proceedings by the European Commission, it is proposed to directly implement the changes in the national legislation. Industry should already be labelling added starch and protein in line with regulation 8 of the FLR. Nevertheless, the consultation period will be extended so enforcement and industry have enough time to prepare for implementation of the amending legislation. Commensurate with better regulation principles, it is proposed that the coming into force date coincide with the Common Commencement date of 6 April 2008.
- A similar approach will be taken in Scotland, Wales and Northern Ireland.
- Similarly, an extended consultation period on the related guidance, alongside the legislation, should allow stakeholders to familiarise themselves with the content prior to the coming into force date of the Regulations.

Background

- Starch and protein can be used in the meat products industry for a variety of products and for many different reasons. Small amounts can improve moisture retention, so adding to succulence and mouthfeel. Proteins can be used to bind added water. Added starch can aid sliceability, helping to prevent sliced meats from falling apart (thickness of slice is an important factor for consumers⁶).
- Council Directive 77/99/EEC was revoked on 1 January 2006 when the consolidated EU food hygiene regulations came into force. This Directive had required that, amongst other things, added starch or proteins in meat products had to be mentioned in certain circumstances. The provision concerned stated:

“In addition The following information must be visibly and legibly displayed on the wrapping or on the label of meat products: where the legislation of a Member State authorises the use of starch or of proteins of animal or vegetable origin for other than technological

⁶ Consumer Survey: ‘Purchasing Ham’ Omnibus Research Report by COI for FSA, March 2007. www.food.gov.uk/multimedia/pdfs/hamreport.pdf

purposes, a reference to such use in connection with the sales description.”

Directive 77/99/EEC defined “meat products” as being:

“products prepared from or with meat which has undergone treatment such that the cut surface shows that the product no longer has the characteristics of fresh meat”

- This provision was implemented through regulation 5 of the MPR and its equivalents in the devolved administrations.
- Name of the food requirements in regulation 5 of the MPR takes the approach of requiring added ingredients to be included in the name of the food for meat products that look like cuts, joints, slices, portions or carcasses of raw or cooked meat or cured meat, unless the ingredient concerned is listed in Schedule 3. Therefore, rather than specifically requiring starch and protein used for non-technological purposes to be included in the name of the food (as set out in the Directive), regulation 5 takes a different approach by exempting starch and proteins from the name of the food where they are used for technological purposes. The overall effect is, however, the same.
- Regulation 5 of the MPR applies to meat products as were defined in Directive 77/99, but also covers raw meat products (normally referred to as ‘meat preparations’). There was no basis in EU law to extend the provision to raw meat preparations, but the proposal to effect that extension was properly notified as a national provision to, and accepted by, the European Commission under the Technical Standards Directive, 98/34/EC.
- It should be noted that the name of the food provisions in regulation 8 of the FLR also apply to meat products within the scope of regulation 5 of the MPR and will continue to do so. Regulation 8 of the FLR requires that, if there is no name of the food prescribed by law and if there is no customary name, or if the customary name is not used, then the name of the food has to be sufficiently precise to inform a purchaser of the true nature of the food and to enable the food to be distinguished from products with which it could be confused.
- There are current difficulties with the application of regulation 5 of the MPR to added starch and protein. The first, and most significant, is in relation to interpretation of the term ‘technological purpose’. The second is concerning the application of regulation 8 of the FLR.
- Regulation 5 of the MPR exempts starch and proteins from being included in the name of the food if they are added for a ‘technological purpose’, but this term has never been defined in EU or UK law. In practice, the lack of a clear definition has resulted in :
 - virtually all uses of starch and protein potentially being argued to be for technological purposes;
 - not all food businesses take the same approach and so there is inconsistency of application of the provision;
 - uncertainty as to the legal requirements in industry;

- enforcement authorities finding it difficult to take action; and,
 - consumers could potentially be misled about the presence of added starch and protein, although they will be included in the ingredients list on pre-packaged meat products.
- It does not appear to have been generally understood that regulation 8 of the FLR applies as well as the requirements of regulation 5 of the MPR. Regulation 8 of the FLR could have overridden the exemption in respect of inclusion of added starch or protein for technological purposes in the name of the food. This is because the addition of starch or protein in some cases, even if it could be argued to be for a technological purpose, and hence exempt under the MPR, might still be misleading if not included in the name of the food. In such cases labelling in the name of the food would be required under regulation 8 of the FLR.
 - It is recognised that there may be some difficulty in interpreting how added starch and protein should be labelled under regulation 8 of the FLR. Information gathered from initial informal consultations⁷ indicates that having guidance 'threshold' levels, for starch and protein, above which the Agency's advice would be to indicate their presence in the name of the food, would be open to consideration. The Agency is keen to explore this idea more widely with stakeholders and welcomes any comments on this proposal (outlined in Option 3).
 - As stated above, labelling requirements under regulation 8 of the FLR may not have been a routine consideration. Because of this, although a significant number of changes are not expected, there may be a few cases where starch or proteins will now be included in the name of the food where they have not been previously. Meat products (falling within the scope of regulation 5) where this may be the case are those where significant amounts of starch or protein are added. The amendment may therefore result in additional information to consumers and a small increase in burdens to business.

Rationale for government intervention

- Failure to update the law would leave the UK open to infraction procedures from the European Commission as Council Directive 77/99/EEC was revoked on 1 January 2006 when the consolidated EU food hygiene regulations came into effect. The proposed amending legislation and guidance would also address the problems arising from the lack of a definition of 'technological purpose' as this term has never been defined in EU or UK law.

3. Consultation

- Following an extended consultation on the draft amendment Regulations and associated guidance, comments received will be considered and the finalised amendment SI will be published. The proposed amendment Regulations will apply in England only. Separate equivalent legislation will be

⁷ Personal communication with industry and enforcement April/May 2007.

made in Scotland, Wales and Northern Ireland. The new associated guidance will apply in all four countries.

Within government

- The Department for Environment, Food and Rural Affairs (Defra) and the devolved administrations in Scotland, Wales and Northern Ireland have been consulted and kept informed of progress with respect to the revocation of Council Directive 77/99/EEC (on 1 January 2006) and new developments as they have arisen. Further views will be sought as part of the consultation exercise.

Public consultation

- Over the past 18 months, stakeholders have been consulted and updated on developments both formally and informally. A letter was sent to interested parties outlining the legal position and the proposed way forward with respect to the revocation of Directive 77/99/EEC (as updated by Directive 97/76/EC). In addition, a stakeholder meeting was convened in December 2006 at which the likely impact on consumers, enforcement and industry of the changes in EC legislation were discussed. Bilateral meetings and informal consultations have been carried out over the last two months.
- The proposed guidance on 'threshold' levels for added starch and protein has been developed with input from stakeholders representing enforcement, consumers and industry.
- This partial RIA accompanies a formal extended consultation launched on 26 July to gain stakeholder comments on the proposed draft Amendment England Regulations. Around 150 interested parties, including consumer organisations, meat industry associations and enforcement authorities will be consulted and provided with the opportunity to make their own representations to the UK government.
- The responses to the consultation will be taken into consideration by the Agency when preparing the full version of the RIA submitted for ministerial signature. A summary of the responses will also be published on the Agency's website.

Stakeholders are invited to comment on this RIA and where relevant provide supporting evidence and information.

4. Options

- Three potential options have been identified for the UK Government following on from the changes to EC legislation.

Option 1 – Do nothing

- This option would not achieve the intended objectives of amending national legislation to bring it into line with EC law; namely to standardise

industry practice, remove the vague distinction between technological and non-technological uses.

- In addition, the UK may be at risk of infraction proceedings by the European Commission for non-implementation of EC legislation.

Option 2 – Implementation of the European changes

- This option would have the desired effect in that national legislation would be brought into line with EC law. The name of the food requirements for meat products and meat preparations (including ‘technological purpose’ exemptions) for added starch and protein will be removed from regulation 5 of the Meat Products (England) Regulations 2003 with a likely coming into force date of 6 April 2008. The labelling rules in this respect would then fall solely under the horizontal labelling provisions, namely regulation 8 of the FLR. This option would partially achieve the intended objectives. The uncertainty surrounding ‘technological purpose’ will be removed. This is considered a positive step by most stakeholders. However, uncertainty arising out of interpretation of the legislation i.e. what the FLR would require by way of the name of the food may remain.
- A major enforcement stakeholder is concerned that costs will increase if the requirements fall to more general labelling legislation. These would stem from increases in activities associated with enforcement of compliance with the general labelling legislation i.e. monitoring, inspections and enquiries from industry.
- Furthermore, differences of interpretation of the legislation between enforcement authorities could lead to unfair competition across industry. Equally, different interpretations by food businesses could have the same effect.
- This option could benefit consumers as it may result in a small increase in the amount of products labelled as containing starch and protein in the name of the food (as the exemption might have been relied upon too heavily before).
- The decision not to include transitional provisions in the amending legislation may lead to non-compliant products on the market after the coming into force of the Regulations. However, an extended consultation period and common commencement ‘coming into force’ date will help to give business enough time to use up existing labelling and stocks of the relevant products. Moreover, initial indications from stakeholders are that only a small proportion of existing product lines may potentially be affected.

Option 3 – Implementation of the European changes plus associated guidance

- This option involves implementing the European provisions (as per Option 2) and, in addition, issuing associated guidance. The related guidance, apart from explaining the change in legislation, would include proposed ‘threshold’ levels above which the Agency would advise to label added starch and/or protein in the name of the food. This would be a purely

voluntary measure (with no statutory force) relating to the labelling of meat products falling within the scope of regulation 5 of the MPR.

- The Agency is keen to explore this option as, while retaining the benefits of Option 2, it also addresses the main risks associated with that same option i.e. those arising out of compliance with the general labelling rules (regulation 8 of the FLR). The potential benefits might be:

Industry

- to reduce administration burdens created by the consideration of the legislation;
- to encourage standardisation of labelling practices and a level playing field in the marketplace;

Enforcement

- to reduce enforcement risks associated with compliance with the general labelling legislation;
- to reduce support needed for industry (i.e. dealing with enquiries);
- more consistent approach, by standardising enforcement practices between Local Authorities;

Consumers

- consistency of information about the relevant meat products that they are buying; and
- potential increase in information on the nature of the meat products they are purchasing (particularly where higher levels of starch and protein have been added).
- Initial one-to-one consultations with stakeholders indicate that most of those consulted would welcome guidance and guideline threshold levels, for indicating starch and protein in the name of the food, would be open to consideration. Following stakeholder consultation, the Agency is initially proposing a threshold level of 1%, to apply independently to added starch and protein in 'regulation 5' meat products. (This threshold level would not apply to foreign animal species protein which should always be indicated in the name of the food irrespective of the level.) These ingredients are typically used at very low levels (approximately 0.5%) for their intended technical effects such as improving the succulence of the meat and to aid sliceability. Generally higher levels are used for extending the meat and it is these products (where the presence of starch and protein should be indicated in the name of the food) the threshold level seeks to differentiate.
- The Agency is keen to explore the concept of thresholds further with stakeholders as there are many potential benefits if a common agreement can be reached.

The Agency would welcome comments on having a guidance 'threshold' level

of 1% each for added starch and protein and any proposals for alternative values with any relevant supporting evidence.

5. Costs and Benefits

- It is difficult to assess and quantify the potential costs and benefits of the proposal as the consultation process so far has not yielded substantive market share information for the whole sector. In addition, some of the potential costs and benefits may be non-monetary in their nature and thus very difficult to translate into financial terms i.e. the potential consumer benefits from more labelling information. However, available information (such as ONS reports and results of stakeholder consultations) can give useful insights on the potential costs and benefits of each option.

Sectors and groups affected

- It is estimated that 9,310⁸ businesses in the UK trade in meat products falling within the scope of regulation 5 of the MPR. (No particular cost effects are expected for the voluntary sector.) The business sectors potentially affected by this proposal would be retailers (of which there are approximately 6,485), wholesale meat suppliers (of which there are approximately 2,190) and manufacturers of meat products and ingredient mixes (of which there are approximately 635). While large supermarkets and small butcher's shops⁹ share the bulk of the market, other players are becoming increasingly popular with consumers including farm shops and farmers' markets¹⁰. Removal of the national provisions will similarly affect importers.
- Businesses are already required to provide labelling information under the FLR and the MPR on all products at retail sale to the final consumer. In most cases the proposed changes will be for pre-packed products where a small number of labels may have to be re-printed. For products sold loose, including those pre-packed for direct sale (packed and sold on the same premises) the information required is often provided at point of sale which will be cheaper and easier to amend if necessary. Those businesses that simply sell on pre-packed produce, other than own-label, will not be affected because labelling would be the responsibility of the producer or packer. A major stakeholder representing the hospitality industry believes it is unlikely this measure will affect caterers.

