

**PPA Food Law and Consumer (FLC) Committee
Minutes of the meeting 10 March 2026 (incl. minutes from 20 April ad-hoc meeting)
Teleconference**

<u>10 March 2026</u>			
Participants:		Guest speakers	
Catharine Hall	KP Snacks (Chair)	Peter Fassen de Heer	Scottish Government
Vanessa Richardson	PPA (Secretariat)	Cheryl McNulty	Scottish Government
Gillian Black	Taylor’s Snacks	Andrew Taylor	CAP
Jeroen Hendrickx	Lamb Weston		
Darren Hewish	Tayto Group	Apologies	
Jyoty Modha	PepsiCo	Andrew Curtis	PPA (Secretariat)
Clare Scallon	Tayto Group	Claire Hassell	Proper Snacks
Susana Rivera	Barcel (non-member)	Shane Green	McCain
Stuart Williams	PepsiCo	Sara Stanley	Proper Snacks
		Charlotte Pick	McCain
		Amber Rogers	Proper Snacks

1) Welcome and anti-trust guidance

Members were welcomed to the meeting and asked to observe the new PPA Competition Law Statement, which was read out loud. Members were pointed to the full statement which can be found on the [PPA website](#).

2) Invited Guest Speaker: Andrew Taylor (Committee of Advertising Practice [CAP], Regulatory Policy Team)

Andrew Taylor (AT), Regulatory Policy Executive at CAP, provided an update on the implementation of the Less Healthy Food (LHF) advertising restrictions, including early enforcement experience, interpretation of the policy framework, and practical compliance considerations.

AT outlined his involvement in the development of the LHF restrictions, which came into force on 5 January. He noted that the Advertising Standards Authority (ASA) was approximately two months into implementation and had received a high volume of complaints (estimated between 200 and 300), significantly more than following the introduction of non-broadcast rules on products High in Fat, Sugar and Salt (HFSS) rules in 2017. This was attributed to increased public awareness and the prominence of social media. AT cautioned that it was still early in the enforcement phase but reported that the majority of complaints were not being progressed, often due to being out of scope, involving SME advertisers, or relating to products that did not meet the LHF definition when nutrient profiling was applied. He commented that industry understanding of the rules appeared strong, with compliant advertising evident across the supply chain.

AT explained that the ASA applies a filtering process, with only a small proportion of complaints proceeding to detailed assessment. Where breaches are identified, rulings will require ads to be amended or withdrawn. AT advised that the first rulings under the new restrictions were expected around April and would provide valuable clarity on regulatory interpretation [**POST MEETING NOTE:** The [first ASA rulings](#) were published on 15 April. The next tranche is expected in May (FLC 180/26)].

AT then summarised the framework used to assess whether an ad is in scope. For the restrictions to apply, an ad must promote an identifiable LHF product, 'depict' a specific LHF product, appear in one of the restricted media (TV or On Demand Programme Service (ODPS) before 9pm, or paid-for online media), and be placed by an advertiser that does not qualify as an SME.

He explained the identifiability test as a broad, holistic assessment of whether an average consumer could reasonably identify an ad as being for a specific LHF product, taking into account ad content, product references, and the nature of the advertiser. Ads may be potentially in scope at this stage but subsequently fall out of scope due to exemptions.

AT highlighted the importance of exemptions, particularly the brand advertising exemption. He explained that ads which do not depict a specific LHF product are unlikely to be caught, even where the advertiser's wider portfolio consists largely or entirely of LHF products. He stressed that depiction, rather than consumer takeaway, is the key consideration for the brand advertising exemption. The assessment focuses strictly on what appears in the ad itself. The PPA Secretariat noted the broadness of the definition of 'depict' in the legislation.

Providing practical guidance, AT described lower-risk creative approaches, including direct promotion of non-LHF products, logo-based or corporate advertising, and use of non-LHF products or generic imagery to promote a wider brand or range. He advised caution where colours, flavours, logos, or imagery could result in the product being visually indistinguishable from a specific LHF product, identifying these as potential risk areas. Corporate Social Responsibility messaging without product depiction was also noted as generally acceptable.

AT discussed media distinctions, confirming that advertising in media outside the scope of the restrictions (such as outdoor or radio) is unaffected by the LHF rules, though existing, non-broadcast, HFSS rules still apply. For online media, AT clarified that organic content on owned social media accounts, websites, and transactional platforms is generally out of scope, provided it is not paid-for.

Members asked whether CAP could provide case studies or examples to illustrate compliance. AT explained that CAP is constrained in providing worked scenarios due to the statutory nature of the restrictions, but that forthcoming ASA rulings would offer practical insight. In the meantime, members were encouraged to rely on the guidance, secondary advice resources, and the published [CAP Q&A material](#). The Secretariat confirmed that members would be informed once the ASA rulings were published.

ACTION: Secretariat to monitor initial ASA rulings on LHF advertising (expected April) and, depending on outcome, consider arranging a follow-up CAP session. [POST MEETING NOTE: Completed (FLC 180/26). PPA to continue monitoring and will rearrange session if required or requested by members].

Questions were raised about creative executions seen in the market, such as ingredient imagery (e.g. poured or molten chocolate). AT advised against assuming such advertising represents definitive guidance but noted that ingredient imagery may be permissible where it does not amount to depiction of a specific LHF product. He commented that early indications suggested a generally high level of compliance and no evidence of widespread non-compliance.

