



**CITY UNIVERSITY
LONDON**



Worshipful Company of Cooks



**Food Research
Collaboration**

2015 CITY FOOD SYMPOSIUM BRIEFING

Centre for Food Policy, City University, London

On 14th December 2015, the Centre for Food Policy at City University London **in conjunction with the Food Research Collaboration and the Worshipful Company of Cooks** organised a symposium to debate, “UK, Food and Europe: The food implications of Brexit”

The background:

The debate about UK membership of the EU is not new. It was heated in the 1970s too. Today, some people hanker after pre-Common Market days and regret entering it on January 1973, and the vote to remain in June 1975, and the widening of EU membership and policy role. Some worry about creeping EU control. Others see the EU has having brought a key food stability compared to the vagaries of the 1930s.

In the world of policy, food and the EU has become a specialist area. Food and agriculture are central elements in the EU structure. A sizeable section of UK media has criticised a supposedly interfering Europe for years, yet the public gets the benefits while not necessarily getting the detail. The polls show diversity and some uncertainty. Amidst all this, the food and agricultural implications of Brexit have barely been raised. The 2015 City Food Symposium aimed to address this.

Symposium purpose:

The annual City Food Symposium brings together a mixture of CSOs, academia and other sectors to discuss and debate the evidence and practice on hot food topics. It is a one day forum to focus on key issues, explore if there is consensus, contribute to the discourse, and build interest in the topic across the food sectors.

This year’s Symposium looked dispassionately at the question: what light can be cast on the implications for food of the UK leaving the EU?

The specific aims of the 2015 Food Symposium were to:

- Summarise current thinking on the UK, EU and implications of Brexit for food and agriculture
- Assess the role of different sectors and actors in the coming debate
- Clarify current food and agricultural policy at UK, EU, global and local levels
- Suggest ways forward.

The Symposium provided top quality information and debate from key actors and experts on the EU and food. A variety of speakers approached the topic from different perspectives: implications for food manufacturing, food service and farming were discussed, as well as the impact of Brexit on food safety, economics, environmental policy and animal welfare. The programme also included sessions explaining current EU influence and policy mechanisms, and the Scottish perspective on Brexit.

The symposium was attended by approx. 150 people, half from academia and civil society organisations, the rest from government, media and the food/agriculture industry. They heard presentations from 13 distinguished speakers.

Attendees were also able to express their point of view through a live poll, before and after the event. A majority of those who voted were against leaving the European Union, but they were not as strongly convinced that the general public would agree with them. Before the Symposium started, most audience members did not think that food would play a major role in deciding the issue; by the end, however, the talks convinced many of them to change their minds.

Talks and Speakers

All presentations were filmed; videos and PowerPoints are now available at <http://foodresearch.org.uk/food-symposium-at-city-university-london/>. What follows is a summary of each presentation.

Session 1: The issues

1. Brexit, an uncertain policy environment

Alan Swinbank, Emeritus Professor of Agricultural Economics University of Reading



An in-out referendum on the UK's membership of the EU is to be held before the end of 2017. As yet we do not know what policy package populates the 'out' option. This presentation will explore some of the opportunities and constraints for the UK's future agri-food policies should the UK decide to leave the EU (Brexit). Would the UK wish to adopt a more free market approach to agriculture for example, or perhaps go for greater food self-sufficiency? The constraints consist, in part, of international obligations in the World Trade Organization (WTO) and towards the EU in any successor trade agreement; the budget funds that HM Treasury might make available for farm support and environmental protection; and political pressure from the farm, environment, and other lobbies, enmeshed with the preferences of the devolved administrations. Most scenarios suggest some disruption to supply chains. Individual businesses will be gainers and losers, but the UK's food security is *not* an issue as overseas suppliers will still want to sell to a wealthy market.

Alan Swinbank is an Emeritus Professor of Agricultural Economics at the University of Reading. Most of his career has centred on critiquing the EU's common agricultural policy (CAP), but he has also written, lectured, and advised extensively on the process of agri-food trade liberalization under the

auspices of the World Trade Organization (WTO), and on EU biofuel policy. Recent books include *Ideas, Institutions and Trade: The WTO and the Curious Role of EU Farm Policy in Trade Liberalization* (Oxford University Press, 2009, with Carsten Daugbjerg). Currently he is a member of a research group assembled by the Yorkshire Agricultural Society discussing Brexit; and in 2014 he published 'If the British left: Agricultural policy outside the CAP?' in the journal *EuroChoices*.

