



Scientific Advisory Committee on Nutrition

Final minutes of the 77th meeting of the Scientific Advisory Committee on Nutrition (SACN): 12 March 2026

Online meeting

Attendees

Chair

Professor Julie Lovegrove

Committee members

Professor Jean Adams

Dr Robert Boyle (closed session only)

Emeritus Professor Susan Fairweather-Tait

Gill Fine

Dr Darren Greenwood

Emeritus Professor Paul Haggarty

Professor Mairead Kiely

Professor Susan Lanham-New

Professor Sophie Moore

Professor Paula Moynihan

Professor Lucilla Poston CBE

Lisa Randall

Emeritus Professor Sian Robinson

Saranja Sivachelvam

Dr Tammy Tong

Professor Kevin Whelan (closed session only)

Nutrition and maternal health working group (NMHWG)

Professor Ann Prentice CBE (chair of NMHWG) attended for agenda item 2 (nutrition and maternal health) only.

Secretariat (Department of Health and Social Care)

Dr Rachel Allen

Dr Adrienne Cullum

Dr Mariana Dineva

Rachel Elsom

Rebecca Hillier

Estella Hung

Neeve Pearce

Celia Sabry-Grant

Mamta Singh

Heiko Stolte

Gillian Swan

Official observers

Dr Brídín Nally (Food Standards Agency, Northern Ireland)

Caroline Robertson (Food Standards Scotland (FSS))

Margie van Dijk (Department of Health and Social Care (DHSC)): open meeting only

Other attendees

Dr Tazeem Bhatia (DHSC): agenda item 3 onwards

Alana McDonald (FSS): agenda item 3 only

Professor Lindsay Jaacks (University of Edinburgh): agenda item 3 only

Xenia Koumi (DHSC)

External (open session only)

Professor Ian Young (previous chair of SACN)

Fiyin Makinwa (Food and Drink Federation)

Temi Oladeji (student, University of Reading)

Ezgi Ozen (lecturer, University of Reading)

Professor Richard Smith (Food Standards Agency (FSA) Science Council)

Ayela Spiro (British Nutrition Foundation)

Elisa Gantois (member of the public)

Cristina Lopez (student dietitian)

Apologies

Apologies were received from the following members:

- Professor Ken Ong was unable to attend the meeting
- Dr Robert Boyle and Professor Kevin Whelan were unable to attend the open session

For agenda item 2, nutrition and maternal health, apologies were received from Professor Annie Anderson and Professor Basma Ellahi, members of the NMHWG.

Closed session

Agenda item 1: welcome, introductions and declarations of interest

1. The chair welcomed attendees and observers to the 77th meeting of the Scientific Advisory Committee on Nutrition (SACN).
2. Members were reminded that an updated register of interests had been circulated (paper SACN/26/03). Members declared the following interests.

Professor Jean Adams declared that she had accepted an invitation to speak at the Danish Diabetes and Endocrinology Academy's (DDEA) summit in October 2026. She would be receiving travel and accommodation expenses and conference registration. The DDEA is funded by the Novo Nordisk Foundation.

Professor Susan Lanham-New noted that her term as a trustee of the British Nutrition Foundation finished in January 2026. In addition, her share ownership and family interests in relation to D3Tex Ltd would be coming to an end in 2026. This is because the UK and Gulf Corporation Council patents have almost expired (2027) and have now not been renewed, and the company is being closed down.

Professor Julie Lovegrove noted that she had stepped down from her position as a trustee of the Academy of Nutrition Sciences on 19 February 2026. This was a condition of her appointment as chair.

3. Members were reminded to submit written updates of all declarations to the secretariat in the format required for the register. They were also reminded to notify the secretariat of any upcoming publications of relevance to SACN's work programme, and to speak to the secretariat prior to taking on any new interests which they think may cause a concern.
4. The chair reminded members that they should not discuss SACN matters with external experts and that the secretariat could always provide advice. Members should also be aware of any potential biases when providing advice as part of SACN, for example relating to their own research interests.