Members sought clarification on retailer and delivery platforms. AT explained that product listings owned and placed by platform owners themselves are usually out of scope, as they are not paid-for advertising. However, where manufacturers pay for promoted listings, sponsored placements, or enhanced prominence, this may bring content within scope. He advised structuring arrangements so that paid placements do not depict specific LHF products, with consumers directed to the retailer's standard, non-paid product listings for product information.

Members asked whether the CAP LHF Q&A resource would be expanded. AT confirmed this was likely, particularly following the publication of ASA rulings, and encouraged members to submit suggested questions via the Advertising Association (AA) (requests to be managed by the PPA Secretariat).

The Secretariat also sought AT's views on potential changes to the 2018 Nutrient Profiling Model (NPM). AT stated that CAP and the ASA would await formal government decisions and consultation outcomes before considering any implications, noting that any changes could affect both broadcast and non-broadcast regimes.

The Secretariat and members thanked AT for his presentation and responses to questions. Please see slides for further information.

Members had a discussion about the new advertising restrictions as well as potential grey areas within the guidance (e.g. brand advertising and influencers). Members expressed an interest in having AT back at a later FLC meeting for an update once more rulings had been published.

ACTION: Members to report concerns on grey areas in LHF advertising restrictions (e.g. brand ads, influencers, retailer promotions).

3) Invited Guest Speakers: Cheryl McNulty and Peter Faassen de Heer (Scottish Government (SG)):

Cheryl McNulty (CM), Team Leader, and Peter Faassen de Heer (PFdH), Senior Policy Manager at the Tobacco, Gambling, Diet & Healthy Weight Unit at the SG, provided an update on diet and health policy developments in Scotland. The update covered implementation of HFSS promotion restrictions, progress on the SG's Diet & Healthy Weight Plan, and the review of the Scottish Dietary Goals (SDGs).

CM began by outlining her role within the SG's Tobacco, Gambling, Diet and Healthy Weight Unit, noting a focus on the food environment. She confirmed that the SG welcomed the UK Government's legislation introducing advertising restrictions for LHF food and drink on television and online, which came into force in January, and that Scotland supported the implementation of this policy. CM noted that there had been limited feedback to date on how the advertising restrictions were operating in Scotland.

Turning to wider diet and healthy weight policy, CM provided an overview of the Scottish Population Health Framework, co-published with COSLA (the Convention of Scottish Local Authorities) in June 2025, and developed with Public Health Scotland (PHS) and the Scottish Directors of Public Health. The framework sets a ten-year ambition to reduce the life expectancy gap between the most deprived 20% of areas and the national average, with improving healthy weight identified as a key priority. Legislation restricting promotion of HFSS food and drink was highlighted as one of the first significant actions delivered under the framework.

CM explained that [The Food \(Promotion and Placement\) \(Scotland\) Regulations 2025](#), which will restrict promotions of HFSS food and drink in Scotland, align closely with existing policy in England and Wales and will come into force on 1 October. The Regulations aim to make healthier choices easier by targeting food categories that contribute significantly to calorie, fat and sugar intakes. Measures include restrictions on the promotion of pre-packed HFSS food and drink, limitations on certain price promotions (such as multi-buy offers and free refills of sugary soft drinks), and restrictions on the placement of HFSS products in prominent in-store and online locations.

Responsibility for enforcement will sit with local authorities, reflecting their experience of enforcing similar legislation. CM stated that enforcement is expected to be proportionate and risk-based, and integrated where possible with existing inspection activity. She confirmed that the SG had worked with businesses to develop implementation guidance, building on materials published in England and Wales. The guidance was described as being in final clearance, with publication anticipated shortly. CM confirmed that the guidance would not be subject to consultation, but would be kept under review and updated if stakeholder feedback identified areas requiring clarification [**POST MEETING NOTE: The [SG implementation guidance](#) was published on 17 March (FLC 133/26)**].

CM also provided an update on the Diet and Healthy Weight Implementation Plan. She explained that development of the plan was at an early stage, with internal engagement completed across SG policy

teams, Food Standards Scotland (FSS) and PHS, and external stakeholder workshops recently concluded. Work was underway to analyse feedback, with a focus on improving the food environment, giving children the best start in life, and supporting access to weight management services. CM noted that, following the Scottish elections in May, advice on priorities and actions would be prepared for ministerial consideration, with a working assumption that the plan would be published in the second half of 2026.

PFdH then provided an overview of the review of the SDGs, noting that the current goals date from 2016 and are informed by advice from the Scientific Advisory Committee on Nutrition (SACN). He explained that FSS convenes an expert panel to review population nutrient intakes, identify areas of over- or under-consumption, and make recommendations to Scottish Ministers, who ultimately decide whether to accept the proposed goals.

PFdH explained that SDGs do not cover all macronutrients, noting that protein is not included because population intake is generally sufficient. Areas of greater relevance include salt, saturated fat, sugars, total carbohydrates and fibre. He emphasised that the SDGs underpin policy development, including HFSS promotion and advertising restrictions, and are used by analysts to monitor progress through tools such as the Scottish Health Survey.

PFdH explained that the current review was prompted in part by Climate Change Committee (CCC) recommendations on red and processed meat consumption, and that the review therefore considers health, environmental and economic impacts. He confirmed that the review was ongoing, with final recommendations expected in the Autumn, and that decisions on adoption would rest with Scottish Ministers.

In response to questions, PFdH confirmed that both free sugars and total carbohydrates are within scope of the SDGs, and that the review is expected to draw on the most recent SACN evidence. He noted ongoing engagement between review committees and SACN to ensure appropriate data is used.