⁸ Based on 'UK Inter Departmental Business Register 2006 (UK Business: Activity, Size and Location: Number of VAT-Based Enterprises) (UK Standard Industrial Classification of Economic Activities (SIC) 2003)'. Note: These figures list VAT-Based Enterprises only and do not take into account the number of individual premises affected; the total number of which may be somewhat higher than these estimates. Premises data (as obtained from the FSA Local Authority Monitoring Report) are not available at a sufficiently low level to allow for the identification of the specific businesses affected by this legislation.

⁹ For the purpose of SIC 2003 classification: "where the [meat] processing is minimal and does not lead to a real transformation (**e.g. butchers**) the unit is classified to wholesale and retail trade". Note: Relevant SIC (Standard Industry Classification) code data was used for sector based quantities where possible, although in practice the MPR was found to apply across sectors, or to groups of organisations that do not correspond directly to SIC codes.

¹⁰ Various sources including: Mintel Report: Red Meat - UK (November 2006), major trade association and internet research.

- Based on a targeted consultation with a major enforcement stakeholder, the measure will also have an impact on the work of enforcement bodies, for example trading standards departments, which would be responsible for the enforcement of the Meat Products Amendment Regulations.
- Consumers will benefit from more consistent information on labels which in turn will enable them to distinguish between meat products and their fresh 'plain' meat counterparts. No other social impacts have been identified.
- Regulation 5 only applies to meat products that look like a cut, joint, slice, portion or carcase of meat. It does not apply to fresh raw meat that contains no added ingredients or comminuted products such as canned corned beef, sausages, or burgers as they do not have the appearance of 'whole' meat. It follows that any impacts of the proposal will not include the sale of these meat products.

Benefits

Option 1 – Do Nothing

- There do not appear to be any incremental benefits (economic, environmental or social) associated with this option.

Option 2 – Implementation of the European changes

- The removal of the reference to ‘technological purpose’ would be welcomed by most stakeholders as the lack of a definition in UK and EU law created much uncertainty. Furthermore, the changes will mean that the labelling rules relating to the addition of starch and protein would be harmonised with EU law.
- A potential benefit for consumers is that there maybe a small increase in the number of products labelled as containing added starch and protein in the name of the food (particularly where larger amounts are added).

Option 3 – Implementation of the European changes plus associated guidance

- The introduction of guidance, including threshold levels for starch and protein, should create a number of benefits for all stakeholders (see paragraph 39). Industry has identified regulation 5 of the MPR as one of the most burdensome Agency Regulations with much of the costs arising from ‘familiarisation’ with the legislation¹¹. For the purpose of this RIA, it has been calculated that it costs approximately £876,000¹² for the business population to familiarise themselves with the whole of regulation 5 legislation. If it is estimated that half¹³ of this cost (and time taken) arises from familiarisation with the labelling rules for added starch and protein, the present cost to industry is approximately £438,000¹⁴ (similar costs are anticipated if the requirements fall to general labelling legislation). It is further estimated that guidance on threshold levels would reduce the time taken and associated costs to £131,000¹⁵ representing a saving of £307,000 (or a 70% reduction). The specific cost savings associated with this option will be dependent on the nature of individual businesses; small businesses in particular might benefit as they often do not have staff dedicated to monitoring the legislation.
- Threshold guidance levels should encourage standardisation of labelling across industry; a level playing field in this respect has been identified as an important factor by stakeholders during formal and informal consultations.
- Enforcement stakeholders will benefit from this option, as guidance will promote a common understanding in the marketplace thus reducing the uncertainty related to compliance with regulation 8 of the FLR. This should

¹¹ Administrative Burdens Measurement Exercise ‘Final Report’ by PricewaterhouseCoopers LLP, June 2006. www.food.gov.uk/multimedia/pdfs/abmefinrep.pdf

¹² Based on 9,310 businesses and industry estimates of 6 hours and 40 minutes (ABME) for familiarisation with regulation 5 at an average hourly salary of £14.12 (£10.86 up-rated by 30% to account for overheads) calculated from Retail and Wholesale Managers as classified in the ‘ONS Annual Survey of Hours and Earnings (2005): Mean Gross Hourly Pay’.

¹³ This estimate is based on it taking more time to understand the legislation relating to starch and protein due to uncertainty surrounding the term ‘technological purpose’.

¹⁴ Based on time estimate of 3 hours 20 minutes i.e. half of the original ABME estimate.

¹⁵ Based on it taking 1 hour with guidance for familiarisation with relevant legislation.

lead to a reduction in the enforcement costs as outlined at Option 2. It will also encourage a common understanding of the requirements between enforcement authorities.

- Consumers should ultimately benefit from more consistent labelling and further confidence in the products they are buying.
- No significant environmental benefits have been identified for the options but an extended consultation period should lead to less need to dispose of labels and packaging.

The Agency would welcome comments from stakeholders on the potential benefits. In particular the Agency would like information on the costs and number of hours taken to comply with legislation for the proposed options over and above what would be done in the normal course of business.

Costs

Option 1 – Do Nothing

- No significant incremental social, environmental or economic costs have been identified for this option.
- However, the UK Government may face costs resulting from infraction proceedings by the European Commission for non-implementation of EU legislation.

Option 2 – Implementation of the European changes

- Early indications from informal one-to-one consultations with industry (including retailers, wholesalers and manufacturers) are that this measure would not incur any significant costs to any of the relevant industry sectors.
- One effect of this option could be a small increase in the number of products labelled as containing starch and protein in the name of the food. It is difficult to estimate the costs to the whole sector, although informal consultation with stakeholders has yielded some useful information relating to butchers' shops and large supermarkets, who share the bulk of the market. The following estimates give a useful indication of the costs of this measure to the industry sectors affected.
- The average cost of re-labelling a product line is estimated by butchers to be approximately £43 (mid-point of the range £33 – £53¹⁶) (the exact amounts will depend on volume, packaging and size of each business). Given that an estimated 7,500 butchers each stock an average of 12 product lines that contain starch and protein, and an estimated 2% of the total number of these products throughout all businesses will be affected by this legislation, the estimated cost will be £77,400 to this sector.
- Current and previous consultations indicate one-off costs incurred by larger retailers to re-label a product line are approximately £1,250 (mid-point of the range £1,000 - £1,500¹⁷). Based on information gathered, it is

¹⁶ Based on cost estimates from shop proprietors to set up software templates, print and label a product line (includes labour costs).

¹⁷ Based upon previous and present stakeholder estimates of having to re-label 50,000 products in one line at a cost of 2-3p each (including labour costs).

estimated that large supermarkets¹⁸ stock an average of 135 own-brand product lines that contain starch and protein, and an estimated 4% potentially affected by this legislation at an approximate cost of £47,250 to this sector.

- It has not been possible to estimate costs to predominantly wholesale businesses, large meat manufacturers or medium sized retailers from the information gathered. Of those contacted, however, none believed re-labelling costs would be significant. (For products sold loose, i.e. at butchers' and deli-counters, labelling information is often provided by point of sale displays that need only be replaced once so re-labelling of loose products would be cheaper.) Re-labelling costs will depend on the nature and size of individual businesses, however overall estimates are low, even for large supermarkets, and support the view of those contacted that incremental costs would not be significant.
- Industry may incur one-off costs reflecting expenditure for the disposal of labels. According to the meat industry (including small businesses) 6-12 months is necessary to use up stocks of packaging for major nutrition labelling changes¹⁹. This measure is significantly smaller, therefore it is anticipated that there will be enough time (including an extended consultation period) for industry to make the necessary arrangements, within their normal commercial labelling cycles.
- Businesses may incur additional administration costs arising out of uncertainty about interpretation of regulation 8 of the FLR. Initial consultations have indicated that there will be no significant incremental costs to industry as a similar level of uncertainty existed before on what constituted 'technological purpose'. However, an enforcement stakeholder has indicated that there might be a rise in inspections of premises which will potentially raise costs to industry. These costs are estimated to be approximately £35,300²⁰ per year.
- None of those contacted from the industry identified any other on-going costs to their businesses.
- There is a risk that uncertainty surrounding the labelling requirements of the FLR will impact adversely on public sector bodies responsible for enforcing the changes in the legislation. A major enforcement stakeholder has indicated that enforcement costs could rise from an increase in enquiries and monitoring activities (in particular inspections of premises, sampling and analysis).
- To quantify these costs, it is estimated that the amount of time taken to provide advice would increase by an average of 2 hours per Local Authority per year at a cost of £19²¹ per hour. This would amount to an incremental cost of approximately £18,800 for 494 Local Authorities undertaking enforcement activities.

¹⁸ Top 7 according to market share : Tesco, Asda, Sainsbury's, Morrisons, Somerfield, Waitrose and Iceland (<http://news.bbc.co.uk/1/hi/business/4694974.stm>).

¹⁹ FSA Survey: Evaluating the impact on business of changes to nutrition labelling requirements in the UK, December 2006. www.food.gov.uk/multimedia/pdfs/ffinutritionlabellingreport.pdf

²⁰ Based on 5,000 businesses (enforcement stakeholder estimate) undergoing enforcement inspections for 30 minutes at an average hourly rate of £14.12.

²¹ ONS Annual Survey of Hours and Earnings 2005: 'Inspectors of factories, utilities and trading standards' £16.52/hour up-rated by 30% to account for overheads, equates to £18.99/hour

- Informal consultation with stakeholders, including the Association of Public Analysts, show that monitoring activities (i.e. sampling and analyses) related to starch and protein are low and relatively cheap at an average of £66²² per sample. Based on these estimates, it is anticipated that on-going monitoring costs for a maximum of 100 samples per year would amount to approximately £6,600.
- Inspections of premises may also increase leading to a maximum incremental cost of £125,000²³.
- The on-going yearly rise in enforcement costs is therefore estimated at approximately £150,000 (total of paragraphs 67 to 69).

Option 3 – Implementation of the European changes plus associated guidance

- There are economic costs associated with this option. It is estimated that it will cost industry £65,700²⁴ with respect to the time taken to become familiar with the guidance on the legislation although this cost would be offset by longer-term benefits once the guidance has been read. In addition there may be increased costs to industry from labelling (see Option 2) however these are not thought to be significant.
- It is estimated that the cost for 494 Local Authorities to read and familiarise themselves with the guidance would be approximately £4,700²⁵.
- No significant environmental costs have been identified for this option although there might be a small increase in environmental costs from disposal of labelling and packaging. No significant social costs have been identified.

The Agency would welcome comments from stakeholders on the potential costs, to them and to others, and to provide evidence and information to support their arguments. In particular the Agency would like information from wholesalers and meat manufacturers on numbers of 'regulation 5' product lines potentially affected by this legislation and associated costs.

6. Administrative Burdens Assessment

- The administrative burdens and associated costs and benefits of the three options were all considered. The costs and savings are outlined in the Draft Summary Costs and Benefits Table at Section 16.

Option 1 – There would be no changes to the level of administration burdens on industry arising from compliance with the existing legislation (regulation 5 of the MPR).

²² Based on personal communications with stakeholders (May 2007).

²³ Based on LACORS' estimate of it taking 30 minutes to inspect a maximum of 5,000 businesses at an hourly rate of £50.

²⁴ Based on 9,310 businesses taking 30 minutes to read the guidance at an average hourly salary of £14.12 (£10.86 up-rated by 30% to account for overheads) calculated from Retail and Wholesale Managers as classified in the 'ONS Annual Survey of Hours and Earnings (2005): Mean Gross Hourly Pay'.

²⁵ Based on the assumption it will take Local Authorities 30 minutes to read the guidance. ONS Annual Survey of Hours and Earnings 2005: 'Inspectors of factories, utilities and trading standards' £16.52/hour up-rated by 30% to account for overheads, equates to £18.99/hour

Option 2 – This option would not fully address the administration burdens faced by industry on whether to label added starch and protein in the name of the food as there will still be a degree of uncertainty under the general labelling legislation (i.e. regulation 8 of the FLR). There may be some re-labelling costs although these would not be significant. There may be a rise in costs relating to enforcement of compliance which will lead to increased costs to industry.