Agenda item 2: nutrition and maternal health position statement

5. Members were asked to declare any interests pertinent to this agenda item. None were declared.
6. The chair welcomed Professor Ann Prentice (chair of the NMHWG).
7. The chair invited the secretariat to provide an update on the SACN nutrition and maternal weight outcomes report.
8. Members were reminded that the SACN nutrition and maternal weight outcomes report was published on 3 February 2026. Members were thanked for all their work and contributions to the report. It was noted that the secretariat had become aware at the time of publication that not all members had had an opportunity to review the final summary to the report, as agreed at the June 2025 SACN meeting. This had been immediately rectified and all members provided approval. As a result of this oversight, in future, matters arising papers will also include relevant actions from previous SACN meetings.
9. The chair invited the secretariat to introduce 5 papers:
 - paper SACN/26/01a - draft nutrition and maternal health position statement cover paper
 - paper SACN/26/01b - draft nutrition and maternal health position statement
 - paper SACN/26/01c (Excel spreadsheet) - draft evidence extraction of dietary reference values (DRVs) from the UK and non-UK expert bodies with meaningful difference
 - paper SACN/26/01d (Excel spreadsheet) - draft tables for chapter 3 presenting National Diet and Nutrition Survey (NDNS) data on micronutrient intakes and status in women of childbearing age in the UK
 - paper SACN/26/01e - draft nutrition and maternal health position statement annexes
 - paper SACN/26/01f - draft maternal health position statement summary
10. Members were reminded that they last considered the draft nutrition and maternal health position statement in November 2025. It was then considered at the Subgroup on Maternal and Child Nutrition (SMCN) and NMHWG meeting in February 2026.

11. Members were reminded of the main decisions agreed at the SACN meeting in November 2025.
12. Members were informed that at its meeting in February 2026, SMCN and the NMHWG had considered the:
 - full data extraction of the evidence base underpinning the DRVs for calcium and agreed that calcium should be considered a 'prioritised nutrient' due to differences in the recommended increments specifically for lactation
 - updated chapter on micronutrients intakes and status and the accompanying data tables (chapter 3 of the draft position statement)
 - summary paragraphs and tables for energy and each of the prioritised nutrients in the 'Comparison of UK and non-UK dietary recommendations and DRVs for pregnancy and lactation' chapter (chapter 4 of the draft position statement) and agreed conclusions and proposed next steps for each
 - overall summary and conclusions (chapter 6 of the draft position statement) and made suggestions to improve clarity, including specifying what would be required for each prioritised nutrient to support any future consideration by SACN
13. The chair invited the NMHWG chair to introduce the draft nutrition and maternal health position statement. The NMHWG chair thanked the working group and the secretariat for all their work progressing the position statement since the last SACN meeting.
14. The NMHWG chair directed members to papers SACN/26/01b (the draft nutrition and maternal health position statement) and SACN/26/01c (draft evidence extraction of DRVs from the UK and non-UK expert bodies with meaningful differences).
15. Members were updated that following the November SACN meeting, the data underpinning the calcium DRVs had been extracted into a spreadsheet. The data covered DRVs for the general population and the increments for pregnancy and lactation, from the UK and the other selected non-UK expert bodies.
16. The NMHWG chair thanked the SMCN and NMHWG member who had undertaken the evidence extraction for calcium and invited them to briefly summarise the evidence for calcium. The NMHWG member made specific thanks to members of the SACN secretariat for their help with the extraction.
17. Members discussed the evidence extraction spreadsheet for calcium and the accompanying summary paragraphs and tables in chapter 4 of the position statement.

18. Members agreed with the SMCN and NMHWG proposal that calcium should be considered a prioritised nutrient and with the proposed next steps for future consideration. Members agreed that a summary of the calcium evidence extraction should be added to chapter 4 and suggested a number of amendments to improve the clarity of the text.