<http://alanswinbank.magix.net/#/Home>

2. Thoughts on food manufacturing

Ian Wright, Director General, Food and Drink Federation



Ian Wright is the Director-General of the Food & Drink Federation, the representative voice of the UK's largest manufacturing sector. Before joining FDF in March 2015, he spent 14 years responsible for the management of Diageo's reputation as it became one of the world's most trusted and respected companies. He has also worked for Mars Confectionery, Pillsbury and Burger King, as well as spells in consultancy and politics. He is also a non-executive director of Mass1, a member of the advisory board of The Work Crowd and a trustee of both The WAVE Trust and Children on the Edge.

3. Implications for farming

Martin Haworth, Acting Director General, National Farmers Union) – implications for farming



It is almost impossible to say what consequences of Brexit for British agriculture would be. We know the advantages and problems of EU membership but we don't know what non membership would mean. Things are made more difficult because those advocating Brexit are a coalition of opposites. The issues to consider are: access to EU market; trade with third countries; what would a British agricultural policy look like; access to labour and regulation.

Martin Haworth has a degree in Modern History from St John's College, Oxford University. After university he became a stagiaire (trainee) at the European Commission in Brussels in 1973. He subsequently joined the full time staff of the Commission working in the External Relations and Information field. Besides working in Brussels he was also in the New York delegation (1975-78 where he was the EC's press attaché at the United Nations) and in the London office.

In 1980 he joined the NFU's Economics Department, specialising in European issues. Between 1983-86 he was Head of the NFU's Brussels office. Returning to London he worked for a time as the Personal Assistant to the then President of the NFU, Sir Simon Gourlay. In 1989 he was made Head of International Affairs at the NFU, involving responsibility for co-ordinating European policy, trade issues and the NFU's international contacts. He has been heavily involved in the work of the European farmers organisation (COPA) and was President to its General Experts Group from 1992-95.

In 1995 he was awarded the Chevalier du Merite Agricole by the French Government. In October 1996 he also assumed management responsibility for the Economics Department and Brussels Office and for policy strategy. From 1999 Martin was Director of Policy at the NFU. From Nov 2009 - April 2010, Martin was appointed Acting Director General. He has also covered the communications brief in a temporary capacity. In 2014 he was appointed as Deputy Director General and is now Acting Director General. In 2011 Martin was the European member of a Transition Board which established the [World Farmers Organisation](#).

4. The view from Brussels so far - what would the impact be of the UK leaving the EU?

Kate Trollope, Editor, EU Food Policy



As editor of EU Food Policy, I cover the European Commission proposals on European food legislation; the subsequent debates and votes in the European Parliament and the deliberations of both Health Ministers in the Council and the votes in the Standing Committee (Plants, Animals, Food and Feed).

If the UK were to leave the EU, the UK would still have to meet all the requirements of the Brussels' legislators if companies want to continue to export to the EU (market of 450 million consumers if the UK leaves). Yet the UK would have absolutely no say, no influence over the rules being agreed or revised. This strikes me as being a potentially disastrous position to be in. At least at the moment, the UK has a substantial number of votes in Council, on the Standing Committee and can build alliances to influence policy. If we leave, the UK would have no votes, no MEPs and, over time, not even any British staff in the European Commission, which makes the proposals. It would not even access sometimes to the proposals under discussion – often crucial words are tweaked at the eleventh hour before a vote.

People say there could be advantages for small, local firms which could be subject to less legislation if the UK left and the government changed the rules for them. But any attempt to lessen UK rules in comparison with EU rules would be risky in terms of EU countries claiming that our food is not as safe as theirs. Everyone talks about Brussels bureaucracy and too much red tape. But the current Juncker Commission is actually withdrawing proposals and reviewing existing ones (nutrient profiles, health claims on botanicals.) Currently, the European Commission is not producing much food legislation – everything is subject to a lengthy impact assessment under the Better Regulation agenda. The Juncker Commission is extremely reluctant to propose new food legislation.

Kate Trollope edits EU Food Policy (www.eufoodpolicy.com), the leading online news service covering food law and voluntary agreements in Brussels as well as key national developments in the EU. She has more than 20 years' experience reporting from Brussels on European Commission proposals on food, debates and votes in the European Parliament, as well as negotiations in the Council and votes in the Standing Committee.

