

Government Chemist Programme Expert Group Meeting

Wednesday 17 May 2023

Hybrid (LGC, Queens Road, Teddington, Middlesex TW11 0LY & MS Teams)

Attendees:

<p><u>PEG</u></p> <p>Brenda McRory Chelvi Leonard David Franklin David Pickering Declan Naughton Diane Turner John L Collins Jonathon Griffin Paul Berryman Simon Branch Sophie Rollinson</p> <p><u>Observers</u></p> <p>David Skelton</p>	<p><u>DSIT</u></p> <p>Eli Johnson James Shapland Maria Turner</p> <p><u>LGC</u></p> <p>Amber Meredith Caroline Pritchard Chris Hopley Christian Ward-Deitrich Davide Ojeda Elena Sanchez John Black Julian Braybrook Kirstin Gray Malcolm Burns Maya Petrova Paul Hancock Philip Dunn Selvarani Elahi Tejal Soni-Khamar</p>
--	---

Apologies: Lucy Foster, Kasia Kazimierczak.

1. Welcome & minutes of the last meeting:

- 1.1 A PEG member chair opened with welcoming attendees and reminded all those present of the usual housekeeping.
- 1.2 Minutes from the previous GC PEG meeting (November 2022) were approved.

2. Review of actions and matters arising from previous meetings:

- 2.1 A PEG member asked if it is possible to share the results of the titanium dioxide analysis with the FSA which would be useful and informative from a risk assessment perspective.
Action 1: CB9 project team to share results of the titanium dioxide analysis with the FSA.
- 2.2 A summary of the results from CB9 will be given at the PEG meeting. *Action completed and closed.*
- 2.3 A PEG member stated from an FSA angle, there was feedback on specific projects which could be useful input for those projects to get maximum value. **Action 2:** GC staff to engage with the FSA on these projects.

- 2.4 A meeting has been arranged with the FSA following the PEG meeting to discuss. *Action completed and closed.*
- 2.5 A PEG member agreed the role of the GC should be more widely recognised by food business operators and whether Defra could help with this via the newsletter to raise awareness of the role of the GC. **Action 3:** GC staff to discuss with Defra.
- 2.6 A GC staff member and a PEG member are in discussions to draft a suitable article. *Action completed and closed.*
- 2.7 A PEG member commented that the FSA has access to a range of different forums so the GC could come in and give a presentation on the role of the GC. **Action 4:** GC staff to discuss with FSA.
- 2.8 A GC staff member has discussed with the FSA and will arrange a suitable time/meeting to give a presentation on the role of the GC. *Action completed and closed.*
- 2.9 A PEG member commented that the list of GC PEG members on the GC website needs updating. **Action 5:** GC to update the PEG member section of the GC website.
- 2.10 A GC staff member to check that this has been completed (**ACTION 1**).

3. DSIT Update

- 3.1 The DSIT presentation (slides circulated with these minutes) summarised the following:
- 3.2 Dept for Science, Innovation and Technology (DSIT) has now been in existence for 100 days. Department brings together the relevant parts of the former Department for Business, Energy and Industrial Strategy and the former Department for Digital, Culture, Media and Sport. DSIT will be moving to a new building in Whitehall by the end of the year.
- 3.3 National Institute of Airborne Acoustic Metrology (NIAAM) - New designated institute, part of the University of Salford. Self-funded – no funding via the NMS.
- 3.4 SI Unit mapping: NPL are leading, developing a database to map the NMS's calibration and measurement capabilities to assess any gaps within the NMS. Will be rolled out to the rest of the NMS once the model has been set up.
- 3.5 There were no comments or questions from PEG members on the update.

4. GC Update

- 4.1 A GC staff member talked through the proposed site move to Guildford for all National Laboratory activities.
- 4.2 A PEG member asked a question on who owns the equipment used in delivery of the GC Programme. A GC staff member confirmed that LGC owns the equipment.