Action: secretariat

19. The NMHWG chair directed members to the background section of chapter 4.
20. Members agreed that as the 2023 Nordic Nutrition Recommendations do not specify different DRVs for different age groups in pregnant or lactating women, it was not necessary to include an age range when reporting their DRVs in the position statement.

Action: secretariat

21. Members also discussed how to present the dietary recommendations from the Dietary Guidelines for Americans (DGA 2020 to 2025) and the associated dietary reference intakes (DRIs) from the Institute of Medicine (IOM) (now known as the National Academy of Medicine (NAM)). It was noted that the DGA 2020 to 2025 makes dietary recommendations covering foods and drinks, dietary patterns and dietary supplements, but does not report the DRIs underpinning these recommendations. Members agreed that when presenting the USA DRIs, the relevant source documents (from either IOM or NAM) should be referenced rather than the DGA 2020 to 2025. Members stressed the importance of referencing the correct sources throughout the position statement.

Action: secretariat

22. The NMHWG chair directed members to the energy section of chapter 4.
23. Members discussed the scientific basis for differences in the increments set for lactation by the UK and the selected non-UK expert bodies and proposed conclusions relating to these.
24. Members also discussed in detail the scientific basis for differences in the increments set for pregnancy by the UK compared with those from the selected non-UK expert bodies. This included the different assumptions about how increased energy requirements during pregnancy might be met. They highlighted the approach taken by NAM in updating estimated energy requirements during pregnancy. Expanded energy prediction equations provide estimates stratified by body mass index (BMI) category (underweight, healthy weight, overweight and obese).

25. Members discussed uncertainties and gaps in the evidence base, including the need to understand energy requirements for different pre-pregnancy BMI categories and any changes in physical activity energy expenditure throughout pregnancy. Members proposed conclusions and research recommendations.

Action: secretariat

26. Members noted the importance of ensuring consistency between the information presented in the extraction table and the text in the position statement.

Action: secretariat

27. The secretariat agreed to circulate the updated extraction table and position statement text relating to energy requirements during pregnancy and lactation with members in time for them to provide comments ahead of the next SMCN and NMHWG meeting on 20 April 2026.

Action: secretariat

28. Members discussed the other prioritised nutrients summarised in chapter 4 in detail and made a number of overarching points. These included the point that given the variation in the DRV categories and definitions used by the different expert bodies, it may not be appropriate to directly compare different DRV categories, such as a recommended nutrient intake and an adequate intake. So, caution is required when interpreting any differences. The secretariat agreed to ensure that a consistent approach to reporting different categories of DRVs would be used throughout the position statement.

Action: secretariat

29. Members discussed the text summarising the reasons for the differences in the increments to folate DRVs for pregnancy and lactation between the UK and the 4 non-UK expert bodies and suggested a number of amendments.

Action: secretariat

30. Members discussed the current UK DRV for zinc during lactation. They noted that this reflects advice from 1991 to exclusively breastfeed for the first 4 months of life and advised that consideration should be given to updating this in line with current breastfeeding advice, that is to exclusively breastfeed for around the first 6 months of life.

Action: secretariat

31. The NMHWG chair directed members to chapter 6 (summary and conclusions).
32. Members reviewed and discussed chapter 6 and suggested amendments to improve the clarity of the text. It was also noted that the chapter should be updated in line with members discussions and decisions relating to chapter 4.

Action: secretariat

33. Members discussed whether any of the increments to general population DRVs for pregnancy or lactation from the 4 non-UK expert bodies could be adopted for the UK population. Members agreed that there would need to be a transparent process in place to inform decisions and that this should be taken to the SACN framework subgroup.

Action: framework subgroup

34. Members agreed that choline should be discussed as part of the SACN horizon scan process at agenda item 7.

Action: SACN

35. Members agreed that it would be helpful for revisions to a number of sections of the draft position statement to be reviewed by SACN ahead of the next SMCN and NMHWG meeting in April.