Option 3 – There are administrative costs associated with this option. Industry and enforcement will need time to become familiar with the guidance. However, the costs will be offset by the anticipated savings resulting from the longer-term benefits of having clear guidance (including advice on threshold levels).

The Agency would welcome comments and evidence on administration costs, over and above what industry would do in the normal course of business, that this Regulation may introduce.

7. Sustainability Assessment

- The economic, social and environmental costs and benefits associated with the three options were all considered.

Option 1 – This option is not sustainable as it would leave the UK open to infraction proceedings by the EU.

Option 2 – Social costs are not significant. There is a small risk of environmental impact from the disposal of labels and packaging however an extended consultation period will mitigate this risk. There will be economic costs falling on industry and enforcers.

Option 3 – Costs are as outlined for Option 2, but are offset against benefits from having guidance on threshold levels. This is the most sustainable option.

8. Small Firms Impact Test

- Approximately 9,255²⁶ of the 9,310 companies affected claim small business status (defined as having less than 250 employees). Butchers represent a large proportion and, according to a major trade association, there are about 7,500 in the UK. Estimates of business totals broken down by size are as follows:

- Micro (less than 10 employees) 85.8%
- Small (less than 49 employees) 11.6%
- Medium (less than 249 employees) 2.0%
- Large (greater than 250 employees) 0.6%.

²⁶ Based on 'UK Inter Departmental Business Register 2006 (UK Business: Activity, Size and Location: Number of VAT-Based Enterprises) (UK Standard Industrial Classification of Economic Activities (SIC) 2003)'. Note: These figures list VAT-Based Enterprises only and do not take into account the number of individual premises affected; the total number of which may be somewhat higher than these estimates. Premises data (as obtained from the FSA Local Authority Monitoring Report) are not available at a sufficiently low level to allow for the identification of the specific businesses affected by this legislation.

- The Agency has conducted a “Small Firms Impact Test” the results of which indicate that this measure would not have a major impact on small businesses. Small businesses (retail and wholesale) and a major trade association representing butchers were consulted.
- None of those contacted thought that the proposed changes would have a significant impact on their business. Information provided suggests that butchers tend to stock 10-15 ‘regulation 5’ meat product lines, some of which are manufactured in-house and others bought in from suppliers. The establishments contacted prided themselves on selling traditional ‘premium’ products. Most said they did not add starch or proteins to their meat and none used starch and/or proteins to bulk out their products.
- All of those contacted re-programme and print their labels in-house at a relatively low cost to their business (see paragraph 60). None thought any potential re-labelling of product lines or label disposal costs would be significant to their business. No on-going costs were identified.
- The Agency’s preferred option (Option 3) would not impose any new administration burdens on small businesses. One stakeholder bought in a proportion of his products from suppliers with labelling information already provided while others believed that none of their products would be affected. Smaller wholesalers might face potential costs, particularly if they have to re-label their own-brand products, however a smaller wholesaler contacted did not think this would be significant.

The Agency would welcome comments from small firm stakeholders on the potential costs and benefits to them including supporting evidence.

9. Competition Assessment

- The results of the Competition Assessment²⁷ indicate that the proposed changes in legislation are unlikely to have any significant effects on competition in the UK marketplace. Smaller businesses generally have a reduced ability to absorb costs, for example those incurred by re-labelling, however consultations with smaller businesses have revealed that the costs would not be high enough to affect their ability to compete in the wider market. It is unlikely that the legislation or proposed guidance will have any adverse effect on barriers to entry or international trade as the proposed changes in the legislation will bring the UK into line with EU law.

Industry stakeholders are invited to comment on the potential impact on business competition of this measure and to provide any financial or other data which they consider will support their case.

10. Enforcement, Sanctions and Monitoring

- Enforcement of the England Regulations will be the responsibility of Local Authority Trading Standards or Environmental Health Departments.

²⁷ Further information on this process can be found in “Guidelines to Competition Assessment – A Guide to Policy Makers Completing Regulatory Impact Assessment” on the OFT website at www.of.gov.uk.

Port Health Authorities are responsible for enforcing the Regulations in respect of imports.

- If the Agency's recommended option (Option 3) is applied the implications for enforcement authorities is not expected to be significant. In the absence of guidance future enforcement costs are estimated to be £150,000 for the UK (as per Option 2).
- The associated guidance has been written in part to explain the amending legislation but also to give further advice (which has no statutory force) on the labelling of the addition of starch and protein to the relevant meat products. Guidance should help enforcers give advice on improving the information given on labels in this area, without resorting to enforcement action. This may eventually reduce enforcement costs.

Enforcement stakeholders are invited to comment on the potential impacts and associated costs to them and provide any evidence to support their case.

11. Issues of Equity and Fairness

- The amending legislation will bring UK food labelling legislation into line with EU law. It is not anticipated there would be a disadvantageous effect on the competitiveness of UK businesses in other Member States.
- The changes would apply to businesses of all sizes; however there will not be a disproportionate impact on Small and Medium Enterprises.

12. Racial Equality

- No racial equality impacts have been identified.

13. Implementation and Delivery Plan

This section will be completed after consultation and included in the full RIA.

14. Post-implementation Review

This section will be completed after consultation and included in the full RIA.

15. Overall Summary and Recommendation

This section will be completed after consultation and included in the full RIA.

16. Draft Summary Costs and Benefits Table

This summary table will be finalised after consultation and included in the full RIA.

Option	Total benefit per annum: economic, environmental, social	Total cost per annum: - economic, environmental, social - policy and administrative
1. Do Nothing	No benefits have been identified.	Risks infraction proceedings imposed by the European Commission against the UK.
2. Implement European changes	<p>No significant benefits although the removal of the reference to 'technological purpose' is welcomed by most stakeholders.</p> <p>Small possibility of an increase in labelling information for consumers.</p>	<p>Possible increase in industry costs due to a slight increase in labelling; total cost cannot be quantified but may not be significant. (Estimated so far to be £77,400 for all butchers and £47,250 for the top 7 supermarkets with the largest market share). A rise in costs might result from inspections of premises of up to £35,300.</p> <p>Small possibility of increase in industry costs due to disposal of labelling, however probably not significant.</p> <p>Increase in enforcement costs of up to £150,000 arising out of activities relating to enforcement of compliance with regulation 8 of the FLR.</p>
3. Implementation of the European changes plus associated guidance	<p>Possible industry administration cost savings of up to £307,000.</p> <p>Standardisation of application of the legislation (by both industry and enforcement) leading to a level playing field in the market place.</p> <p>Increased consistency of labelling for consumers.</p> <p>Small possibility of increased labelling information for consumers.</p>	<p>Possible increase in industry costs due to a slight increase in labelling; total cost cannot be quantified but may not be significant. (Estimated so far to be £77,400 for all butchers and £47,250 for the top 7 supermarkets with the largest market share). A rise in costs might result from inspections of premises of up to £35,300.</p> <p>Small possibility of increase in industry costs due to disposal of labelling, however probably not significant.</p> <p>Industry costs of up to £65,700 for familiarisation with the guidance.</p> <p>Enforcement costs of up to £4,700 for familiarisation with the guidance.</p> <p>Increase in enforcement costs of up to £150,000 arising out of activities relating to enforcement of compliance with regulation 8 of the FLR.</p>

Contact point

Ms Fiona Claudius
Labelling, Standards and Allergy Division
Food Standards Agency
Room 115c, Aviation House

125 Kingsway
London WC2B 6NH

Tel: 020 7276 8152

Fax: 020 7276 8193

e-mail: fiona.claudius@foodstandards.gsi.gov.uk

PARTIAL REGULATORY IMPACT ASSESSMENT

1. Title of the Proposal

1. Labelling of 'Added Ingredients' in MPR regulation 5 Meat Products

A guide to regulatory compliance incorporating guidance on best practice²⁸.

2. Purpose and Intended Effect

Objectives

2. The new Guidance is principally a consumer information measure concerning requirements in relation to the name of the food for meat products that have the appearance of a cut, joint, slice, portion or carcase of meat or of cured meat. It is intended for use by consumers, manufacturers, retailers, wholesalers, catering establishments, enforcement officers and importers.

3. The main objectives are:

- to ensure clear information about the relevant meat products for consumers so that they can make informed choices;
- to give guidance on regulatory requirements principally those of regulation 5 of the Meat Products (England) Regulations 2003 (the MPR)²⁹ while reducing the administrative burdens on industry and keeping any additional burdens that may arise as a result of this guidance to a minimum³⁰;
- to encourage a common understanding across industry and enforcement authorities of best practice in relation to the labelling of the relevant meat products;
- to facilitate fair competition within industry; and
- to encourage consistent enforcement.

Background

4. Regulation 5 of the MPR is mainly concerned with indicating the presence of certain added ingredients in the name of the food (i.e. added water and ingredients (including proteins) from different animal species) for meat products that can be easily confused with similar 'plain' meat products. Under UK law, the labelling of such products is controlled by the MPR and the Food Labelling Regulations 1996 (the FLR) (as amended). These rules apply to imported meat products as well as those produced in the UK.

²⁸ From now on referred to as the Guidance.

²⁹ Equivalent regulations exist for Scotland, Wales and Northern Ireland.

³⁰ The Meat Products (England) Regulations 2003 was identified as one of the most burdensome pieces of FSA legislation by the Administrative Burdens Measurement Exercise 'Final Report' by PricewaterhouseCoopers LLP, June 2006. www.food.gov.uk/multimedia/pdfs/abmefinrep.pdf

5. The issue of prominent labelling of 'added ingredients' in these meat products has been highlighted in results of FSA Surveys³¹, enforcement exercises³² and a European Food and Veterinary Office (FVO) inspection³³.

6. All reported problems in the labelling of these products (particularly relating to chicken imports for the catering sector). The issues highlighted were:

- the undeclared addition of water (i.e. over-declaration of the meat content) in chicken;
- the undeclared presence of pork and beef hydrolysed proteins used as water retaining agents in chicken; and
- the obscure labelling of water retaining agents (such as salt) in raw pork cut products.

7. Water retention agents are used primarily for their water-binding properties in meat. There are many different water retention agents used, including salt, polyphosphates, sugars, gums and proteins. More recently, hydrolysed collagen proteins from animal sources such as beef, pork or poultry have been developed and used for their greater water holding capacity.

8. The Guidance has been developed to improve labelling in this area to provide consumers with clear and more informative labelling; to help the industry comply with the legal requirements while ensuring enforcement follows the Hampton principles of being risk based and proportionate.

9. In addition, the Guidance seeks to minimise the administrative burdens on industry arising from consideration of the legislation. The Administrative Burdens Measurement Exercise (ABME) identified regulation 5 of the MPR as one of the most burdensome pieces of FSA legislation. Equally, issuing clear guidance on the legislation was suggested by industry during that same exercise and during subsequent informal consultations.

10. Care has been taken to clearly separate the legal requirements from advice on best practice, the aim, being to ensure that the legal requirements are clear, which should improve compliance and, consumer protection while keeping the burdens on industry to a minimum.

³¹ Food Standards Agency (UK) - Survey of Added Water in Chickens and Chicken Products (Number 08/00), October 2000; www.food.gov.uk/science/surveillance/fsis2000/8chick

Survey of Meat Content, Added Water and Hydrolysed Protein in Catering Chicken Breasts (Number 20/01), December 2001; <http://www.food.gov.uk/science/surveillance/fsis2001/20chick>

Food Safety Authority (NI) Investigation; Investigation into the Composition and Labelling of Imported Chicken Breast Fillets, May 2002.

³² Shropshire Trading Standards Survey: Added Water and Salt in Pork Products, July 2004; www.shropshire.gov.uk/portal_commisar.nsf/viewCommitteeItem/80256D810051CA7F80256C6A003EA01D?OpenDocument

Imported Food sampling and Surveillance Projects, 2003 - 2005. www.food.gov.uk/multimedia/pdfs/swg2905report.pdf

³³ Final report on a mission carried out in the United Kingdom from 20 to 27 April 2005 in order to assess the official supervision of poultry meat production with a special regard to the use of water retention agents.

11. The Guidance is a UK-wide document and is applicable in England, Scotland, Wales and Northern Ireland.

Rationale for Government intervention

12. The FSA is in a good position to consider issues of mislabelling as it has a key role in protecting consumers' interests in relation to food. It is also well-placed to take a broad view of the issue.

13. Guidance on regulation 5 of the MPR would address the mislabelling problems highlighted by previous sampling exercises. In addition, it will address the need to reduce administrative burdens on industry.