Members asked how the SG was engaging with the UK Government and devolved administrations on recent developments to the 2018 NPM. PFdH confirmed close engagement across administrations and highlighted the importance of a consistent, UK-wide approach where possible. CM clarified that the Scottish Regulations on HFSS promotion restrictions use the 2004-05 NPM, and while the SG welcomed the development of an updated NPM based on the latest scientific evidence, any future changes would require appropriate consultation and process.

The Secretariat and members thanked CM and PFdH for their updates. See SG slides for further information.

[POST MEETING NOTE: The SG has shared meeting slides after the meeting, which will be circulated to members along with the meeting minutes].

4) Review of meeting minutes (14 November 2025) and any actions arising

The Committee confirmed that the minutes of the previous FLC meeting held on 14 November 2025 (FLC 065/26) were correct and proceeded to review the actions arising from the meeting. See slides for details. In addition, please note:

- **UK-EU Sanitary and Phytosanitary (SPS) Agreement:** a change of approach was agreed with members. PPA to input into Department for the Environment, Food & Rural Affairs (Defra) Call for Information on UK-EU SPS Agreement (see notes below). Marked as 'Completed'.
- **Food Standards Agency (FSA) Food System Strategic Assessment Workshop:** final report expected mid-2025. PPA Secretariat to follow up once final report is released. Item completed and removed.
- **FSA Guidance on Clear Food Labelling:** member feedback needed by 13 March.

ACTION: Members to inform the PPA Secretariat of any concerns regarding the draft FSA Guidance on Clear Food Labelling by 13 March. [POST MEETING NOTE: The guidance is still under development. At the moment, no further comments are being requested. Marked as 'Completed'.].

- **Bread and Flour Regulations (BFR) – folic acid fortification:** Members are encouraged to continue to report any issues in relation to the transition/enforcement on folic acid fortification of non-wholemeal wheat flour. Fortification with folic acid becomes mandatory from December.

ACTION: Members to inform the PPA Secretariat of issues encountered with regards to the transition to folic acid fortified wheat flour.

- **Members** interested in applying to FLC's **vice-chair position** to contact the PPA Secretariat: PPA Secretariat still looking for volunteers. Please contact the PPA Secretariat if you are interested in helping the team.

ACTION: Members interested in applying for FLC's vice-chair position to contact the PPA Secretariat.

5) Updates

a) Nutrition and Health

The Secretariat provided an update on diet and health policy timings and highlighted some events which were not further discussed during the meeting, i.e.:

- **Welsh Government (WG) Regulation on Healthy Eating in Schools:** [The Healthy Eating in Schools \(Nutritional Standards and Requirements\) \(Maintained Primary Schools\) \(Wales\) Regulations 2025](#) were published in December 2025 and will come into force on 31 October **[POST MEETING NOTE: The implementation guidance on the Regulations were published on 31 March. Two documents have been published: [The DRAFT Healthy Eating in Schools regulations 2025: statutory guidance for local authorities and governing bodies](#) and [The Promotion of healthy eating and drinking in maintained schools - Guidance for local authorities and school governing bodies on the Healthy Eating in Schools \(Wales\) Measure 2009 \(FLC 162/26\)](#)].**
- **EU Food Dialogue Conference:** announced as part of the Vision for the Future of Agriculture and Food **[POST MEETING NOTE: The event took place on 5 March and centred on the theme 'Reestablishing the essential link between farming, territory, and food'. Focus on local, seasonal and sustainable food. The next session will look into competitiveness of food industry. More information will be provided as relevant discussions take place].**
- **2026 Salt Awareness Week:** 11-17 May **[POST MEETING NOTE: This year's theme will be 'Salt it out' and the focus will be on the health risks associated with excessive salt consumption].**
- **National Diet & Nutrition Survey (NDNS) Urinary Sodium analysis and year 1 salt reduction progress report:** NDNS Urinary Sodium analysis expected sometime in 2026. The Department of Health and Social Care (DHSC) would also like to publish the year 1 salt reduction progress report at the same time but cannot commit due to lack of resources.
- **SACN priorities:** work on vitamin D requirements for dark skin population groups has begun. There are also plans to start work on protein, iodine and wholegrains later in 2026. Other workstreams incl. bioavailability of iron and omega-3 (no timescales). SACN are also keeping a watching brief on processed foods, non-nutritive sweeteners, plant-based diets, folic acid, calcium, magnesium and selenium.

i) HFSS Promotion restrictions (England and DAs)

The Secretariat provided an update on developments on promotion restrictions of HFSS products in the UK and the DAs. See slides for details. In addition, please note:

Scotland:

[POST MEETING NOTE: Scotland was not discussed in detail, as representatives from the SG had already presented earlier in the meeting. However, please note that the [SG implementation guidance](#) was published on 17 March (FLC 133/26). Also, as per SG's presentation, the SG Diet and Healthy Weight Implementation Plan is expected in H2 2026 and the SDGs are expected in the autumn, so timescales on slide have been amended].

Northern Ireland (NI):

- **Healthy Futures Obesity Strategic Framework:** 10-year, whole-systems obesity strategy; food environment and HFSS policy most relevant for the sector.
- **Nutritional Standards for staff and visitor food in health and social care settings:** apply to catering, retail and vending (excluding patient food); implications for procurement and catering contracts.

ii) 2018 NPM

The Chair provided an update on the recently published 2018 NPM. See slides for details. **[POST MEETING NOTE:** The consultation on the implementation of the 2018 NPM to the England HFSS promotion restrictions and the UK-wide LHF advertising restrictions was launched on 25 March (FLC 147/26)].