Action: secretariat

36. Members were directed to chapter 3 (micronutrient intakes and status) and the accompanying Excel spreadsheet on NDNS data on micronutrient intakes and status in women of childbearing age in the UK (paper SACN 26/01/d).
37. Members were asked to consider the security of the erythrocyte transketolase activity coefficient (EKTAC) threshold for thiamin insufficiency and whether this was a public health concern. Members agreed that this required further due consideration and should be discussed as part of the SACN horizon scan process at agenda item 7.

Action: secretariat

38. The chair informed members that another meeting of SMCN and NMHWG was scheduled for 20 April 2026. The updated position statement would be considered by SACN at its meeting in June, with the aim of publishing it in 2026.
39. Members were encouraged to share comments and edits with the secretariat following the meeting.

Action: secretariat

40. The chair asked the official observers if they had anything to add. No further points were raised.

41. The chair thanked SACN, SMCN and NMHWG members for their valuable input.

Agenda item 3: FSS red and processed meat

42. Members were asked to declare any interests pertinent to this agenda item. The following interests were declared. Professor Paul Haggarty noted he had previously declared a conflict of interest due to his wife's (Professor Geradine McNeil, the University of Edinburgh) involvement in this project. He left the meeting for this agenda item.

43. The chair invited Alana McDonald (FSS) to introduce this item. This is a project commissioned by FSS and being conducted by the University of Edinburgh with the aim of informing future FSS guidance on red and processed meat consumption. The chair referred members to the following papers:

- SACN/26/02a: FSS review of the health effects of meat and modelling UK meat intakes
- SACN/26/02b: data extracted and AMSTAR ratings

44. Part 1 of the project comprises a systematic review of evidence published since 2010 on the health benefits and risks associated with reducing red and processed meat consumption. Part 2 models the associations between reducing red or processed meat consumption and nutrient intake. This is based on dietary intake data from the Scottish Health Survey and the Dietary Intakes in Scotland's Children survey, as well as NDNS data for the UK (updating modelling conducted in the [SACN iron and health report 2010](#)).

45. Professor Lindsay Jaacks (the University of Edinburgh) presented the findings from the project.

46. Members discussed the findings of the systematic review and the modelling exercise, and their relevance to current UK dietary recommendations.

47. Discussion points on the systematic review included:

- the funding sources of included studies and the minimal effect of the results of the industry-funded studies on the conclusions due to the availability of other non-industry-funded studies
- the methodology of the systematic review, in particular, the reasons for not including high-quality cross-sectional studies for outcomes where this study design might be more appropriate - it was noted that generally, SACN's preference is not to use cross-sectional data where prospective cohort studies or trials are available
- the effect of the differing definitions of 'high' and 'low' meat intakes used in the included studies
- points of caution around meta-analysing aggregate data compared with individual participant data for dose-response analysis
- the variables used to adjust meta-analytic effect estimates, particularly other food groups
- the evidence on the associations between unprocessed red meat compared with processed red meat and health outcomes

48. Discussion points on the modelling exercise included the:

- methodology of the substitution analysis and the importance of carefully selecting the replacement options for any substitution analysis
- justifications for selecting the micronutrients included in the substitution analysis
- importance of considering bioavailability in substitution analysis

49. Members agreed that they need to see the full final report before deciding on whether SACN can reconsider its recommendations on red and red-processed meat ahead of the planned work on iron bioavailability.

Action: secretariat, FSS and University of Edinburgh

Open session

Agenda item 4: welcome, declarations of interest and government updates

Welcome

50. The chair welcomed members and observers to the open session.

Update on membership

51. At the start of both the open and closed sessions the chair thanked Professor Ian Young, the SACN chair until 28 February 2026, for his contributions to SACN over the past 16.5 years and highlighted some of the important work that he had been involved in. She said that she was honoured to have been appointed SACN chair from 1 March 2026.
52. The chair welcomed Professor Paula Moynihan to her first meeting as a full SACN member, having joined on 1 January 2026. She confirmed that SACN would be looking to recruit new members later in the year, including recruiting for a new deputy - chair. The chair also noted that Professor Paul Haggarty was approaching the end of his 10-year term and his final SACN meeting would be in June 2026.