3. Consultation

Within government

14. The Guidance has been prepared by the Agency with the assistance of a Drafting Group with representation from the Department of Environment, Food and Rural Affairs (Defra). Stakeholder meetings have also been held by the Agency. Defra and the devolved administrations in Scotland, Wales and Northern Ireland have been consulted and kept informed of progress.

Public consultation

15. Members of the Drafting Group included major stakeholders representing consumers, enforcement and the meat industry (i.e. retailers, wholesalers and manufacturers). With respect to the mislabelling problems in poultry products, an open stakeholder meeting was attended by consumer representatives, religious groups, enforcement agencies, manufacturers, retailers and suppliers to the catering industry and caterers. Another meeting was held more recently to consult and update stakeholders further.

16. A summary of the responses to this consultation will also be published on the Agency's website.

4. Options

Option 1 – Do nothing

17. This option would not address the risks arising from mislabelling of meat products that can be easily confused with raw or cooked 'plain' meat by consumers. Moreover, it would not reduce the current administrative burdens on industry identified during the ABME.

Option 2 – publish FSA guidance on best practice and legal requirements

18. This option would involve publishing guidance on legal requirements and best practice advice for labelling of added ingredients for meat products falling within the scope of regulation 5 of the MPR.

19. This is the Agency's preferred option as it would give additional clarity and a common understanding of the requirements across industry and enforcement authorities. Ultimately, it would lead to fairer competition in the

market place and a reduction in administrative burdens on industry by making it easier to comply with the legislation.

20. Furthermore, this measure would reduce the risks highlighted by previous surveys, particularly with respect to the use of water retention agents in poultry and the addition of excessive water to 'bulk out' meat products. Consultations with stakeholders during 2003-06 revealed that all were in favour of work to improve the prominence of added ingredients in the name of the food in these cases.

21. The use of hydrolysed pork or beef collagen proteins as water retention agents in poultry meat is distasteful to many consumers, particularly those who for religious or other reasons choose not to eat beef or pork. The Guidance clearly sets out the legal requirements for prominent labelling of foreign species protein in the name of the food for regulation 5 meat products.

5. Costs and Benefits

Sectors and groups affected

22. Those affected include retailers, wholesale meat suppliers, meat product manufacturers, caterers, enforcement authorities and importers.

23. There may be impacts on consumers, in particular ethnic groups, as the Guidance may lead to improved labelling information on the nature of the meat products they are buying.

Benefits

Option 1 – Do nothing

24. There do not appear to be any incremental benefits (social, economical or environmental) associated with this option.

Option 2 – publish FSA guidance on best practice and legal requirements

25. This is the Agency's preferred option, as the Guidance will lead to benefits from providing further clarity on the legislation. The ABME estimated that familiarisation with the legislation imposes significant administrative burdens on industry. This view was reiterated by industry at a more recent stakeholder meeting.

26. It is anticipated that the Guidance will reduce those administrative burdens. To quantify this benefit, it is estimated that it costs businesses a total of £438,000³⁴ to familiarise themselves with regulation 5 legislation. It is further estimated that Guidance could reduce the administration cost to

³⁴ Based on 9,310 businesses and industry estimates of 6 hours and 40 minutes (ABME) for familiarisation with regulation 5 at an average hourly salary of £14.12 (£10.86 up-rated by 30% to account for overheads) calculated from Retail and Wholesale Managers as classified in the 'ONS Annual Survey of Hours and Earnings (2005): Mean Gross Hourly Pay'. Minus costs of £438,000 relating to starch and protein.

£263,000³⁵ representing a saving of £175,000³⁶. This saving may be of particular benefit to small businesses.

27. A common understanding of the labelling rules should lead to a level playing field across industry. A common understanding by enforcement authorities should result in more consistent enforcement which will have a similar effect.

28. In addition, the Guidance would reduce costs arising out of inspections of premises. It may also lead to a reduction in the time required by Local Authorities to undertake enforcement activities e.g. the time required to answer enquiries from industry.

29. Ultimately consumers would benefit from consistent information about the products that they are buying and more prominent labelling information. Ethnic minorities will have better chances of avoiding foreign proteins (such as hydrolysed pork or beef collagen proteins in poultry meat), which they choose not to eat for religious or other reasons.

30. No significant environmental benefits have been identified for this option.

The Agency would welcome comments from stakeholders on the estimated administrative cost savings of this option. In addition, the Agency would welcome comments from industry and enforcement on the potential cost savings from referring to the Guidance and the possible reduction in inspections of premises.

Costs

Option 1 – Do nothing

31. No incremental economic, social or environmental costs have been associated with this option. However the issues over mislabelling of added ingredients to meat products, particularly water and foreign species protein, and associated enforcement costs would remain.

Option 2 – publish FSA guidance on best practice and legal requirements

32. This option would lead to an increase in costs to enforcement and industry from reading the Guidance. To quantify these costs, it has been calculated that it would take 1 hour to become familiar with the Guidance, equating to industry costs of £131,000³⁷ and enforcement costs of £9,400³⁸.

³⁵ Based on 9310 businesses taking 2 hours to become familiar with the legislation with the aid of guidance at a cost of £14.12 per hour.

³⁶ Based on the difference between existing cost of £438,000 and a new cost of £263,000 with Guidance.

³⁷ Approximate cost based on 9310 businesses taking 1 hour to read the Guidance at an average hourly salary of £14.12.

³⁸ Approximate cost based on 494 Local Authorities taking 1 hour to read the Guidance at an average hourly rate of £18.99 (ONS Annual Survey of Hours and Earnings 2005: 'Inspectors of factories, utilities and trading standards' £16.52/hour up-rated by 30% to account for overheads, equates to £18.99/hour).

However some of these costs would be offset by potential savings associated with this option in the longer term.

33. The average cost of re-labelling a product line is estimated by butchers to be approximately £43 (mid-point of the range £33 – £53³⁹) (the exact amounts will depend on volume, packaging and size of each business). Given that 7,500 butchers each stock a further 28 'legislation 5' product lines (in addition to those 12 already accounted for by the starch and protein legislation), and an estimated 2% of the total number of these products throughout all businesses will be affected by this legislation, the estimated cost will be £181,000 to this sector.

34. Current and previous consultations indicate one-off costs incurred by larger retailers to re-label a product line are approximately £1,250 (mid-point of the range of £1,000 - £1,500⁴⁰). Based on information gathered, it is estimated that large supermarkets stock an average of 315 own-brand 'legislation 5' product lines (in addition to those 135 already accounted for by the starch and protein regulation), and an estimated 4% of the total number of these products will be affected by this legislation, at a cost to the sector of approximately £110,250.

35. It has not been possible to estimate costs to predominantly wholesale businesses, large meat manufacturers or medium sized retailers from the information gathered. Of those contacted, however, none believed re-labelling costs would be significant. (For products sold loose, i.e. at butchers' and deli-counters, labelling information is often provided by point of sale displays that need only be replaced once so re-labelling of loose products would be cheaper.) Re-labelling costs will depend on the nature and size of individual businesses. However overall estimates are low, even for large supermarkets, and support the view of those contacted that incremental costs would not be significant.

36. No significant social or environmental costs have been identified for this option.

The Agency would welcome comments from stakeholders and, where relevant, supporting evidence, on the estimated administrative costs (including potential re-labelling) of this option.

6. Administrative Burdens Assessment

37. The administrative burdens and associated costs and benefits of the two options were all considered.

³⁹ Based on cost estimates from shop proprietors to set up software templates, print and label a product line (includes labour costs).

⁴⁰ Based upon previous estimates and present estimate of having to re-label 50,000 products in one line at a cost of 2-3p each (including labour costs).

Option 1 – The current administrative burdens on industry arising from compliance with regulation 5 of the MPR as identified by the ABME would not be reduced.

Option 2 – There would be one-off industry and enforcement administrative costs associated with becoming familiar with the Guidance. However, these would be offset by the longer-term savings in administrative costs that would be incurred from becoming familiar with the legislation in the absence of the Guidance. Also in the longer term, inspections of premises may decrease in frequency reducing costs further for both industry and enforcement.

7. Sustainability Assessment

38. The economic, social and environmental costs and benefits associated with the two options were considered.

Option 1 – No significant economic, social or environmental impacts have been identified for this option.

Option 2 –

Economic

- There would be industry and enforcement costs associated with this option however, these will be mainly offset by savings also associated with this option.

Social

- The publication of Guidance should be beneficial to consumers in that they will get more consistent and transparent labelling; and
- Consumers, in particular ethnic minorities, would benefit through more information on the nature of the products they are buying (particularly on meats products containing ingredients of animal species they would like to avoid for religious or other reasons).

Environmental

- No significant environmental impacts have been identified.

8. Small Firms Impact Test

39. Initial soundings with representatives of small businesses did not identify a significant impact of the Guidance on this sector. Informal consultations with butchers revealed that they often rely on trade associations but Guidance would be welcomed if it adds further clarity to the legislation. It is anticipated that the proposed Guidance would benefit, rather than adversely impact upon, small businesses.

40. At a recent Stakeholder meeting, the Agency was informed that the administration burden of regulation 5 of the MPR had a particular impact on the small business sector and Guidance would be welcomed. It is anticipated that the Guidance would help reduce this burden.

The Agency would welcome comments from small firm stakeholders and, where relevant, supporting evidence, on the potential costs and benefits to them of having Guidance.

9. Competition Assessment

41. A preliminary competition filter was carried out and consequently the Agency considers that there will be no substantive competition issues for the market sectors affected. Indeed, the issuance of Guidance should promote fairer competition as there will be more consistent interpretation of the legislation.

42. Regulation 5 of the MPR is purely a national provision that was notified at the time of its making to the EC. UK guidance will affect imports and exports because under European law meat products and preparations are subject to general labelling rules. However, information gathered so far suggests that there would be no adverse impacts on UK businesses.

Industry stakeholders are invited to comment on the potential impact on business competition of the options and to provide financial or other data which they consider will support their case.

10. Enforcement, Sanctions and Monitoring

43. The proposed Guidance has no statutory force although, along with best practice advice, it explains the legal requirements. As previously estimated there will be a total cost of £9,400 to Local Authorities. However, the Guidance is anticipated to help enforcers give advice on improving the information given on labels of the relevant meat products, without resorting to enforcement action. This should ultimately reduce longer-term enforcement costs.

Enforcement stakeholders are invited to comment on the potential impacts and associated costs to them of the options and provide evidence to support their case.

Contact point

Ms Fiona Claudius
Labelling, Standards and Allergy Division
Food Standards Agency
Room 115c, Aviation House
125 Kingsway
London WC2B 6NH

Tel: 020 7276 8152

Fax: 020 7276 8193

e-mail: fiona.claudius@foodstandards.gsi.gov.uk

LABELLING OF 'ADDED INGREDIENTS' IN MPR REGULATION 5 MEAT PRODUCTS**A GUIDE TO REGULATORY COMPLIANCE INCORPORATING GUIDANCE ON BEST PRACTICE****Contents:**

Introduction
Relevant Legislation
Scope - What Products are Covered?
What Labelling is Required?
Product Name and Manner of Labelling or Marking of Added Ingredients
Use of Qualifying Descriptors
Print Size and Clarity
References
Contact Points for Further Information

Annex 1: Background & 'Added Ingredient' Information
Annex 2: Extract from the MPR 2003 – Schedule 3
Annex 3: Glossary of Terms as used in this Guidance
Annex 4: Extract from FSA's 'Clear Food Labelling' Guidance

1 Introduction

- 1.1 This guidance has been prepared by the Food Standards Agency (FSA) with the assistance of a Drafting Group comprising a consumer organisation, LACORS and industry⁴¹.
- 1.2 This guidance applies to prominent labelling of added ingredients in meat products which have the appearance of a cut, joint, slice, portion or carcase of meat or of cured meat (in each case whether cooked or uncooked) and in this guidance are referred to as "whole meats". The aim is to protect consumers and facilitate fair competition and consumer choice by encouraging adoption of consistent, transparent labelling practices. It also provides guidance and 'best practice' advice on labelling of 'added ingredients' in meat products used in cooked recipe dishes in catering establishments. The guidance is aimed at manufacturers, retailers, wholesalers, catering establishments, enforcement authorities and importers.