Please also note:

- The Food and Drink Federation (FDF) is collating member feedback on the guidance. Members were encouraged to submit feedback on the guidance **[POST MEETING NOTE:** PPA has reached out to members for feedback on the 2018 NPM guidance (FLC 172/26 and FLC 195/26)].
- Main implementation challenge is calculation of free sugars, given the lack of commercially available analytical data and reliance on estimation and assumptions.
- Significant concerns raised about the practical feasibility of enforcement, given uncertainty over how businesses and regulators would consistently derive free sugar values.
- Members highlighted difficulty in distinguishing between ingredients used as vegetables versus spices or flavourings, where quantities are minimal but may still technically contribute free sugars.
- Concerns are highly product- and category-specific, with some categories significantly more affected by the 2018 model than others.
- Wider concern expressed regarding the impact on prior industry investment, where reformulation had already been undertaken to meet the existing NPM, potentially undermining progress.
- Proposal by the Institute of Grocery Distribution (IGD) presented to DHSC, based on total sugars as a proxy for free sugars **[POST MEETING NOTE:** Members were later consulted on these proposals (FLC 167/26 and 187/26). This remains a contingency plan for the FDF, who continues to push back on the introduction of the new NPM].
- At the Ministerial Roundtable (4 March), industry set out significant delivery constraints. One retailer indicated full implementation of the 2018 NPM could take 8–10 years.
- A key outcome from the Ministerial Roundtable was a Government commitment to undertake a full Impact Assessment (IA) of applying the 2018 NPM to promotion and advertising restrictions. **[POST MEETING NOTE:** The FDF and the AA have both commissioned third parties to conduct IAs on the impact of the introduction of the 2018 NPM on reformulation and advertising spend].
- Members were invited to provide evidence on product-level impacts, implementation costs and feasibility to inform future engagement and consultation responses.

ACTION: *Members to submit **product-level impacts of the 2018 NPM** to PPA Secretariat, especially around free sugar, but also capability information for sales-weighted NPM score calculations.*

iii) Mandatory reporting

The Chair provided an update on the upcoming proposals on mandatory reporting, announced as part of the 10 Year Health Plan, '[Fit for the Future](#)' (FLC 205/25) published on 3 July 2025. Please see slides for information and references. Also note:

- Mandatory reporting reiterated as the first step, with mandatory targets deferred to the next parliamentary term, although it has been suggested that both may be consulted on together.
- DHSC working groups building on previous work of the Food Data Transparency Partnership (FDTP) work, rather than starting from scratch.
- From FDF membership discussions:
 - Strong concern that a per-100g calorie metric is of limited value for categories where caloric density is structurally fixed and could actively mask meaningful progress.
 - Concern raised that allowing voluntary metrics alongside mandatory ones could create unintended pressure, where opting not to provide voluntary data may be perceived negatively.
 - Members expressed unease that reporting outcomes could be used to rank or compare businesses, rather than focusing on tracking progress within individual companies.
 - Concerns about reputational risk, particularly if reported data is interpreted without appropriate category or portfolio context.
 - Mandatory reporting design is closely linked to decisions on which NPM applies, with uncertainty over whether reporting would be based on the current NPM or the 2018 NPM.
 - Concern raised that changes to the reporting framework risk undermining prior reformulation investment, where products were adjusted to meet existing criteria.
- PPA members were encouraged to provide evidence on cost, feasibility and product-level impacts to inform future engagement and consultation responses, in particular regarding 100g vs per-portion calorie reporting.

ACTION: *Members to provide feedback on mandatory reporting metrics, especially the 100g vs per-portion calorie measure.*

[POST MEETING NOTE: At its [March 2026 meeting](#), the FSA Board considered the Government’s proposed Healthier Food Targets and Reporting scheme. The discussion did not represent a final policy decision. Instead, the Board was asked to support the FSA’s continued advisory role to DHSC focusing on whether the proposals would be practical, proportionate, enforceable and auditable. The FSA will return to the Board with further detail if it is formally appointed as regulator. The FSA Board raised serious concerns around extra funding needed for the FSA to carry out additional duties].

iv) NDNS Y12-15 & Defra Family Food Statistics

The Secretariat provided an overview of the latest NDNS covering Y12-15 (2019-2023), which were published in June 2025 (FLC 183/25), as well the Defra Family Food Statistics for Fiscal Year Ending (FYE) 2024, published in November 2025 (FLC 072/26). Members were reminded that PPA carried out analytical work on the nutritional contribution of members’ products to the diet based on the latest NDNS in October 2025 (FLC 328/25), which was presented to members at the November 2025 FLC meeting. However, the consumption data was still pending as an action for the Secretariat, due to the difficulties in gathering and analysing the data without the support of AHDB (Agriculture and Horticulture Development Board) Potatoes. Analysis of the Family Food Statistics was also pending as it was published shortly before the last FLC meeting. See slides for further detail. In addition:

- Differences in time periods and category definitions between the NDNS and the Family Food Statistics were highlighted as further limiting direct comparability.
- Comparisons are particularly difficult for potato products and chips, where category definitions diverge more significantly than for crisps and savoury snacks.
- A change in NDNS methodology (paper diaries to online data capture) limits comparability across years within the dataset.
- The NDNS time series spans the Covid-19 pandemic, which is likely to influence observed consumption patterns.
- PPA will use the new data in its material to illustrate contribution of members’ products towards diet.