Declarations of interest

53. Members declared their interests again, for the benefit of external observers of the open session. See paragraph 3.

Government updates

54. Dr Tazeem Bhatia gave an update on behalf of DHSC, in line with the text provided in the matters arising paper (paper SACN/26/05).
55. There were no further updates from official observers.

Agenda item 5: minutes of the previous meeting for agreement

56. The minutes of the 76th SACN meeting held on 13 November 2025 (paper SACN/26/04) were agreed as a correct record of the meetings except for 2 points:
- paragraph 66 - a query was raised as to the necessity of including “(not from NDNS)” given that the link was provided, and it was agreed that this text should be removed

- paragraph 68 - a query was raised about the meaning of “there was scope to perform alternative analyses that can show multiple interactions between the data” and it was agreed to replace with “there was scope to perform multiple additional analyses”

Action: secretariat

Agenda item 6: matters arising from previous meeting, working group and other government updates

57. Members were referred to paper SACN/26/05, matters arising and government, working group and subgroup updates which were discussed by exception only.
58. It was noted that the [SACN 2025 annual report](#) had been published. As is usual practice following the publication of an annual report, the secretariat offered letters of appreciation to members for their contribution to the committee. Members were asked to let the secretariat know if they would like to receive a letter.

Action: SACN and secretariat

59. It was noted that at its last meeting in November, SACN agreed to write a formal letter to DHSC setting out SACN’s position on the free sugars classification of lactose. [A letter from SACN](#) was published as a post-meeting paper in November 2025.
60. It was noted that as part of the matters arising, members were also provided with an update on the nutrient analysis of cows’ milk following the discussions at the SACN meeting in June 2025.
61. Regarding correspondence, the secretariat noted receiving:
 - continued parliamentary questions, which are available to view on [UK Parliament - written questions, answers and statements](#), and continued enquiries related to folic acid
 - freedom of information requests
 - other types of correspondence as detailed in the matters arising document, including from Dairy UK, which had contacted SACN regarding the decision to classify hydrolysed lactose as a free sugar - it was noted that the secretariat had responded to Dairy UK in line with the minutes from the SACN meeting in November 2025 available on the [SACN webpage](#)

62. A member asked whether the monitoring of folate status in the population had begun and whether there were any updates on this. The secretariat noted that work was underway and agreed to provide an update on this at a future SACN meeting.

Action: secretariat

63. The chair informed members that, following her recent appointment as chair of SACN, she had discussed membership of the SACN framework subgroup with the secretariat. This followed the departure of several subgroup members from the committee over the past year, including Professor Ian Young, Dr David Mela and Harry McDermott. It was proposed that Dr Darren Greenwood be appointed as chair of the subgroup and the following SACN members join the subgroup: Dr Robert Boyle, Professor Paula Moynihan, Dr Tammy Tong and Lisa Randall. Members agreed with these proposals.
64. The chair asked the official observers if they had anything to add. No further points were raised.

Agenda item 7: SACN June 2026 horizon scan

65. Members were asked to declare any interests pertinent to this agenda item. None were declared.
66. The chair invited the secretariat to introduce 2 papers:
- SACN/26/06a - June 2026 horizon scan cover paper
 - SACN/26/06b - June 2026 spreadsheet detailing DRVs for UK, USA (IOM and NAM), the European Food Safety Authority (EFSA) and Nordic Nutrition Recommendations
67. Members were reminded that they had agreed at their meeting in November 2025 that the method used to prioritise nutrients for consideration in SACN's nutrition and maternal health position statement (agenda item 2 of these minutes) could be a valuable addition to SACN's horizon scan process and could help identify topic areas requiring review by SACN.
68. Members were invited to consider the following 3-staged approach to prioritising nutrients proposed by the secretariat:
- identify nutrients of potential public health concern in the UK based on data on intakes or status from NDNS
 - consider any differences in UK DRVs from those set by expert bodies in Europe and the USA