⁴¹ Booker, British Hospitality & Restaurant Association (BHA), British Meat Processors Association (BMPA), British Pig Executive (BPEX), British Poultry Council (BPC), British Retail Consortium (BRC), Bodycote Law Labs, DEFRA, Food and Drink Federation (FDF), Food Standards Agency (FSA), Local Authority Co-ordinators of Regulatory Services (LACORS), Meat and Livestock Commission (MLC), National Federation of Meat & Food Traders (NFMFT), Provision Trade Federation (PTF), Which?

- 1.3 The provisions of the Food Labelling Regulations 1996, as amended, and the 2003 Meat Products Regulations are explained in respect of statutory 'added ingredient' labelling of meat products. 'Best practice' advice is also offered on how labelling of added ingredients in meat products could help consumers to make more informed choices and avoid the potential for them to be misled. A clear distinction is made between legal requirements and advice on best practice, **with best practice advice highlighted by shaded boxes**. While the legal requirements must be met, following 'best practice' advice is not mandatory. Existing guidance has been drawn on, in particular the Agency's 'Clear Food Labelling' guidance.
- 1.4 The purpose of the legislation is to ensure that the name of the food reflects its true nature and content, so that consumers are accurately informed about the food and not deceived. The type of added ingredients may be an important factor in determining consumer choice. For example, a meat product containing ingredients from a different species to the rest of the meat, e.g. hydrolysed beef or pork proteins in a chicken product.
- 1.5 In addition, the prominent labelling of added water and other ingredients will help avoid confusion about products with a similar appearance in the marketplace. For instance, consumers will be able to distinguish between meat and meat products that otherwise look like meat (e.g. "pork chop" versus "pork chop with added water").
- 1.6 Industry (including importers) and enforcement officers are encouraged to use this guidance when making decisions on the declaration of added ingredients in meat products. Imported products will be subject to legislative requirements in the same way as domestically produced products but if there is any doubt on this point, industry should seek further advice from the relevant Local Food Authority.
- 1.7 The guidance in this document should not be taken as an authoritative statement or definitive interpretation of the law, as only the Courts have this power. Following guidance outlined here may assist companies to establish a defence of due diligence in ensuring their meat product labelling is correct. Ultimately, only the Courts can decide whether, in particular circumstances, an offence has been committed, or such a defence is available. However, the Courts and other regulatory enforcement bodies will be able to take this guidance into account when considering any possible breach of the rules.
- 1.8 The issue of prominent labelling of 'added ingredients' in meat products has been highlighted as a result of surveys by the FSA and enforcement authorities. These surveys found mislabelling problems of added water and the undeclared presence of pork and beef hydrolysed proteins. Most of the problems were in relation to imported chicken products destined for the catering sector. Obscure labelling of water retaining agents (such as salt) has also been associated with raw pork cut products. This guidance has been produced with a view to addressing the issues highlighted. Further background is outlined at Annex 1.

2 Relevant Legislation

Summary

- 2.1 The labelling of meat and poultry products with added water and other ingredients is controlled by the Food Labelling Regulations 1996, as amended, and the 2003 Meat Products Regulations (MPR). The MPR require that for a product that resembles a cut, joint, slice, portion or carcase of meat or of cured meat, added water (where it makes up above 5% for cooked and uncooked meat, and cooked cured meat; and above 10% for uncooked cured meat) must be mentioned in the name of the food as well as any other ingredient of a different animal species to the meat. In addition, the meat content has to be declared either in the ingredients list or in/next to the name of the food, which indirectly indicates the amount of added water.
- 2.2 This guidance relates to, and should be read in conjunction with, the legal provisions specified below. To note, the England Regulations are referred to but the equivalent Regulations in Scotland, Wales and Northern Ireland are also relevant as this guidance applies on a UK-wide basis.

5.Trade Descriptions Act 1968

this makes it an offence for a trader to:

- apply a false trade description to any goods;
- supply or offer to supply any goods to which a false or misleading trade description is applied.

6.Food Safety Act 1990 (FSA 1990)

this makes it an offence to sell a food for human consumption which:

- to the purchaser's prejudice is not of the nature, substance or quality demanded (section 14);
- in a label or advertisement is falsely described or misleading as to the nature, substance or quality of the food (section 15);

is misleadingly presented (section 15).

- ***Article 2 of Directive 2000/13/EC on food labelling***

this requires that the labelling, advertising and presentation of a food must not be such as could mislead a purchaser to a material degree, particularly:

- as to the characteristics of the food and, in particular, as to its nature,

identity, properties, composition, quantity, durability, origin or provenance, method of manufacture or production;

- by attributing to the food effects or properties that it does not possess;
- by suggesting that the food possesses special characteristics when in fact all similar foods possess such characteristics.

7. Food Labelling Regulations 1996 (as amended) (FLR 1996)

these particularly require:

- where there is no name prescribed by law and a customary name is not used, that the name used for the food shall be sufficiently precise to inform a purchaser of the true nature of the food and to enable the food to be distinguished from products with which it could be confused;
- the name of the food to include or be accompanied by an indication of the physical condition or treatment to which the food has been subjected where a purchaser could be misled by the omission of this information;
- a list of ingredients.

The rules require specific information to be given (see section 4). They also require this information to be easily visible, clearly legible and indelible (see para. 5.5). They do not set a minimum print size for this information (but see section 7 & Annex 4 on best practice).

QUID Rules

Quantitative ingredient declarations (also known as QUID) are required by Regulation 19 of the FLR. QUID of ingredients must generally be made when the following criteria apply :

- the ingredient or category of ingredients is included in the name of the food or is usually associated with that name by the consumer;
- an ingredient/category of ingredient is given emphasis on the label in words, pictures or graphics; or
- the ingredient or category of ingredients is essential to characterise a food and to distinguish it from products with which it might be confused because of its name or appearance.
- Further detailed advice on QUID rules is given in the Agency's Guidance Notes on QUID.

Allergen Labelling

- The FLR (as amended) require, in implementation of Directive 2003/89/EC, that pre-packed foods (including alcoholic drinks) made using any allergens on a specified list or their derivatives must indicate the presence of these ingredients, making a clear reference to the source allergen (regulation 34B). However, a transitional provision exists for products which do not give such an indication if the food concerned was marked or labelled before 25 November 2005 (regulation 50).

- Directives 2005/26/EC and 2005/63/EC provide a temporary exemption from these labelling requirements for a defined list of products derived from the listed allergenic ingredients that have been shown not to be allergenic. This temporary exemption, which expires on 25 November 2007, was enacted into national legislation by the Food Labelling (Amendment) (England) (No.2) Regulations 2005 in England and parallel Regulations in Scotland, Wales and Northern Ireland.

Further detail on these new rules can be found in accompanying guidance to these Regulations. In addition, the reader is advised to consult Agency 'Advice for Caterers on Allergy and Intolerance' (<http://www.food.gov.uk/healthiereating/allergyintol/caterers/>).

Meat Labelling

- Implement Commission Directive 2001/101/EC as amended by Commission Directive 2002/86/EC relating to the new EC definition of "meat". This is done in regulation 14 (4), and parts I and II of Schedule 3. The definition applies exclusively to labelling of products which contain meat as an ingredient, i.e. it does NOT apply to the labelling of meat cuts and anatomical parts which are sold without further processing;
- It is necessary to provide a QUID declaration for meat ingredients in the product in accordance with the FLR but NOT necessary to declare the quantity of added water in the name of food nor in the list of ingredients.

8.Meat Products (England) Regulations 2003 (MPR)

Regulation 5 of MPR:

- contains 'name of food' provisions requiring that where certain meat products contain added water and/or other added ingredients, other than those listed in Schedule 3 (see Annex 2), these ingredients **must be declared in the name of the food**;
- applies to a **meat product with appearance of cut, joint, slice, portion or carcase of meat or cured meat, whether cooked or uncooked**, but NOT to reserved description meat products (i.e. those specified in Schedule 2 to the Regulations) or a meat product with the appearance of minced raw meat which has been shaped;
- prescribes that added animal ingredients from different meat species must be declared in the name of the food regardless of their function, e.g. 'chicken breast containing beef protein';
- if salt is being added other than as seasoning, it must be indicated in the name of the food (whilst the Food Labelling Regulations 1996 also require any added salt to be given in the ingredients list in descending order of weight);
- applies to both UK-produced and imported meat products.

9. EC Poultrymeat Marketing Regulations - 1906/90/EEC & 1538/91/EEC (as amended)

- these Regulations establish limits for extraneous water allowed in fresh and frozen poultrymeat which range from 2% to 7% depending on the circumstances. These limits are intended to allow for the absorption of water during the normal hygienic preparation of poultrymeat (i.e. normal processes of plucking, spray washing and cooling);
- further detailed advice on these Regulations is given in DEFRA's draft "Enforcement Guide to EC Poultrymeat Marketing Standards Regulations";
- extraneous water absorbed by poultrymeat during its hygienic preparation is exempted from ingredient list declaration by Regulation 16(2) of the FLR.

10. EC Regulation 178/2002, the Food Safety Act 1990 (Amendment) Regulations 2004 & the General Food Regulations 2004

- The principal aim of this Regulation is to protect public health and consumers' interests in relation to food.
- The Food Safety Act 1990 (Amendment) Regulations 2004 and the General Food Regulations 2004 align domestic legislation with the general principles and requirements of Regulation 178/2002, and introduce new enforcement provisions.
- Article 16 of Regulation 178/2002 on 'presentation' requires that the labelling, advertising, and presentation of food shall not mislead consumers. It applies in addition to the Trade Descriptions Act 1968 and Sections 14 and 15 of the Food Safety Act 1990, which continue in place.
- Further detailed advice on these Regulations is given in the Agency's 'EC General Food Law Regulation 178/2002: Food Safety Act 1990 (Amendment) Regulations 2004 and General Food Law Regulations 2004 Guidance'.

3. Scope – What Products are Covered?
--

3.1 This guidance applies to meat products covered by Regulation 5 of the MPR 2003. That is, any meat product whether raw or cooked, or cured with the appearance of a meat cut, joint, slice, portion or carcass (hereinafter described as, "whole meats") and includes the following :

- white meats, e.g. rabbit products; poultry products: chicken, turkey, goose and duck products, in the form of breast fillets, joints, thighs, drumsticks, stir-fry strips;
- red meats, e.g. pork products, lamb products, beef products in the form of chops, steaks (e.g. fillet, sirloin), joints, loin joint, medallions, loin steaks, shoulder joint, leg joints, rib-roast, stir-fry strips;

- ham, bacon;
 - other cured meats, e.g. pastrami, salt beef, etc.;
 - game meat products, e.g. venison, pheasant, wild duck in the form of joints, etc.
- 3.2 In deciding if a meat product falls within the scope of Regulation 5, there should be due regard as to whether the product has the appearance of “whole meat”. In reaching this decision, no account should be taken of the presence in or on the “whole meat” of any seasoning, garnishing or gelatinous substance, nor of any packaging material enclosing the meat product.
- 3.3 Products outside the scope of this document are those which are obviously not “whole meat” products such as: sausages, burgers, meat pies, breaded products (e.g. nuggets), barbecued meat, hot and spicy wings where it is obvious from product appearance that ingredients have been added. Similarly, composite dishes containing meat (e.g. meat in gravy) fall outside the scope as they necessarily require water and other ingredients for their production. That said, the guidance does cover cases where meat products are used in composite dishes in catering establishments (see para. 5.28).
- 3.4 Some canned meat products are also outside the scope, e.g. comminuted meat products such as corned beef, luncheon meat, etc. However, canned meats with the appearance of “whole meat” (i.e. cut, joint, slice, etc.) such as canned hams do fall within the scope.

<h4>4. What Labelling is Required?</h4>

- 4.1 The principal provisions of the FLR (see also section 2 above) are to require all food which is ready for delivery to the ultimate consumer or to a catering establishment, subject to certain exceptions, to be marked or labelled with:
- the name of the food (r.5);
 - a list of ingredients (r.5);
 - the quantity of certain ingredients or categories of ingredients (QUID)(r.5);
 - the appropriate durability indication (r.5);
 - any special storage conditions or conditions of use (r.5);
 - the name and address of the manufacturer or packer, or of a seller within the EC (r.5);
 - an indication as necessary if the food or ingredients have been irradiated (r. 14(2), r. 25, Schedule 2); and,
 - an indication as necessary of any additive(s) used (r.14) unless exempted by r.17 of FLR.

- and in certain cases:

- particulars of the place of origin of the food;
- instructions for use.

- Other legislation to be aware of is the requirement to give an indication as necessary if the food or ingredients are genetically modified (r. 5 of the Genetically Modified Food (England) Regulations 2004).

