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CONSUMER PRINCIPLES.

1. A public safety backstop.
2. Food businesses are responsible.
3. A science-based approach.
5. A risk-based approach.
6. Independent oversight.
7. Clear criteria for any transfer of responsibilities.
CONSUMER PRINCIPLES.

8. Incentives and disincentives for compliance.

9. Review and monitoring.

10. Address future hazards.
1. A PUBLIC SAFETY BACKSTOP.

- Fundamental for protecting public health.
- Essential to identify animal health problems and food safety hazards.
- Need to deal with most significant hazards.
- Important to ensure that consumers can buy a wholesome product.
2. **FOOD BUSINESSES ARE RESPONSIBLE.**

- Ultime responsibility for safety lies with food businesses.

- But independent inspection does not undermine this responsibility.
3. A SCIENCE BASED APPROACH.

- Decisions about the nature of meat inspections guided by advice from EFSA.

- To learn lessons from the approach to poultry before shifting responsibilities for other meat inspection.
4. A MULTI-DISCIPLINARY APPROACH.

- To take in account a wide range of relevant expertise (veterinary and public health expertise).
- To take account of slaughterhouse practices...
- ...and consumer expectation.
- All relevant stakeholders need to be consulted.
5. A RISK – BASED APPROACH.

- Meat industry is very diverse and operating to different standards.

- Important that the enforcement regime reflects this...with greatest resources focused on the poorest performing.

- But also needs to take account that circumstances can quickly change.
6. INDEPENDENT OVERSIGHT.

- Strong independent oversight by competent authorities will always be essential.

- Any conflict of interest in responsibilities must be avoided.
7. CLEAR CRITERIA FOR ANY TRANSFER OF RESPONSIBILITY.

- Where businesses consistently perform to a high standard, it may be appropriate to transfer greater responsibility.

- Essential...a high level of confidence in the management.

- Clear, transparent criteria.
8. INCENTIVES AND DISINCENTIVES FOR COMPLIANCE.

- Non-compliance should not be tolerated and tough penalties to prevent poor standards.

- To publish hygiene standards or scores so that the public can see which are the best and poorest performing businesses.
9. REVIEW AND MONITORING.

- Regular review and monitoring as circumstances change.

- Periodic unannounced visits by independent enforcement officers.
10. ADDRESSING FUTURE HAZARDS.

- Important to recognize the meat inspection’s role in identifying and addressing eventual new animal diseases.
- Necessity to detect new and emerging hazards at an early stage.
- No conflict of interest should delay reporting and disclosure.
CONCLUSION.

- Meat safety remains a sensitive issue for consumers.
- Much effort has been put into improving food safety in recent years...
- ...but problems remain and it’s important to be alert to emerging risks.
- Inspection must focus on the most significant hazards.
CONCLUSION.

- But it also needs to be ensured that meat is wholesome.
- Modernisation exercise must be based on scientific evidence.
- HOW to do should be distinguished from WHO does it.
- A risk – based approach is essential...but always need to be effective, independent oversight.
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