She specialises in areas such as health and nutrition claims, food labelling and food information to consumers, foods for special groups, novel foods, food from cloned animals, nanotechnology, food additives and food contact materials such as Bisphenol A. She has also closely followed the voluntary initiatives such as the Platform for Action on Diet, Physical Activity and Health and the debate over which foods should be marketed to children. As well as editing EU Food Policy, she speaks on food legislation topics, having recently contributed to a European Parliament workshop and also moderates at conferences. She has a degree in English Literature from Exeter University. You can contact Kate via Kate.Trollope@eufoodpolicy.com

5. Why this matters for Food Service industries

Peter Backman, Managing Director, Horizons



Peter Backman examined the links between the UK and the rest of Europe in the context of the foodservice market and its supply chain – and he will raise questions concerning the potential influence Brexit could have on these links.

Peter Backman is the Managing Director of Horizons, an expert on the structure and dynamics of the foodservice sector, and its supply chain, in the UK and across Europe. He is responsible for the company's vision and driving the business forward. He has been involved, as a researcher and consultant within the sector, for over 30 years blending his knowledge with a deep understanding of the trends, key players and challenges of organisations with an interest in foodservice.

He regularly speaks at conferences worldwide and his views are sought by television, radio, the Bank of England and the press. Peter has many innovations to his credit having been the first person to define the structure of the eating out market in the terms which are now widely used by the industry, as well as the most extensive database model of the foodservice sector. Peter is the past Chairman of Arena, the pan-industry networking organisation that he was instrumental in setting up twenty five years ago. He is a Fellow of the Institute of Hospitality and a member of the Market Research Society.

Session 2: Some tricky issues

6. Unravelling food enforcement

Jenny Morris, Principle Food Policy Officer, Chartered Institute for Environmental Health and Head of The Institute of Food Safety, Integrity & Protection (TiFSiP)



Food legislation is agreed by EU Member States in order to provide a consistent standard and approach. This is not a straight forward process as different Member States have varying views that reflect their history, culture and approaches. Agreement is reached through a series of discussions that can be difficult and tortuous, between technical experts, political representatives, the Commission and the European Parliament. If Britain leaves the EU it will no longer have a direct voice in such discussions but will need to meet EU standards if it wishes to continue to export food to Europe. This presentation will consider potential implications and provide a case study as an example to illustrate pros and cons of being an EU member. Beyond this illustration it is worth noting that all the food legislation will shortly be reviewed.

Jenny Morris is the food policy specialist at the Chartered Institute of Environmental Health (CIEH) and in May 2014 was appointed as Head of The Institute of Food Safety, Integrity & Protection (TiFSiP), a new CIEH initiative. TiFSiP is a collaborative and inclusive membership body aimed at addressing the increasing challenges faced by all those working to ensure that food is safe, healthy and trustworthy. Her current responsibilities include establishing TiFSiP partnerships to enhance knowledge, share expertise and work collaboratively to address specific issues. This will involve working with government, central and local, environmental health practitioners, industry, other professional bodies, representative groups and consumers.

Jenny is a member of the Advisory Committee on the Microbiological Safety of Food, a statutory committee that provides expert advice to Government on questions relating to microbiological issues and food. She is also a Member of the London Food Board that advises the Mayor on food strategy for London and supports its implementation. From May 2011 until September 2012 Jenny was seconded to the London Organising Committee of the Olympic and Paralympic games, where she was responsible for food safety for London 2012.

In addition to national activities Jenny also regularly works at European level with food safety professionals from other Member States. She is the Secretary to the European Food Law Enforcement Practitioners Forum (FLEP), an informal group with contact points in some 32 countries, set up to assist European food control authorities to exchange information, address inconsistencies and share approaches to practical enforcement problems.

Jenny is a Chartered Fellow of the CIEH, has a Bachelors degree in Environmental Health, a Masters degree in Food Safety, Hygiene and Management and a Masters degree in Business Administration in the field of public service. She was awarded an MBE for Services to Environmental Health in 2014. Prior to working in environmental health Jenny managed her own small food business and is a qualified chef and food safety trainer.