4.2 The exceptions relate to foods which are not pre-packed (i.e. loose) or which are pre-packed for direct sale. These are exempt from full food labelling requirements. However, labelling rules require an indication as necessary if these foods or ingredients have been irradiated, derived from GM, or contain certain categories of additives.

Added water and other added ingredients labelling

4.3 Regulation 16 of the FLR requires that added water used as an ingredient must generally be shown in the list of ingredients when it exceeds 5% of the finished product. An exception to this applies to water used solely for the reconstitution or partial reconstitution of an ingredient (in concentrated or dehydrated form), or where water is used as, or as part of, a medium which is not normally consumed.

4.4 Regulation 5 of the MPR requires added water⁴² and/or other added ingredients to be declared in the name of the food of meat products with the appearance of a cut, joint, slice, portion or carcase of meat or of cured meat (whether cooked or uncooked). The added ingredients that must be named include added animal ingredients from different meat species, but excludes those ingredients listed at Schedule 3 of the MPR (see Annex 2 and section 2 above). For example, chicken breast fillet products which contain added water and pork proteins must be named, “chicken breast fillets with added water and pork protein”. Whilst a QUID declaration for the meat ingredient is necessary, the quantity of added water in the name of the food or in the ingredients list is not legally required.

4.5 QUID rules require that the quantity must appear either in or next to the name of the food, or in the list of ingredients in connection with the ingredient or category of ingredients in question. Some manufacturers already voluntarily give a quantitative declaration of the added water prominently in, or near, the name of the food for their meat products. As best practice, industry may wish to include a quantitative declaration of any added water in, or next to the name of the food of “whole meat” products or include a quantitative declaration of the meat content in, or

⁴² In the case of meat (whether cooked or uncooked) or cooked cured meat, this is allowed to contain up to 5% added water, whilst uncooked cured meats are allowed to contain up to 10% added water without requiring a mention of the added water in the name of the food.

next to, the name of the food of “whole meat” products (e.g. chicken breast with 10% added water).

5 Product Name and Manner of Labelling or Marking of Added Ingredients

- 5.1 Under the FLR (Regulations 6-11) the legal name of the food must be:
- (i) if there is a name prescribed by law, that name;
- or where there is no name prescribed by law,
- (ii) a customary name ⁴³ - that is a name which, in time, comes to be accepted by consumers in the UK, or in particular areas of the UK, as the name of the food without it needing further explanation; or,
 - (iii) a name indicating the true nature of the food. That is, if there is no name prescribed by law and no customary name (or the customary name is not used) a legal name is one that is sufficiently precise to inform the consumer of the true nature of the food and to enable it to be distinguished from products with which it could be confused.
- 5.2 It should be noted that if a legal or customary name is used, it could still be qualified further by an explanatory description about the true nature of the food, if the end result is that the consumer is accurately informed.
- 5.3 There are currently no specific names prescribed by law (i.e. required to be used) for meat products. However, there are rules that require certain ingredients to be declared in the name of the food of certain meat products. These include ‘added water’ and ingredients from different animal species to that of the meat product (see para. 4.4).
- 5.4 There are some common customary names such as ‘ham’, ‘bacon’, ‘pastrami’. However, most other meat products which look like a fresh meat cut (raw or cooked) will fall into the category requiring the legal name indicating the true nature of the food. These meat products are often given a fancy name (e.g. “succulent pork chops”, “butter basted chicken portions”, etc.) alongside the name of the food (e.g. “pork with added water, glucose syrup and salt”, “butter basted chicken breasts with added water”, etc.). Ham is understood to be a customary name when applied to a product which has been cooked and cured only, with up to 5% added water and not those with other added ingredients. Therefore, a customary name that is further qualified to indicate presence of added ingredients (including greater than 5% added water)

⁴³ Trade or fancy names will not comply with these requirements and similarly a customary name cannot suddenly come into existence. A description does not necessarily become a customary name after a set time of usage. A “fancy name” is a name serving a marketing function but which does not itself capture precisely the true nature of the food and enable the food to be distinguished from products with which it could be confused.

would not be considered a customary name, e.g. “ham with added water”.

5.5 Regulation 38 of the Food Labelling Regulations 1996 requires the legal name of the food (on a label, menu, notice or ticket) to be “clearly legible.....and marked in a conspicuous place in such a way as to be easily visible. Such particulars shall not in any way be hidden, obscured or interrupted by any other written or pictorial matter”.

5.6 Some companies have interpreted this provision by adopting an approach which does not necessarily ensure that the name of the food is prominent information on the pack.

Some examples include:

- the actual name of the food being associated only with the list of ingredients, often in the same size type print;
- the name on the back or bottom of the pack in a position of relative obscurity.

Other examples which have been noted include:

- the name being incorporated within a marketing phrase promoting other virtues of the product so that the significance of the name can be lost.

5.7 In such cases, the fancy name for the product is given far greater prominence than the legal name of the food and care must be taken to ensure that legal requirements are met and the consumer is not misled.

5.8 In 2002, the Agency published its ‘Clear Food Labelling’ Guidance, based on the recommendations of an independent task force (see Annex 4). The guidance gives best practice advice on:

- grouping key facts together, so they are easier to find;
- using a minimum type size and high colour contrast, to make these key facts easier to read;
- using plain English, to make the information easier to understand;
- print size and clarity.

5.9 It should be borne in mind that consumers are likely to choose these products on the basis of appearance. There is therefore potential for consumers to be misled by the visual appearance and presentation of what may appear to be simply a cut, joint, slice, portion or carcase of raw, cooked or cured meat. Presentation of information on added ingredients is therefore particularly important.

5.10 We recommend that general advice on ‘Clear Food Labelling’ should be followed for labelling of the products covered in this guidance. Industry will want to take appropriate steps to minimise the possibility that consumers could be misled. For instance, the legal name of the food should be given sufficient prominence to ensure that it is clear to the consumer. To achieve this, the “name of the food” should ideally

be used as the primary means of consumer communication. Where a fancy name is used this should not be significantly more prominent than the name of the food and, in any event, should not mislead.

5.11 Industry may wish to include, as far as is reasonable, in the legal name of the food all added ingredients (see exemptions listed at Annex 2).

5.12 Industry should take into consideration that each and every reference to the name of the product could be potentially misleading. For example, it may be misleading to describe or refer to a pork chop with added water and salt, simply as a “Pork Chop”, even if the legal name appears elsewhere on the label. When considering offences of misleading labelling, the courts will look at the overall effect of the labelling of the product. Retailers should note that similar considerations apply to shelf talkers.

5.13 Where a product has undergone further processing / treatment not expected by the consumer, industry may wish to include an indication of the treatment in the fancy name (e.g. “Succulent Pork Chop”). The name of the food would then detail the type of processing / treatment undergone.

Labelling of starch and proteins

[DN – this section has been drafted to take account of changes to EC hygiene legislation (77/99/EEC) and drafted as if the proposed amendment MPRs 2008 were in place.]

5.14 Changes to European hygiene legislation⁴⁴ have removed the concept of ‘technological purpose’ which has never been defined in EU law. Consequently, that concept and the associated exemptions have been removed from national provisions.

5.15 Regulation 5(2)(b) of the MPR 2003 (and its equivalents in the devolved administrations) requires added ingredients in certain meat products to be declared in the name of the food unless they are exempted from this requirement by Schedule 3 of the MPRs. However, in line with the new EU rules, regulation 5(2)(b) no longer applies to added starch and protein and the related reference to starch and protein added for technological purposes has been removed from Schedule 3 of the MPR 2003. Therefore, there is no longer a specific requirement to declare added starch and protein in the name of the food for meat products irrespective of why they are used.

5.16 However, the FSA 1990 and the general food labelling rules of the Food Labelling Regulations 1996 (as amended) relating to the name of food provisions will continue to apply to all meat products including those

⁴⁴ Directive 2004/41/EC repealing certain directives concerning food hygiene and health conditions for the production and placing on the market of certain products of animal origin intended for human consumption and amending Council Directives 89/662/EEC and 92/118/EEC and Council Decision 95/408/EC.

with added starch and/or proteins. Therefore, in the absence of any name prescribed by law for the food or customary name which is used, any added starch or protein would need to be declared in the name of the food of meat products if not to do so would mislead the consumer about the true nature of the food or would not enable the food to be distinguished from products with which it could be confused (regulation 8 of the FLR).

5.17 In summary, industry will need to decide if, under general labelling rules, not to declare added starch and/or protein in meat products would mislead the consumer about the true nature of the product on a case-by-case basis.

5.18 Industry will want to take appropriate steps to minimise the possibility that consumers could be misled. For instance, if the addition of starch and/or protein could be considered to be bulking out the meat, as a meat replacement, etc., or if there is any doubt as to whether added starch and protein should be in the name of the food, we recommend that full information about these added ingredients be given prominently in the name of the food for consumer information (see also paras. 5.10-5.11 and 5.24).

5.19 It is understood that starch and/or proteins are added to some meat products at a level of 1% to confer their intended technical effect (e.g. to lower product cooking losses, improve product sliceability, etc.). To facilitate common understanding and to establish a level playing field in the marketplace, it is suggested that a threshold level of [1%] be applied above which the presence of these ingredients should be indicated in, or next to, the name of the food.

5.20 It is emphasised, however, that the separate requirement in regulation 5(2)(a) of the MPR 2003 to declare in the name of the food ingredients of animal origin if they come from a different species will continue. Therefore, where, for example, pork or beef proteins are used in poultry products they will continue to have to be declared in the name of the food.

Bacon, ham and other cured meat products

5.21 Water is needed to distribute the curing salts into the meat in the curing process to make bacon, ham and other cured meat products (e.g. salt beef, pastrami, etc.). Therefore, a certain amount of added water is inevitable in most cured meat products. Cooked cured meat (e.g. ham) is allowed to contain up to 5% added water, whilst uncooked cured meats (e.g. bacon) are allowed to contain up to 10% added water without requiring a mention of the added water in the name of the food. Where ham and bacon contain more than 5% and 10% respectively, the name of the food must include a statement, "with added water". An allowance of 10% added water for bacon is permitted as 10% is accepted as the cut-off minimum amount of water that is needed to distribute curing salts efficiently in the pork in a wet cure process,

which is the main method of bacon manufacture. In any case, added water (over 5%) must also be declared in the ingredients list, under the general rules of the FLR. Also, the pork content will be quantified in the ingredients list or in or next to the name of the food under QUID rules.

5.22 Whilst the above reflects the legal position, manufacturers may also wish to follow the best practice outlined in paragraphs 5.10, 5.11 and 5.13 above. In addition, given consumer concerns that added water may be present in cured meat products industry may wish to include a quantitative indication of the water content in, or next to, the name of the food for these particular products or include a quantitative declaration of the meat content in, or next to, the name of the food (see also best practice advice at para. 4.5 above).

Meat products (which have the appearance of “whole meats”) sold loose or pre-packed for direct sale over the counter and deli counters

5.23 Most foods sold loose or pre-packed for direct sale over the counter are exempt from full food labelling requirements other than requiring the name of the food (and, an indication as necessary if the food or ingredients have been irradiated, derived from GM or contain certain categories of additives). However, under the FLR, loose meat products must give a declaration of the meat content. Furthermore, the name of certain meat products must be accompanied by any added ingredient information required by Regulation 5 of the MPR as stated at section 2, paras. 4.4 and 5.15 (e.g. “ham with added water and milk proteins”).

5.24 Industry may wish to consider, as far as is reasonable, the legal name of the food should include all added ingredients, whether or not these are legally required (see exemptions listed at Annex 2).

5.25 The legally required information relating to product name, meat content, category of additives, and ‘added ingredient’ information for certain meat products must be displayed on, for example, display tickets, etc., in a conspicuous place that is readily discernible by an intending purchaser at the place where he chooses that food (e.g. “ham, 90% pork with added water and milk proteins”).

5.26 Industry may wish to consider having further ‘added ingredient’ information available to sales staff to pass on to consumers if they request it (e.g. on back of label).

Meat products (which have the appearance of “whole meats”) sold not pre-packed or sold pre-packed for direct sale by catering establishments

5.27 Full labelling information is not legally required for foods sold by catering establishments where the food is not pre-packed or is pre-packed for direct sale, including meals cooked on the premises (see sections 2 and 4). Caterers will be supplied with relevant ‘added ingredient’ information from producers. Therefore, descriptions

provided by caterers on menus, chalkboards, etc., are required to describe the product accurately as purchased by the consumer and not be misleading. Thus, for meals cooked on premises, either as eaten or taken away, information provided to consumers should accurately reflect, and be relevant to, the food being bought rather than relating to the raw ingredient component(s) and should reflect the provisions of this guidance.