iv. Other Diet & Nutrition updates

The Secretariat then provided an update on other recent health and nutrition developments. See slides for further information. In addition:

Ultra-Processed Foods (UPF):

- **Lancet Series on UPF and Human Health (FLC 370/25):** Lancet UPF series more of a synthesis of existing evidence rather than new evidence. Second paper's critique of nutrient-based policy approaches may influence longer-term policy thinking. Third paper's focus on commercial and system-level drivers of UPF consumption highlighted as a shift in framing, potentially increasing scrutiny beyond product composition alone.
- **UKRI (UK Research and Innovation) report on public perceptions on UPF: [POST MEETING NOTE: The UKRI/Sciencewise report '[Making sense of UPFs](#)' was published on 16 April].**
- **EU study on consumption of UPF in [Vision for Agriculture and Food](#) (FLC 054/25): [POST MEETING NOTE: Now expected late 2026/early 2027].**
- **European Potato Processors' Association (EUPPA) discussions:** The EUPPA Food Law Committee is currently working to map potato products across multiple UPF classification systems, reflecting the lack of a single agreed definition of UPFs. Planned work will focus on data collection covering product composition, processing methods and cooking/preparation practices, with analysis expected to begin around mid-2026. Processing methods highlighted as a core area of uncertainty, particularly the treatment of pre-frying, deep-frying and re-frying across different UPF definitions. The distinction between industrial processing and home preparation, for example where deep-frying occurs in domestic settings, noted as a key challenge. The exercise is intended to support evidence-based positioning ahead of future discussions on UPF definitions, rather than predetermine outcomes.

EU Cardiovascular Health Plan '[Safe Hearts Plan](#)' (FLC 410/25):

- Uncertainty as to how far the European Commission's (EC) proposed food processing assessment system may lean on UPF classifications, as no clear position has yet emerged.

EU discussions on maximum levels for vitamins and minerals in food:

- **[POST MEETING NOTE: At the 5 March meeting between the EC and EU Member States (EUMSs), the EC confirmed its intention to continue work based on the current methodological approach, with limited openness to significant changes. A dedicated EUMS task force has been reactivated to address outstanding technical issues. A call for evidence is now expected in Q2 2026.]**

b) Food Labelling, Composition & Regulation

i. UK-EU SPS Agreement

The Secretariat provided an overview on the latest developments on the upcoming UK-EU SPS agreement since the last meeting. Please see slides for further details. In addition, please note:

- Members noted that, at this stage, there is still limited clarity on the practical impact of the agreement for individual businesses, making it difficult to provide detailed feedback.
- Significant uncertainty was raised around transition periods, with scepticism about the realism of the proposed mid-2027 start date.
- Particular concern was highlighted around divergence in pesticide and Plant Protection Products (PPPs), which may be difficult to reconcile quickly across supply chains.
- Certain UK/GB regulatory initiatives previously under discussion may now be unlikely to progress (e.g. UK assessment of smoke flavourings)

- Government acknowledgement that commitments to support sectors needing longer to adapt are welcome, but details remain unclear.
- Guidance viewed as an initial framework rather than a definitive roadmap, with further detail needed before businesses can fully prepare.
- PPA to prepare a response to the Call for Information on the UK-EU SPS Agreement, which closes on 23 April.

ACTION: Secretariat to prepare PPA response to **Defra's Call for Information on the UK-EU SPS Agreement** and circulate it to members for comments. **[POST MEETING NOTE: Completed. Response sent to Defra on 23 April (FLC 194/26). The Call for Information is now closed].**

ACTION: Members to review the new SPS guidance and send concerns or impacts to PPA Secretariat.

[POST MEETING NOTE: It is expected that legislation on the SPS agreement will form part of the King's Speech on 13 May. The UK-EU Summit is exp. in June/July, and the SPS Bill is expected to gain Royal Assent in September/October].

ii) Allergy Labelling

The Secretariat provided an update on recent discussions related to allergen labelling and Precautionary Allergen Labelling (PAL). Please see slides for further information. In addition, please note:

Codex and UK:

- Revised reference dose intended to address inconsistency in PAL use, rather than to encourage wider application of PAL.
- Members highlighted uncertainty about how Codex-level decisions will translate into practical UK implementation, once responsibility shifts to national regulators.
- UK's intention to broadly follow Codex still leaves open questions around timing, interpretation and enforcement once Codex adoption is finalised.
- Uncertainty was expressed about whether PAL would be discussed again at upcoming FSA Board meetings, depending on the publication of papers. **[POST MEETING NOTE: The FSA will not be consulting further on the PAL guidelines due to a majority agreement from stakeholders and steer from the FSA to support the Codex allergen thresholds].**

ii. Other Labelling, Composition and Regs.

The Secretariat provided several updates under this agenda item. Please see slides for details. In addition:

- **BMG/ADAS cost of food labelling project:** **[POST MEETING NOTE: To date, the BMG/ADAS report has not been published].**
- **Smoke Flavourings UK:**
ACTION: Members concerned about EU ban on smoke flavourings to contact PPA Secretariat.
- **National Level Regulation:** **[POST MEETING NOTE: At the [March FSA Board meeting](#), the FSA Board agreed the scope of the Future of Food Regulation programme, which aims to deliver an effective, resilient and trusted regulatory system that is fit for the future. No regulatory model or proposals have yet been determined. The FSA is now beginning work to design, evidence, test and engage further on policy options, with a detailed programme plan expected by the end of June. Stakeholder engagement will inform the workstreams, including through working groups, technical advisory committees, post-Board roundtables, planned 'reality visits', and a new Senior Advisory Forum, which is expected to hold its introductory meeting in May. Future work is expected to cover areas such as business**

registration, enforcement, online regulation, the Food Hygiene Rating Scheme, guidance, data and digital systems, and the long-term sustainability of regulatory resources].