7. The future of food safety and public health policy: inside or outside the EU?

Erik Millstone, Director of Science Policy, University of Sussex



Several probable up-sides and down-sides of the UK remain in, or pulling out of, the EU will be reviewed. The comments will review:

- 1) The institutions in which food safety standards and public health policies are set,
- 2) The procedures with which they work and
- 3) The resources devoted to surveillance and enforcement

Erik Millstone is a Professor of Science Policy at the University of Sussex. Since 1974 he has been researching into the causes, consequences and regulation of technological change in the food and chemical industries. His research focus has extended over food additives, pesticides and veterinary medicines, as well as BSE, GM foods and obesity. Since 1988 he has been researching the role of scientific experts, evidence and advice in public policy-making.

Having conducted comparative studies of food safety policy-making regimes across numerous jurisdictions, he contributed to articulating proposals for the creation of the UK's Food Standards Agency, and led a study for the European Parliament reviewing the proposal to create the European Food Safety Authority.

Much of his current research forms part of the STEPs (or Social and Technological Pathways to Sustainability) programme (see <http://www.steps-centre.org/>). It focuses on the drivers of technological change in agriculture for developing countries and on the consequences of those technological changes for farmers, and more generally for poor communities in developing countries.

8. Social and health ramifications. Brexit: The Great Unknown

Geof Rayner, Fellow, Centre for Food Policy, City University London



The prospect of UK withdrawal from the European Union is a complex, not to say perplexing issue. In fact it may seem at first blush to be the type of issue to which Donald Rumsfeld, the former US Secretary of State, addressed himself in 2002, when he referred cryptically to the existence of 'known unknowns' and 'unknown unknowns'. In Rumsfeld's case it was his way of escaping claims

that 'weapons of mass destruction', the central rationale for the Iraq war, could not be found (and subsequently were shown to be non-existent.) In the case of the UK's EU withdrawal, however, his philosophising does probably apply. There are a copious number of both 'known unknowns' and 'unknown unknowns' facing the UK and Europe in terms of Brexit. These range from things as plain and simple as the consequences of the UK's likely continued dependency on EU-sourced fruit and vegetables to the unravelling of health and welfare arrangements spanning hundreds of different topics, from EU pharmaceutical regulation (based in the UK) to the humble EHIC card. If the forging of such relationships was difficult enough, and extended over many years, the disaggregation of such agreements and practices at a time of likely intense antagonism and over a relatively constrained timescale might not, from a civil servant's perspective, bear thinking about. In this presentation I look at a variety of issues where potential difficulty and dispute are likely apply, but also look at why some of the simplest issues might be difficult to resolve. I also cast a wider net over some of the consequences for Britain's future -- as group of small islands somewhere off the coast of Europe, potentially cut off by political fog.

Dr Geof Rayner is an honorary research fellow at City University and was formerly professor associate in public health at Brunel University. He has been involved in public health and social policy as a researcher, practitioner and campaigner for over 30 years. He has also worked for WHO, the European Commission and numerous campaigns and NGOs, including the European Public Health Alliance. His recent writings include *Ecological Public Health: Reshaping the Conditions of Good Health* (Earthscan/Routledge 2012), with Tim Lang and *The Metabolic Landscape: Perception, Practice and the Energy Transition*, with Gina Glover and Jessica Rayner (Black Dog Publishing 2014).

9. Environmental policy

David Baldock, *Director, Institute for European Environmental Policy (IEEP)*



The EU has developed perhaps the most comprehensive and one of the more ambitious bodies of environmental law and policy in the world. Most environmental legislation in the UK now derives from the EU, which provides UK environmental law with a framework, and a sense of direction and momentum. Environmental standards in the UK and most other EU Member States generally have risen in response to the framework of binding legislation and new "green" industries have developed.

Outside the EU the UK would lose its (not insignificant) influence on the making of this policy, whilst continuing to be bound by most of it, if it were an EEA member like Norway.

Important measures that would not apply would include the key nature directives and the bathing water directive; leading to uncertainties about the future rules applied in these areas in the different parts of the UK. If the UK chose to be outside the EEA then a much greater question would arise about the future of environmental standards and the direction of travel, without the stable framework of EU law. Brexit of any variety has major implications and carries significant risk for environmental objectives.