- 5.28 Where a name is given to foods sold in a catering establishment (e.g. on a menu), the labelling rules require that the name must indicate the true nature of the food and distinguish it from products with which it could be confused. For “whole meat” products, this would also include labelling in the name of the food any added proteins from a different meat species and should be clearly shown on the menu or sales ticket for the final consumer. This is irrespective of whether the meat product is used without further cooking (e.g. sliced ham) or cooked in a recipe dish (e.g. meat in gravy). Cooking will not affect the presence of added proteins or other meat derived ingredients in the meat product.
- 5.29 More generally, in respect of meat products, the catering establishment should consider whether the product is of the nature, substance or quality expected by the consumer. For bought in cold, cooked meat products, the legal name of the product, indicating the true nature of the food should be given (see paragraphs 5.10 – 5.13).

5.30 There are a number of different ways in which information about the nature of any meat products used can be given. These can include the menu descriptions such as on chalkboards, wall notices; pre-printed take-away menus etc. Information that is displayed prominently in or near the product name, in text that is easily seen by consumers at the point of selection will be of most help to consumers. In circumstances where additional information is needed, information should be supplied to staff on any added ingredients in meat products used, so that this information can be easily and clearly conveyed to consumers if requested.

6. Use of Qualifying Descriptors

- 6.1 There are many common terms and descriptors used on meat products which look like a fresh meat cut to describe specific characteristics and/or treatments applied, such as “basted”, “self-basting”, “succulent”, “marinated”, etc.
- 6.2 Care should be taken when the name of such meat products use qualifying descriptors such as “basted” that this is done accurately.
- 6.3 Industry will want to ensure that these terms are used accurately and consistently, in line with Annex 3 to describe how the product was prepared and as commonly understood by consumers to be usual practice. In some cases, it may be more accurate to describe the

product as “pre-basted” or “self-basting”, etc. The glossary (Annex 3) outlines some definitions of these terms as commonly understood.

7. Print Size and Clarity

- 7.1 Further detailed advice on print size and clarity is given in the Agency’s best practice guidance on ‘Clear Food Labelling’ and the relevant extract is reproduced at Annex 4.

8. References

Legislation

- Directive 2000/13/EC of 20 March 2000 on the approximation of the laws of the Member States relating to the labelling, presentation and advertising of foodstuffs. OJ No. L109, 6.5.2000, p.29.
- Directive 2001/101/EC of 26 November 2001 amending Directive 2000/13/EC of the European Parliament and of the Council on the approximation of the laws of the Member States relating to the labelling, presentation and advertising of foodstuffs.
- Council Regulation (EEC) No.1906/90 of 26 June 1990 on certain marketing standards for poultry. OJ No. L173, 6.7.90, p.1-4.
- Commission Regulation (EEC) 1538/91 of 5 June 1991 introducing detailed rules for implementing Regulation 1906/90 on certain marketing standards for poultrymeat. OJ No. L143, 7.6.1991, pp.1-36.
- Food Safety Act 1990, London: HMSO, ISBN: 0-10-541690-8.
- Trade Descriptions Act 1968, ISBN: 0-10-542968-6.
- The Food Labelling Regulations 1996 (SI 1499), as amended, ISBN: 0-11-035941-0.
- The Food Labelling (Amendment) (No.2) Regulations 1999 (SI 1483), ISBN: 0-11-082694-9.
- The Food Labelling (Amendment) (England) Regulations 2003 (SI 2003/474), ISBN: 0-11-045185-6.
- The Food Labelling (Amendment) (Scotland) Regulations 2003 (SSI 2003 No.578), ISBN: 0-11-062551-X.
- The Food Labelling (Amendment) (Wales) Regulations 2003 (WSI 2003 No.832 W.104), ISBN: 0-11090698-5.
- Food Labelling (Amendment) Regulations (Northern Ireland) 2003 (SI 2003 No.159), ISBN: 0-33795004-0.
- The Food Labelling (Amendment) (England) (No.2) Regulations 2004 (SI 2004/2824), ISBN: 0-11-050030-X.

- The Food Labelling (Amendment) (Scotland) (No.2) Regulations 2004 (SSI 2004/0472), ISBN: 0-11-069308-6.
- The Food Labelling (Amendment) (No.2) (Wales) Regulations 2004 (SI 2004 No.3022), ISBN: 0-11091038-9.
- The Food Labelling (Amendment No.2) Regulations (Northern Ireland) 2004 (SI 2004 No.469), ISBN: 0-33795734-7.
- The Food Labelling (Amendment) (England) (No.2) Regulations 2005 (SI 2005/2057), ISBN: 0-11-073186-7.
- The Food Labelling (Amendment) (Scotland) (No.2) Regulations 2005 (SSI 2005/0456), ISBN: 0-11-069710-3.
- The Food Labelling (Amendment) (Wales) (No.2) Regulations 2005 (SI 2005 No.2835), ISBN: 0-11-091191-1.
- The Food Labelling (Amendment No.2) Regulations (Northern Ireland) 2005 (SI 2005 No.396), ISBN: 0-337-96142-5.
- The Food Labelling (Amendment) (England) (No.2) Regulations 2005 (SI 2005/2969), ISBN: 0-11-073531-5.
- The Food Labelling (Amendment) (Scotland) (No.3) Regulations 2005 (SSI 2005/0542), ISBN: 0-11-069779-0.
- The Food Labelling (Amendment) (Wales) (No.2) Regulations 2005 (SI 2005 No.3236), ISBN: 0-11-091224-1.
- The Food Labelling (Amendment No.2) Regulations (Northern Ireland) 2005 (SI 2005 No.475), ISBN: 0-33796214-6.
- The Genetically Modified Food (England) Regulations 2004 (SI 2004/2335), ISBN: 0-11-049799-6.
- The Genetically Modified Food (Scotland) Regulations 2004 (SSI 2004/432), ISBN: 0-11069281-0.
- The Genetically Modified Food (Wales) Regulations 2004 (SI 2004 No.3220), ISBN: 0-11-091045-1.
- The Genetically Modified Food Regulations (Northern Ireland) 2004 (SI 2004 No.385), ISBN: 0-33795666-9.
- The Meat Products (England) Regulations 2003 (SI 2003 No.2075), ISBN: 0-11-047359-0.
- The Meat Products (Scotland) Regulations 2004 (SI 2004 No.6), ISBN: 0-11-062587-0.
- The Meat Products (Wales) Regulations 2004 (SI 2004 No.1396), ISBN: 0-11-090948-8.
- The Meat Products (Northern Ireland) Regulations 2004 (SI 2004 No.13), ISBN: 0-337-95361-9.
- General Food Law Regulation 178/2002/EC. OJ No. L31, 1.2.2002, p.1-24.

- The Food Safety Act 1990 (Amendment) Regulations 2004 (SI 2990), ISBN: 0-11-050223-X.
- The Food Safety (NI) Order 1991 (Amendment) Regulations (Northern Ireland) 2004, No.482.
- General Food Regulations 2004 (SI 3279), ISBN: 0-11-051007-0.
- The General Food Regulations (Northern Ireland) 2004, No.505.
- Directive 2004/41/EC repealing certain directives concerning food hygiene and health conditions for the production and placing on the market of certain products of animal origin intended for human consumption and amending Council Directives 89/662/EEC and 92/118/EEC and Council Decision 95/408/EC. OJ No. L195, 2.6.2004, pp.12-15.

All available at: www.opsi.gov.uk/legislation/index.htm;
www.europa.eu.int/eur-lex/.

Agency Guidance Notes

- FSA Guidance Notes on FLR 1996 (January 1997)
<http://www.food.gov.uk/foodindustry/guidancenotes/labelregsguidance/foodlabelregsguid>
- FSA Guidance Notes on 'QUID' (June 1999)
<http://www.food.gov.uk/foodindustry/guidancenotes/labelregsguidance/quidguid>
- FSA Guidance Notes on MPR 2003 (Sept. 2003)
www.food.gov.uk/foodindustry/guidancenotes/meatregsguid/meatproductsguidancelabel
- FSA Guidance Notes on the Food Labelling (Amendment) (No.2) – Regulations 2004 (November 2004)
<http://www.food.gov.uk/foodindustry/guidancenotes/labelregsguidance/foodlabguidance>
- FSA Guidance Notes on the Food Safety Act 1990 (Amendment) Regulations 2004 and the General Food Regulations 2004 (December 2004, Re-issued in March 2005)
<http://www.food.gov.uk/foodindustry/guidancenotes/foodguid/generalfoodsafetyguide>
- Agency Advice for Caterers on Allergy and Intolerance (May 2004)
<http://www.food.gov.uk/healthiereating/allergyintol/caterers/>
- Clear Food Labelling Guidance (October 2002)
<http://www.food.gov.uk/foodindustry/guidancenotes/labelregsguidance/clearfoodlabelling>

9. Contact Points for Further Information

The address for all correspondence relating to the issues set out in this advice is:

Labelling, Standards & Allergy Division
Food Standards Agency
Aviation House
125 Kingsway
London WC2B 6NH

Tel: 020 7276 8157 / 8154
Fax: 020 7276 8193
E-mail: labelling@foodstandards.gsi.gov.uk

In Wales:

Food Standards Agency Wales
1st Floor, Southgate House
Wood Street
Cardiff
CF10 1EW

Tel: 029 2067 8911
Fax: 029 2067 8918/8919
E-mail: wales@foodstandards.gsi.gov.uk

In Scotland:

Food Standards Agency Scotland
St Magnus House
6th Floor
25 Guild Street
Aberdeen
AB11 6NJ

Tel: 01224 285111
Fax: 01224 285110

In Northern Ireland:

Food Standards Agency Northern Ireland
10C Clarendon Road
Belfast
BT1 3BG

Tel: 028 9041 7714
Fax: 028 9041 7726

Background & ‘Added Ingredient’ Information

1. Background

- 1.1 If water is added as an ingredient to fresh meat (including poultry), it cannot be sold as fresh meat but becomes a “meat product” which has to be labelled to indicate that water and/or other added ingredients have been added. There are no limits laid down for added water and other ingredients. Such meat products must be properly labelled so that the consumer is not misled (see section 2 of this document). Therefore, products such as pork cuts or chicken breast fillets with added water and other ingredients can be marketed legally, provided all the necessary information is given to the consumer.
- 1.2 The issue of prominent ‘added ingredient’ labelling of meat products has come to the fore following surveys carried out by the FSA, Irish authorities and Local Authorities⁴⁵. These highlighted mislabelling problems of added water and undeclared addition of pork and beef hydrolysed proteins mostly in imported chicken breast products destined for the catering sector, as well as obscure labelling of water retaining agents (such as salt) in raw pork cut products.
- 1.3 There have been consumer concerns about the lack of full descriptions of product names on meat products. In particular, that use of beef and pork hydrolysed proteins may result in inadvertent consumption of beef or pork by consumers who avoid these ingredients for religious, ethical or other reasons.
- 1.4 These surveys, combined with public concerns about the results and continuing evidence of mislabelling, have resulted in the FSA lobbying the EC to strengthen labelling requirements for these products but the EC concluded that current legislation is adequate. This guidance on prominent labelling of added ingredients has been produced with a view to addressing the concerns raised. The guidance specifically focuses on those meat products which could be most confusing to consumers, namely products that otherwise look like cuts, joints, slices, etc., of fresh meat.

⁴⁵ Food Standards Agency, Survey of Added Water in Chickens and Chicken Parts, Food Surveillance Information Sheet (FSIS) 8/00, Oct 2000; Food Standards Agency, Survey of Meat Content, Added Water and Hydrolysed Protein in Catering Chicken Breasts, FSIS 20/01, Dec 2001; Food Safety Authority-Ireland, Investigation into the Composition and Labelling of Imported Chicken Breast Fillets, May 2002; ‘Agency Exposes Consumer Chicken Con’, FSA Press Release (12.03.03); Shropshire Trading Standards Survey on Added Water and Salt in Pork Products, July 2004.