- **EU Empowering Consumers for the Green Transition (EmpCo) Directive:**
 - Enforcement was expected to focus initially on online environmental claims, rather than on-pack claims, which was seen as an important practical distinction.
 - **[POST MEETING NOTE:** FoodDrinkEurope has reported that DG Just expected a pragmatic agreement on this could be achieved in the summer].
- **EU Recycling labelling/Packaging & Packaging Waste Regulation (PPWR):**
 - EC's Joint Research Centre (JRC) technical study on harmonised waste sorting labels has triggered significant concern regarding practical implementation.
 - Industry highlighted challenges around packaging design constraints, particularly for small packs.
 - Multilingual packaging requirements were flagged as a key complexity when introducing harmonised labels across markets.
 - There were concerns about the feasibility, cost and timelines associated with widespread label changes on food products.
 - **[POST MEETING NOTE:** The FoodDrinkEurope position on harmonised waste sorting labelling schemes now published. FoodDrinkEurope considers that the JRC proposal does not sufficiently account for the practical and design challenges faced by manufacturers and stresses the need for clear, uniform secondary legislation to avoid inconsistent national interpretation and Single Market fragmentation. The Draft Implementing Act hasn't yet been published. The UK is currently considering aligning with EU on recycling labelling proposals, considering that NI will be in scope of certain aspects of the PPWR. Defra plans to consult on the matter at the end of 2026/early 2027].
- **EU CMO (Common Market Organization) Regulation review:**
 - Uncertainty remains around whether and how the final agreement may affect non-meat products, e.g. seasonings (used in snacks), where meat-related terms are used descriptively.
 - Media scrutiny on the implications of the CMO started, if the UK aligns with EU legislation.
 - Absence of final legal text makes it difficult to assess implications for specific product uses, particularly branded flavours **[POST MEETING NOTE:** To date, the final text has not been published].
 - Recent court ruling on dairy terms ([Dairy UK v. Oatly AB](#)) referenced as increasing focus on fair competition arguments, rather than solely consumer protection, which could influence future interpretation.
- **CCFA56 – 13-17 April 2026**
 - **[POST MEETING NOTE:** The PPA Secretariat was not able to join the National Codex Consultative Committee (NCCC) on 18 March. However, we would be grateful if members could inform PPA about additive usage in their products, to enable PPA to better track regulatory developments (esp. regarding UK-EU regulatory alignment)].
 - ***ACTION: Members to please send PPA a list of additives used in their products.***

c) Food Safety

This section of the meeting was not covered on 10 March due to Andrew Curtis' (AC) absence.

ACTION: Secretariat to arrange a dedicated call with Andy to cover food safety topics (incl. acrylamide, glycoalkaloids, etc.).

[POST MEETING NOTE: Completed (FLC 139/26). An ad-hoc meeting was set up on 20 April to cover recent relevant developments on food safety issues, including acrylamide, glycoalkaloids, 3-monochohopropanediol (3-MCPD), and Plant Protection Products (PPPs). See meeting minutes below].

Ad-hoc PPA Food Law and Consumer (FLC) Committee
Minutes of the meeting 20 April 2026
Teleconference

<u>20 April 2026</u>		
<u>Participants:</u>		<u>Guest speakers</u>
Catharine Hall	KP Snacks (Chair)	N/A
Vanessa Richardson	PPA (Secretariat)	
Paul Beswetherick	Europe Snacks	<u>Apologies</u>
Gillian Black	Taylor's Snacks	Darren Hewish Tayto Group
Gemma Chope	PepsiCo	
Jeroen Hendrickx	Lamb Weston	
Jyoty Modha	PepsiCo	

The PPA Secretariat provided an update on food safety-related issues only, covering primarily acrylamide, but also furans, 3-MCPD esters, glycoalkaloids, Mineral Oil Hydrocarbons (MOH) and pesticides. See slides for details. Please also note the following:

i) Acrylamide

• **EU**

- It was noted that at the start of the year the EC had restarted discussions with EUMS on the introduction of Maximum Levels (MLs), as well as new and revised Benchmark Levels (BMLs).
- For the most part the values that had been proposed were similar to those included in the Stakeholder Consultation from end of 2021.
- Despite the absence of a formal consultation stage so far, extensive bilateral engagement between EU sector associations and EC officials have already taken place
- The EC had attended a recent FoodDrinkEurope Contaminants meeting and had given an update, with the expectation that the proposal will be formalised during the second half of the year.
- EC had presented an updated set of MLs and BMLs. It was also noted that there was also still a risk of substantive change during the scrutiny period once the proposal reaches the European Parliament (EP) – a previous attempt to introduce MLs for infant and baby food led to the entire proposal being rejected by the EP (following consumer group lobbying).
- The proposals will also be subject to World Trade Organization (WTO) Technical Barriers to Trade (TBT) notification, adding potential delay.
- In January, the European Snacks Association (ESA) had obtained a complete set of the data held for acrylamide in foods from the European Food Safety Authority (EFSA). Dr Steve Powers had been employed to review the data on behalf of the sector (it was noted that a number of datapoints had been excluded due to unit errors or unsuitable analytical methods, highlighting limitations in the dataset).
- Despite data quality issues, the reviews showed there was general alignment between industry analysis and the EC's direction of travel on BMLs and MLs.
- Data gaps were highlighted for certain product categories, particularly cereal-based snacks, requiring the use of proxy categories to enable comparison.
- It was noted that that lack of clear category definitions within the EFSA datasets is a recurring issue.
- In its latest update, the EC had acknowledged insufficient data for potato starch-based snacks, leading to the use of default limits which were aligned with chips and crisps.
- The EC also considered that potato crisp 'sticks' needed special consideration due to higher observed acrylamide levels (presumed to be due to product features and limitations of existing process controls e.g. surface to volume area and inline sorting).