David Baldock's background is in philosophy and economics. He joined IEEP in the mid-1980s to establish a programme of work on agricultural and rural environmental issues. He became Deputy Director in 1992 and Director in 1998. As well as being an authority on European agricultural policy and the environment, David's specialist areas include EU strategies for climate, natural resources and public investment. He has an active interest in sustainable development and the growing implications of building a bioeconomy. Current external commitments include membership of the Commission's high-level group on the competitiveness of the car industry in Europe

10. Practical implications for policy making

Andrew Jarvis, Executive Director, ICF International



Andrew will reflect on the potential implications of Brexit on the practical business of food policy development and management, on the operation of the related systems and support services and the UK's access and influence.

Andrew Jarvis is an Executive Director at ICF International, a consultancy working in public policy. He leads the firm's environment, energy and economics work in Europe. Much of his work involves evaluation, for the European Commission and EFSA, of EU policies and programmes relating to food policy. Examples include the regulation of animal cloning, regulation of GMOs in the food chain, the financing of official controls, the EU's programmes for controlling animal disease. Andrew has worked on public policy research and consultancy for more than 20 years in the UK, EU and Asia. From 2006-08 he was a Deputy Director in the Prime Minister's Strategy Unit, in which role he led a strategic review of UK food policy.

Session 3: The public interest

11. Consumer Culture

Andrew Curry, Director, The Futures Company



Drawing on some Futures Company attitudinal data, Andrew will talk about changing consumer attitudes to food and to retail. He will discuss what we know about attitudes to BREXIT as well as the types of possible post-BREXIT relationships with the EU and then sketch some headline implications for food consumption.

Andrew Curry is a Director of The Futures Company in the London office, where he is managing editor of the company's thought leadership programme, Future Perspectives, and directs client futures projects in a wide range of sectors and areas. He has written or co-written award winning Future Perspectives reports, including *Unlocking New Sources of Growth* and *The 21st Century Business*. He also edited and co-wrote the report on *The Future Shopper*. These can be found at thefuturescompany.com.

He is a Board member of the Association of Professional Futurists and also edits the APF's quarterly newsletter, *Compass*. He also edited the APF's eBook, *The Future of Futures* (2012). Before joining The Futures Company (then The Henley Centre) in 1999, Andrew worked as a broadcast journalist for the BBC and Channel 4 News, and as a television producer.

12. The EU and animal welfare

Peter Stevenson, Chief Policy Advisor, Compassion in World Farming (CIWF)



Brexit may make little difference to animal welfare (AW). It is sometimes thought that UK progress is impeded by the fear that if we move ahead of our EU competitors on AW, UK farmers will be undermined by lower welfare imports. However, there is limited appetite in UK Government or industry to improve AW. Release from the constraints of EU free trade rules is unlikely to lead to substantial AW improvements. Moreover, if the UK left the EU, our trade relationships with the EU would be governed by the WTO rules.

Looked at from the EU perspective, Brexit may make little difference to AW. The UK is rarely supportive of AW initiatives in EU. AW improvements in the EU are grinding to a halt but Brexit is unlikely to exacerbate this. The future of AW will be determined not by Brexit but by the degree to which the EU and UK accept that fundamental changes are needed in our food system from the point of view of health, food security, natural resources, climate change, resource-efficiency and AW.

Peter Stevenson studied economics and law at Trinity College Cambridge. He played a leading role in winning the EU bans on veal crates, battery cages and sow stalls as well as a new status for animals in EU law as sentient beings. He has written comprehensive legal analyses of EU legislation on farm animals and of the impact of the WTO rules on animal welfare. Peter is lead author of the recent study by the FAO reviewing animal welfare legislation in the beef, pork and poultry industries. He has written well-received reports on the economics of livestock production and on the detrimental impact of industrial farming on the resources on which our future ability to feed ourselves depends.

13. Feeding Scotland in the EU if not the UK

Pete Ritchie, Director, Nourish Scotland



The CAP and the CFP have a major impact on Scottish farming and fishing, with most farms reliant on subsidy to survive: and people in Scotland are more likely than those in England to vote to stay in Europe. A Brexit would almost certainly lead to a second independence referendum: but a national agricultural policy would face the same tension between producing commodities for the food industry and supporting stewardship, rural development and public health.

Pete Ritchie is executive director of Nourish Scotland, a civil society organisation working for a fairer and more sustainable food system. He also runs a diversified organic farm business at Whitmuir. Pete is a member of the Food Ethics Council and the Scottish Food Commission.