EXTRACT FROM MPR 2003:

SCHEDULE 3

Regulation 5(2)(b)

**ADDED INGREDIENTS WHICH ARE NOT REQUIRED TO BE INDICATED
IN THE NAME OF THE FOOD IN THE CASE OF A MEAT PRODUCT TO
WHICH REGULATION 5 APPLIES**

1. Any additive.
2. Any curing salt.
3. Any ingredient used solely as a garnish or decorative coating.
4. Any ingredient (not being an additive) that is added only in order to impart odour or taste or both.
5. Any salt, herb or spice used as seasoning.
6. Any starch that is added only for a technological purpose. ***[DN – is likely to be deleted, following amendment of the MPR 2003, in line with new EC rules.]***
7. Any protein (of either animal or vegetable origin) that is added only for a technological purpose. ***[DN – is likely to be deleted, following amendment of the MPR 2003, in line with new EC rules.]***
8. Any sugar that is added only in order to impart a sweet taste.
9. In the case of meat (whether cooked or uncooked) or cooked cured meat, added water making up not more than 5% of the weight of the product.
10. In the case of uncooked cured meat, added water making up not more than 10% of the weight of the product.

Notes:

For the purposes of item 1 of this Schedule, “additive” means any substance permitted for use in food by the Colours in Food Regulations 1995^(a), the Flavourings in Food Regulations 1992^(b), the Miscellaneous Food Additives Regulations 1995^(c) or the Sweeteners in Food Regulations 1995^(d).

[DN – to be deleted following amendment of the MPR 2003: For the purposes of items 6 and 7 of this Schedule, “technological purpose” means any purpose within the meaning of “technological purposes” in point 4 of Chapter V of Annex B to Council Directive 77/99/EEC on health problems affecting intra-Community trade in meat products, as amended and updated by Council Directive 92/5/EEC^(e) and as further amended by Council Directive 97/76/EC^(f)
]

(a) S.I. 1995/3124, amended by S.I. 2000/481, 2001/3442.

S.I. 1992/1971, amended by S.I. 1994/1486, 1996/1499.

S.I. 1995/3187, amended by S.I. 1997/1413, 1999/1136, 2000/3323, 2001/60, 2294, 3442, 3775 and S.I. 2003/1008.

(d) S.I. 1995/3123; amended by S.I. 1996/1477, 1997/814, 1999/982, 2001/2294, 2002/379 and S.I. 2003/1182.

(e) OJ No. L57, 2.3.92, p.1.

(f) OJ No. L10, 16.1.98, p.25.

GLOSSARY OF TERMS AS USED IN THIS GUIDANCE

<u>Term</u>	<u>Definition</u>
Added ingredient	means any added substance, including any additive and any constituent of a compound ingredient, which is used in the preparation of a food and which is still present in the finished product even if in altered form, as defined by FLR (see also Annex 2).
Added water	<p>“added water” in a meat product is regarded as the quantity of water present in the product exceeding the quantity of water that would naturally be present in the meat part used in the product when raw. Added water content is calculated as the total weight of added water in the product expressed as a percentage of the total weight of the product as sold.</p> <p><u>Water not requiring ingredient listing (see section 2):</u></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - does not include water used in preparing food, used as or partly used as medium which is not consumed, or does not exceed 5% of the finished product (in line with Regulation 16 of the FLR). - also does not apply to water used in the hygienic preparation of fresh, frozen or quick-frozen chicken or portions to which the EC Poultrymeat Marketing Regulations apply (i.e. 1906/90/EEC, as amended).
Basted	common understanding of this term is that it is the application of added fat, butter and/or cooking juices applied to outside of the <u>cooked</u> meat (as in roasting meat) and not solely by addition of water.
Pre-basted / Self-basting	common understanding of this term is that it is the application of added fat and/or butter applied to the raw meat at point of manufacture / preparation and not solely by addition of water.
Catering Establishment	means a restaurant, canteen, club, public house, school, hospital or similar establishment (including a vehicle or a fixed or mobile stall) where, in the course of a business, food is prepared for delivery to the ultimate consumer and is ready for consumption without further preparation, as defined by FLR.

Cured meat	means a food consisting of meat and curing salt, whether or not the food also contains any other ingredient, as defined by MPR 2003.
Marinate	means the process of applying either: (i) a mixture of oils, vinegars, spices and herbs etc.; or, (ii) a mixture of water, salt, flavours, spices and herbs; or, (iii) a dry blend of spices, salt, flavours applied as coating. Does not comprise of only a water/salt mixture but would normally include other flavouring ingredients such as spices, etc.
Meat Product	<p>means any food which consists of meat or which contains as an ingredient, or as ingredients the following: meat, mechanically recovered meat, or from any mammalian or bird species recognised as fit for human consumption, heart, tongue, the muscles of the head (other than the masseters), the carpus, the tarsus or the tail, as defined by MPR 2003.</p> <p>N.B. - it does not include raw meat to which no ingredient(s) has been added (other than proteolytic enzymes); or poultrymeat falling within the EC Poultrymeat Marketing Regulations, as amended; or any other product containing the fat, but no other meat, of any bird or animal.</p>
Water retaining agent	means an ingredient only intended to increase the water-binding capacity of meat.
Whole meats	means any meat product whether raw or cooked, or cured with the appearance of a meat cut, joint, slice, portion or carcass.

EXTRACT FROM FSA'S 'CLEAR FOOD LABELLING' GUIDANCE (OCTOBER 2002)

Print size and clarity

Do not hide, obscure or interrupt product information with any other written or pictorial matter. Make sure that all product information is easily visible and clearly legible.

Ideally use a font size of 10 point for the essential information in paragraph 8 **(1)** of the guidance wherever possible. If this is not possible, the absolute minimum for this information should be 8 point.

Where it is necessary to consider which information to give in 10 point and which in 8 point because of space limitations, priority should be given to retaining the name of the food, the date mark and the list of ingredients in 10 point and as much of the other information as is possible.

Where packs are physically too small, or of a shape which cannot support 10 point type size, it is paramount to address other factors. These will include

- ensuring that non-essential information doesn't take up unnecessary space,
- the number of languages used,
- the type colour and font, and
- the layout of the label.

Use simple sans serif fonts with a good "x" height and avoid ornate fonts or distracting effects, like shadowing.

Use the normal weight of the font for standard text, and bold for emphasis.

Do not use all upper-case letters or underlining for emphasis.

Only use italics for isolated words – do not use them for large blocks of text, or for small font sizes.

Use the "range left" format, and avoid hyphenation and justified text.

Print essential information in black type on a white background. If this is not possible, make sure there is a good tonal contrast between the type (which should be dark) and the background (which should be light).

Avoid "reversing out", except possibly for headings in a large font size (at least 12 point). In any event, only use it for white type on a black background.

Do not place images behind text ("watermarking").

(1) "Paragraph 8: Although the law only requires nutrition information when a nutrition claim is made, it is of increasing interest to consumers. Some consumers find the format prescribed in law for both voluntary and compulsory labelling difficult to use".

Avoid the use of green and red together – it can be difficult to decipher. Strong colours work better than pastel shades.

Be careful when wrapping text around images – it can be difficult to read. In any case, always make sure the left-hand edge of the type is kept straight, and that wrapping the text doesn't produce a line length that only consists of two or three words.

Metallic and shiny surfaces make reading difficult. Try to use a matt-finish printing surface.

Simple icons can help direct consumers to information ("signposting"). This can be particularly useful for cooking instructions (for example, pictures of a frying pan, oven and microwave). But make sure the icons will be easily recognisable.

It is important to ensure that numerals are distinct. The numbers 0, 3, 5, 6 and 8 can easily be misread in certain typefaces.

Adopt a consistent format when presenting information like nutrition labelling on a range of products to make it easier for consumers to identify and locate.

Increasing the printable area on pack

Give the essential information described in paragraph 2 top priority when designing labels. If you find it hard to follow this advice on ideal formats, consider the following ways of making more space available:

- Reducing space used for branding and claims
- Increasing the label size without obscuring sight of the product where this is important to consumers
- Using inside label space for information which does not govern choice, like detailed recipes
- Using a different type/style of label.

The Meat Products (England) (Amendment) Regulations 2008 Interested Parties List

Advertising Association	Food From Britain
Alcontrol labs	Food Safety Authority of Ireland
Allied Meat Importers Ltd	Food Standards Agency Northern Ireland
Armagh Environmental Health	Food Standards Agency Scotland
Asda Stores Ltd	Food Standards Agency Wales
Association of British Abattoir Owners	Freshbake Foods
Association of British Abattoir Operators	Friends of the Earth Cymru
Association of Meat Inspectors	Friends of the Earth UK Ltd
Association of Muslim Professionals	General Consumer Council for Northern Ireland
Association of Port Health Authorities	George Adams & Sons Ltd
Association of Public Analysts	Halal Consumers
Board of Deputies of British Jews	Halal Food Authority
Bodycote Lawlabs	Halal Meat
Booker Cash and Carry Ltd	Haverhill Meat Producers Ltd
Brakes	Health Food Manufacturers Association
Brews' and Licensed Retailers Association	Hospital Caterers Association
British Beer and Pub Association	Iceland Frozen Food plc
British Food Export Council	Institute of Food Research
British Frozen Food Federation (BFFF)	Institute of Food Science and Technology
British Hospitality Association (BHA)	Institute of Grocery Distribution
British Meat Processors Association (BMPA)	International Meat Trade Association
British Nutrition Foundation	J Sainsbury Plc
British Pig Executive (BPEX)	Joint Consultative Council For Meat Trade
British Poultry Council (BPC)	Laboratory of the Government Chemist
British Retail Consortium (BRC)	LACORS
British Standards Institution	Lancashire County Analysts Dept
Cabinet Office	League of British Muslims
Campden & Chorleywood Food Research Assoc	League of Jewish Women
Canned Food Importers Association	Leatherhead Food Research Association
Caterer and Hotel Keeper Magazine	Licensed Animal Slaughter & Salvage Assoc
Catering Update	Lidl Supermarket
Central Science Laboratory	Livestock & Commission for N.I.
Norfolk County Council	Local Authority Caterers Association
Chilled Food Association	Local Government Association
Co-operative Group (CWS) Ltd	London Retail Meat Traders Association Ltd.
Country Land & Business Association (CLA)	Marks & Spencer Plc
DARD N.I.	Meat and Livestock Commission (MLC)
DEFRA	Meat Industry Liaison Group
Department of Health	Meat Traders Journal
Devro Ltd	Meat Training Council
Dovey Premium Products Ltd	Muslim Council of Britain
DTI	N.I. Agricultural Producers' Association
DTI Small Business Service	N.I. Meat Exporters Association
Eurofins Scientific Ltd	National Association of Catering Butchers
European Research into Consumer Affairs	National Association of Master Bakers
Faccenda Group Ltd	National Association of Poultry Suppliers
Federation of Bakers	National College of Food Technology
Federation of Danish Pig Producers and Slaughterhouses	National Consumer Council
Federation of Fresh Meat Wholesalers	National Council of Hindu Temples (UK)
Federation of Muslim Organisations	National Council of Woman
Federation of Small Businesses	National Council of Women of Great Britain
Federation of Synagogues	National Farmer Union (NFU)
Federation of Wholesale Distributors	National Federation of Meat and Food Traders
Fibrisol	National Federation of Women's Institutes
Food and Drink Federation/UKAFFP	National Meat Traders Association
Food Commission	Network of Sikh Organisations UK
	Northern Foods Meat Group

The Meat Products (England) (Amendment) Regulations 2008 Interested Parties List

P and M Butchers	The Worshipful Company of Butchers
Pioneer Foods	Townswomens' Guilds
Princes Foods Ltd	Trading Standards Institute
Provision Trade Federation (PTF)	Trading Standards Institute Scottish Branch
RHM Technology Ltd	Unilever
Safeway Stores Plc	Union of Muslim Organisations of UK and Eire
Scottish Consumer Council	Universal Meat (UK) Ltd
Scottish Women's Rural Institute	University of Bristol
Shropshire County Council	VIVA
Soil Association	Waitrose Ltd
Solent Butchers	Which?
Somerfield Stores Ltd	WM Morrisons Supermarkets Plc
Somerset Scientific Services	Womens Farming Union
Spar (UK) Ltd	Women's Food & Farming Union Livestock Committee
Stephen Rhodes Associates (SRA)	Worcestershire Scientific Services
Suffolk Meat Traders & Consumers	Worshipful Company of Butchers
Surrey Trading Standards	York House Meat Products Ltd
Sustain the Alliance for Better Food & Farming	
Tesco Stores Ltd	
The National Federation of Meat and Food Traders	