- For vegetable crisps, it was noted there was a limited set of data held by EFSA, and that the EC had taken note of the data and draft Code of Practice submitted directly by ESA. This had led to an upwardly revised BML of 1500/200ppb (tba).
- It was noted that EUPPA's position was that BMLs are the only workable regulatory tool for frozen products, as these were prepared/finished at home by the consumer, and this had been accepted by the EC.
- An amended categorisation as proposed by EUPPA had been submitted to the EC and was designed to better reflect production and coating differences that influence acrylamide formation e.g. inclusion of battered straight-cut French fries as a distinct category justified on the basis that battering increases acrylamide formation risk. The Secretariat reported that the EC originally intended 'Fruit chips' to refer to banana chips.
- It was noted that additional product categories may be drawn into the framework over time, but BMLs would only be appropriate where effective mitigation tools can be demonstrated.

- **UK**

- The full ESA and EUPPA data sets that had been submitted to EFSA were also submitted to the FSA last year to ensure alignment between the datasets.
- However, depending on the outcome of UK-EU SPS agreement, UK activity on acrylamide may become irrelevant, as the EU regulations will supersede any national legislative developments.
- Members noted that contaminants such as acrylamide, MCPD, furan, lead and Polycyclic Aromatic Hydrocarbons (PAHs) collectively raise questions about the adequacy of proposed transition periods.
- Discussion as to whether a two-to-three-year transition period would be sufficient to cover the cumulative impact of aligning across multiple contaminant regulations.
- Members were invited to provide views on transition needs to feed into PPA's response to the Defra UK-EU SPS Call for Information.

ACTION: Members were invited to provide views on transition periods (and other elements) on the Defra Call for Information on the SPS Agreement. **[POST MEETING NOTE:** The Defra Call for Information is now closed. PPA responded on 23 April (FLC 194/26)].

- **Annual data collection**

- ESA's annual data collection had been launched in January to allow sufficient time for data validation, formatting and statistical analysis.
- The expectation was that analysis would begin once the remaining data is received after Easter.
- It was noted that there was always a lag between data submission and publication of analytical reviews, with some reports taking close to a year from submission to release.
- It was noted that the most recent data on dough-based snacks continued to show a downward trend over time, despite some variability at higher percentiles.
- Ingredient choice was identified as a key driver of variability, with spelt highlighted as particularly problematic (although conclusions are limited by the small number of data points).
- Chickpea and potato products were identified as areas with greater variability, while maize showed statistically significant reductions and consistently low levels.
- Lentil and rice products showed reductions without statistical significance, reflecting limited reactivity and smaller datasets.
- Members were cautioned against over-interpreting results where sample sizes are small, particularly for less common raw materials.
- The nuts and seeds data was described as fragmented, with wide variability due to differences in processing methods that are not captured within the dataset.
- Almonds were identified as having higher acrylamide formation potential compared to other nuts, while peanuts showed wide variability.
- No regulatory proposals currently exist for nuts and seeds, though the topic has re-emerged in discussions and cannot be fully ruled out.

- The potential for nuts to be drawn into future regulatory toolboxes was flagged as a risk, despite the EC indicating limited mitigation options.
- Starch-coated products appeared to show lower acrylamide formation than expected. It was speculated that the starch coatings may reduce exposure of reactants or act as a protective barrier, but could also be a result of there only being a small number of manufacturers with well-controlled processes.

- **Acrylamide: other updates**

- Members were encouraged to submit any outstanding data as early as possible to avoid last-minute complications.
- Concern raised that recent draft updates to the Codex Code of Practice include numerous mitigation measures that are not viable at industrial scale.
- Potential for the updated Codex document to expand its scope to cover vegetable products, including vegetable crisps and fries.
- Further revisions to the draft FoodDrinkEurope toolbox are expected following significant industry feedback on the previous version. Once updated, the toolbox is intended to support engagement with both Codex and the EC.
- Concerns were raised about input by the International Life Sciences Institute (ILSI) for potential inclusion in the toolbox, which could potentially lead to misalignment if submissions arrive late in the process.