- assess the evidence, methodological approaches and interpretation underpinning the DRVs in the UK, Europe and the USA
69. The secretariat noted that paper SACN/26/06a provided information on the first 2 of these stages, with the aim of enabling members to shortlist nutrients in which to undertake the third stage at the horizon scan meeting in June 2026.
70. Members were content with the proposed approach to prioritising nutrients for further examination at the horizon scan meeting. For pragmatic reasons, they agreed that the current exercise should focus on micronutrients.
71. Members were also content with the proposal to consider all age groups except young children (aged 5 years and under), as this age group had been considered in depth in SACN's 2023 report on feeding young children aged 1 to 5 years.
72. Members noted that the approach could be applied to macronutrients in future with appropriate modification, for example, where the public health concern is related to higher rather than lower intakes. The chair reminded members that if there were additional topics they wanted to raise for discussion at the horizon scan meeting, such as specific macronutrients, to let the secretariat know by the end of March.

Action: members

73. Members discussed each micronutrient in turn, considering whether they should be further examined at the June 2026 horizon scan meeting, retained on the watching brief, or not progressed further at this stage.
74. Members noted that, in line with expert bodies such as EFSA, the setting of DRVs for any one nutrient assumes that the status for all other nutrients is adequate (that is, there is no deficiency).
75. Members noted that some UK DRVs were derived using mean population body weights from around 1991 (and earlier), which no longer reflect the current weight status of the UK population (for example, vitamin A, magnesium, potassium and selenium). Members therefore agreed that these should be further assessed.

Micronutrients for further examination

76. Members agreed that the following micronutrients should be further examined at the horizon scan meeting.

Vitamin A

Vitamin A should be examined for the following reasons:

- potential concern with low intakes in many age groups
- expert bodies have updated DRVs since the UK DRVs were set indicating there may be new evidence or methodological approaches to setting DRVs
- UK DRVs are based on historic estimates of population body weights

Thiamin

Thiamin should be examined for the following reasons:

- no evidence of poor intakes in any age group but evidence of poor status in some age groups
- issues raised in relation to the security of the status biomarker threshold for insufficiency

Riboflavin

Riboflavin should be examined for the following reasons:

- potential concern with low intakes in many age groups
- evidence of poor status (although the threshold or cut-off for riboflavin low status is insecure)
- other expert bodies have updated DRVs since the UK DRVs were set indicating there may be new evidence or methodological approaches to setting DRVs

Vitamin B6

Vitamin B6 should be examined for the following reasons:

- no evidence of poor intakes in any age group but evidence of poor status in some age groups
- other expert bodies have updated DRVs since the UK DRVs were set indicating there may be new evidence or methodological approaches to setting DRVs

Folate

Folate should be examined for the following reasons:

- a nutrient of continuing public health relevance with concern with low intakes in many age groups

- evidence of poor status
- other expert bodies have updated DRVs since the UK DRVs were set indicating there may be new evidence or methodological approaches to setting DRVs

Vitamin B12

Vitamin B12 should be examined for the following reasons:

- little evidence of poor intakes but evidence of poor status in some age groups
- other expert bodies have opted to set adequate intakes rather than DRVs due to insufficient evidence base - this therefore merits further consideration by SACN

Vitamin C

Vitamin C should be examined for the following reasons:

- no evidence of poor intakes but evidence of poor status in some age groups
- other expert bodies have updated DRVs since the UK DRVs were set indicating there may be new evidence or methodological approaches to setting DRVs

Calcium

Calcium should be examined for the following reasons:

- potential concerns with low intakes in many age groups but no functional biomarker of status exists due to serum calcium being homeostatically controlled by the 3 calcitrophic hormones (calcitonin, calcitriol and parathyroid hormone)
- other expert bodies have updated DRVs since the UK DRVs were set indicating there may be new evidence or methodological approaches to setting DRVs