5. International Science Review Update

- 5.1 The key points of the presentation can be found in the slides circulated with these minutes. Questions and comments are summarised below:

- 5.2 A PEG member asked if the Science Review was a painful exercise overall. The Government Chemist commented that it was a tough and intense process. A GC staff member further commented that it was a good opportunity to take stock and see the range and volume of activities over the last few years as part of the submission to the review board.
- 5.3 A PEG member asked DSIT if they thought that there could be an impact on the NMS KPIs.
- 5.4 In response DSIT commented that as part the project to review the KPIs, discussions are around being less about counting and more about what the actual impact is, so it will be interesting to see what the recommendations from the International Science Review are.

6. GC2023 Programme Review

- 6.1 The key points of the presentation can be found in the slides circulated with these minutes. Questions and comments are summarised below.
- 6.2 A PEG member asked how the outcomes from the capability building projects are disseminated.
- 6.3 A GC staff member replied that some are through peer-review publications, some are published the GC website, and others are internal reports.
- 6.4 A GC staff member further noted that the capability building projects are there to reinforce the statutory function for referee cases by building internal capability. They also noted that the GC annual review provides a summary of publications and GC input into relevant guidance documents.
- 6.5 A PEG member also mentioned the Joint Knowledge Transfer scheme, for more general stakeholder engagement.
- 6.6 A PEG member asked if there were any shifts or new themes within the new GC programme.
- 6.7 A GC staff member reiterated that some of the projects have natural connections running into the new programme and last years' GC Stakeholder Workshop had prioritised sustainability aspects such as alternative proteins which is being looked at under the new Programme.
- 6.8 A PEG member asked a question around impact and the structure / formula that needs to be adhered to, to show where impact is coming from.
- 6.9 A GC staff member commented that there is no consensus on impact, but the GC is improving the way it collects information.

7. GC2023 Programme KPIs and Dissemination Outputs

- 7.1 The key points of the presentation can be found in the slides circulated with these minutes. Questions and comments are summarised below.

- 7.2 A PEG member asked to clarify the dates of the GC Conference. A GC staff member confirmed the GC conference will be held from the 20th -21st June at the Royal Society of Chemistry, Burlington House.

8. CB9: Toxic inorganic, arsenic in an expanded range of rice-based products

- 8.1 The key points of the presentation can be found in the slides circulated with these minutes. Questions and comments are summarised below.
- 8.2 A PEG member asked a question regarding the capability of the public analysts, noting that four participated but that only one was accredited; so was unsure what would happen in an enforcement case in terms of who would be able to give a result.
- 8.3 A GC staff member responded saying this is commonly recognised and something that the FSA are looking at in supporting public analysts being able to have UKAS accredited methods for capability and depends on the volume of sample going through the laboratories as to whether they choose to maintain the accreditation or not.
- 8.4 A PEG member commented that they had ISO accreditation, but the methods were perhaps more basic than those used by the GC, so may explain why some uncertainties are higher.
- 8.5 A PEG member further commented that resources in public analyst labs have diminished over the years.
- 8.6 A PEG member further commented that with the help of the FSA now they have been given some funding which we will enable them to increase their capability this year.
- 8.7 A GC staff member commented that a report of findings was currently being reviewed and will likely form part of a peer-review publication.
- 8.8 A PEG member asked if the GC team could send them the slides so that they could share with his risk assessment colleagues.

9. CB10: Validated method for titanium dioxide nanoparticles in food

- 9.1 The key points of the presentation can be found in the slides circulated with these minutes. Questions and comments are summarised below.
- 9.2 A PEG member asked if the GC team could send them the slides so that they could share with his risk assessment colleagues.
- 9.3 A GC staff member replied that the team will need to discuss this request first.

10. Feedback and questions

- 10.1 A PEG member asked PEG members for their feedback.
- 10.2 One PEG member thanked the GC team for their amazing work and praised the attention to detail.
- 10.3 Another PEG member thanked the GC team for a very informative update.
- 10.4 LGC to circulate the meeting minutes in the next few weeks **(ACTION 2)**.

10.5 LGC to circulate a Doodle Poll for the Autumn 2023 meeting (**ACTION 3**).