- **ii) Furans**

- **[POST MEETING NOTE: The results of the COST Action on furans are now expected in May].**

- **iii) 3-MCPD and glycidyl esters**

- No additional comments. Publication of the Regulation was expected in early summer.
- **[POST MEETING NOTE: There have been no further updates on 3-MCPD].**

- **iv) Glycoalkaloids**

- **EU**

- Current EFSA data is too limited to support setting MLs and the EC was taking a 'wait for more data' approach.
- It was noted that industry data submissions (ESA, EUPPA and others) were important in shaping next steps.
- EUPPA had also raised some concern about potential autocontrol requirements based on HACCP principles, given gaps in available test methods for glycoalkaloid degradation products.
- It was noted that evidence from the MinGlyKa project suggests processing steps (e.g. peeling and slicing) significantly reduce glycoalkaloid levels in finished products. **[POST MEETING NOTE: The final report of the MinGlyKa project were sent to project participants in March. Scientific papers based on the project results are expected to be published later in 2026].**

- **v) MOHs:**

- **EU**

- Noted that practical readiness for implementation of the EC proposals is a concern, particularly around access to appropriate testing capacity.
- The EC's FAQ document contains useful background but contains limited commodity-specific guidance.

vi) PPPs:

- Alignment between the UK and EU PPP legislation is expected but could be problematic given diverging authorisations on active substances.
- Ongoing and frequent MRL changes were highlighted as a significant operational challenge for the sector.
- Re. French emergency measure on mancozeb, the trade risk for UK exports is now considered minimal given mancozeb's loss of authorisation in the UK.
- French measure could set a precedent for further unilateral national measures on PPPs. Similar emergency action by Poland was noted as an early sign of potential regulatory fragmentation across the EU (FLC 214/26).

vii) Precision Breeding (England)

- This item was not covered during the meeting. See slides for information.

viii) New Genomic Techniques (EU)

- This item was not covered during the meeting. See slides for information.

d) Sustainability

The Secretariat provided a brief update on recent relevant packaging developments in the UK and the EU, including the Extended Producer Responsibility for packaging (pEPR) scheme, the EU PPWR, on UK initiatives on Food Waste and the UK and EU Deforestation Regulations. See slides for further details. Please also note the following:

i) Producer Responsibility Organisation (PRO):

- **[POST MEETING NOTE:** On 23 March, UK Packaging PRO was formally appointed by PackUK as the PRO for the UK's packaging EPR scheme].

ii) PPWR:

- **[POST MEETING NOTE:** On 30 March, the EC published new [guidance](#) and [FAQs](#) on the PPWR].

iii) Deforestation:

- **EU**
- **[POST MEETING NOTE:** In March, the EC published the third edition of the EU Deforestation Regulation (EUDR) [Supply Chain Infographics](#), reflecting the amendments agreed by the co-legislators in December 2025 and clarifying the implications for obligations of different actors across the supply chain. (FLC 160/26). In May, the EC has also published its simplification package for the EUDR, incl. an [updated FAQs document guidance](#), a draft Delegated Act on the product scope, now open for a four-week public feedback period, a Report to the EP and the Council, and a draft Implementing Act governing the Information System, to be sent to representatives of the Member States in the EUDR Committee. The EC will hold an online Platform to explain the details of the package on 8 June (FLC 219/26)].

6) Committee matters

The Secretariat noted again that the FLC vice-chair role remains vacant and invited interested members to contact the PPA Secretariat or Chair for more information.

ACTION: Members interested in applying for FLC's vice-chair position to contact the PPA Secretariat.

- **Risk matrix**

The Risk Matrix was discussed during the meeting and some changes were agreed. In the interest of time, the Secretariat agreed to make the necessary changes and circulate the draft matrix to members for comments.

ACTION: Secretariat to amend FLC Issues Matrix and circulate to members for approval. [POST MEETING NOTE: The Secretariat shared a draft revised Issues Matrix with members for approval (FLC 131/26). No further changes were requested].

The following changes were made:

- Moved ‘Scottish Obesity Strategy (Diet & Healthy Weight Plan)’ from ‘future issue’ to ‘current issue’ (kept as ‘moderate impact’).
- Removed ‘FOPNL developments’.
- Added ‘EU regulatory alignment’ as a new item under ‘current issue’ x ‘big impact’.
- Removed ‘GB Smoke flavourings review’.
- Removed ‘UK Smoked Ingredients’ and removed ‘EU’ from ‘EU Smoked Ingredients’. Retained ‘Smoked Ingredients’ under ‘future issue’ x ‘moderate impact’.
- Removed ‘UK’ from ‘UK Recycling labelling’ as agreed, so covers both UK and EU. Have kept it under ‘future issue’ x ‘small impact’.
- Removed ‘UK Deforestation’.
- Added ‘GS1 QR codes (transition from barcodes)’ as a new item under ‘future issue’ x ‘moderate impact’
- Added ‘GLP-1 medication – impact on categories’ as a new item under ‘current issue’ x ‘moderate impact’. Marked as a high-profile media issue.

7) AOB

There were no AOBs raised.

8) Next meeting dates

The next 2026 FLC meetings will be held on:

- **In-person:** 30 June – 10:30am start (London – FDF offices)
- **Online:** 11 November– 1pm start.

ADDENDUM:

On an ongoing basis, members are invited to submit to the Secretariat any product data held on:

3-MCPD	Mycotoxins (aflatoxins, ochratoxin A, patulin, fusarium toxins, fumonisings, deoxynivalenol (DON) and zearalenone (ZEA))
Acrylamide	Perfluoroalkyl substances (PFAS)
Cadmium	Pesticides (CIPC)
Nickel	MOSH/MOAH
Dioxins	Tropane alkaloids
Glycoalkaloids	UK import/EU export issues (e.g., composites, HRFNAO, NIRMS, BTOM)
Hydrocyanic acid (HCN)	Supply chain shortages (e.g., sunflower oil, lecithins, etc)/substitution issues