Magnesium

Magnesium should be examined for the following reasons:

- potential concerns with low intakes but no secure biomarker of status
- EFSA set adequate intakes due to a lack of an appropriate biomarker
- UK DRVs are based on historic estimates of population body weights

Potassium

Potassium should be examined for the following reasons:

- its public health relevance and links to sodium intake
- that other expert bodies have set adequate intakes due to insufficient evidence to set DRVs
- UK DRVs are based on historic estimates of population body weights

Selenium

Selenium should be examined for the following reasons:

- potential concerns with low intakes but no secure biomarker of status
- differences between UK and USA DRVs
- EFSA set adequate intakes due to a lack of an appropriate biomarker
- UK DRVs are based on historic estimates of population body weights

77. The secretariat agreed to extract further information on all of the above nutrients, including the scientific basis of and methodological approaches to setting the DRVs in UK, Europe and the USA, to enable members to deliberate whether UK DRVs require updating.

Zinc

Zinc should be examined for the following reasons:

- potential concerns with low intakes but no secure biomarker of status
- other expert bodies have updated DRVs since the UK DRVs were set indicating there may be new evidence or methodological approaches to setting DRVs

Action: secretariat

78. Members agreed that no further assessment was required at the present time for the following micronutrients.

Niacin

Niacin should not be examined for the following reasons:

- no evidence of low intakes or concerns about low status
- no recent updates to DRVs by other expert bodies

Sodium

Sodium should not be examined because public health concerns around sodium intakes are related to risk management rather than uncertainty in DRVs.

Vitamin E

Vitamin E should not be examined for the following reasons:

- insufficient evidence of deficiency or any deficiency syndrome in healthy people
- other expert bodies have set adequate intakes due to insufficient evidence to set DRVs

Copper

Copper should not be examined because it has no UK status data or suitable biomarker.

Biotin, chloride, chromium, molybdenum, manganese, pantothenic acid, phosphorus and vitamin K

Biotin, chloride, chromium, molybdenum, manganese, pantothenic acid, phosphorus and vitamin K should not be examined for the following reasons:

- no UK DRVs (due to insufficient evidence) or no intake data (because each of the nutrients were never included in the NDNS, or were removed following evidence of there being no concern over intakes)
- other expert bodies have set adequate intakes due to insufficient evidence to set DRVs

Choline

Choline should not be examined for the following reasons:

- no UK DRVs for choline
- no widely accepted biomarker for choline status
- no UK intake and status data

Fluoride

Members noted that fluoridation is outside SACN's remit. It was noted that work from other international expert bodies suggests there's not enough evidence to set secure DRVs.

Vitamin D, iron and iodine

79. Members noted that vitamin D, iron and iodine were already on SACN's work programme and therefore were not considered a part of this discussion.

General points

80. The secretariat also agreed to consider reviewing all micronutrient biomarker thresholds used within the NDNS.

81. Members discussed the importance of consistency of approach in determining which nutrients should be progressed. It was agreed that the tables in paper 26/06a would be updated for the horizon scan meeting to include the approach taken for each nutrient and the rationale for that decision.

Action: secretariat

82. The chair asked the official observers if they had anything to add. No further points were raised.

Agenda item 8: any other business

83. The chair noted that the secretariat would be in touch with members regarding meeting dates for 2027. She advised the proposal was to sift for dates earlier for the autumn, spring and summer meetings to allow time for the publication process for summer publications ahead of recess. The secretariat asked members to advise if this would cause any issues.

Action: secretariat, members

84. The secretariat noted that scoping work was underway on protein and asked members to let them know if they would like to support on this work prior to establishing a formal working group.

Action: secretariat, members

85. No further points were raised. The chair drew the meeting to a close.

86. The next SACN meeting will be held in person on 17 June 2026, with the horizon scan on 18 June 2026. The chair confirmed that the secretariat would be in touch regarding any accommodation needs.

Action: secretariat

The chair closed the meeting.