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ANNUAL REPORT 2010 1
The year 2010 proved once again that the role and position of the European Food Safety Authority (EFSA) in the area of food and nutrition safety is unique. Without its sound risk assessments, EU food safety standards and rules would not be underpinned by the proper scientific base necessary to maintain the high standards and quality of all products within the food chain.

The outcome of the work undertaken by its scientists is often the subject of lively debates in the European Parliament’s Committee on the Environment, Public Health and Food Safety (ENVI), which I have the honour to chair. The issue of food information to consumers, the placing on the market of foods derived from cloned animals or the provision of toxicological tests for genetically modified organisms (GMOs) are just an illustration of the variety of topics which were debated or voted upon within the ENVI Committee in 2010.

Some of those themes were discussed with EFSA representatives during the official European Parliament delegation visit in Parma in June 2010. Besides the latest developments affecting the Authority, the delegation also examined the implementation of food and feed legislation, the independence and selection of experts, and the health claims. Based on the results achieved and in the light of a shared vision for the future, the ENVI Committee recommended renewing the mandate of EFSA’s Executive Director, Ms Geslain-Lanéelle.

Since its foundation in 2002, EFSA has developed into a major EU Agency with some 450 staff members and more than 1,500 external experts co-operating in a network of over 400 scientific institutions. Hundreds of scientific outputs are produced every year reaching a peak of 565 scientific opinions and advice in 2010. EFSA is currently receiving around 800 applications a year, in fields as varied as nutrition, food additives, nutrient sources, food contact materials, enzymes, flavourings, feed additives, GMOs and pesticides.

Assessment and communication on all risks associated with the food chain is part of EFSA’s vision to become the globally recognised reference body for risk assessment in food and feed safety, animal health and welfare, nutrition, plant protection and plant health. A vision that is resulting in highly protected and well informed consumers.

Jo Leinen
Chair of the Committee on the Environment, Public Health and Food Safety, European Parliament
The European Food Safety Authority has a key role and responsibility in the European Union for the development of one of the highest levels of food safety in the world. The challenge to maintain such standards is great; the commitment to meet such a challenge is even greater. Responding in a timely and effective way to technological and scientific developments is another crucial task for the Agency.

EFSA’s scientific work includes some 2,500 scientific opinions published since its founding in 2002. Many of the opinions deal with highly complex and new issues in areas such as health claims, food additives, novel food, pesticides or nanotechnology. In addition to scientific opinions, EFSA undertakes complementary scientific work in the areas of assessment methodology, data collection and exposure, zoonoses data collection and analysis.

EFSA has established itself as a well respected Authority on food safety and risk assessment, both at the EU level and internationally. The continuously growing number of scientific opinions allows the Commission to objectively manage the evolution of food safety indicators, to detect early on possible risks to food safety and also to place us in the vanguard of enhanced methods of risk assessment. I appreciate EFSA’s work to ensure the independence of its scientific advice and its willingness to intensify efforts in this area: this is imperative to ensure trust and credibility.

I note that EFSA’s scientific output continues to increase significantly year by year. This is to the credit of both EFSA’s staff and the many scientists from the Member States whose scientific input is essential and much appreciated.

Scientific exchange of information with national authorities is a central provision of EFSA’s founding regulation. Work carried out in Member States such as data collection and research activities of national scientific bodies underpins much of EFSA’s output.

The European Commission looks forward to a continued strong co-operation with an Authority which will continue to provide excellent and independent scientific advice for European food safety policy.

John Dalli
EU Commissioner for Health and Consumer Policy
EFSA remains steadfast in its commitment to ensuring that Europe’s food is safe. It continues to do this through delivering robust and independent scientific advice on risks along the entire food chain from farm to fork. In pursuing its mission in 2010, EFSA again strengthened its ties with its European and national partners and engaged with a wide body of stakeholders across Europe.

As in previous years, EFSA’s workload continues to grow both in volume and complexity with the adoption of more than 560 scientific outputs, supporting publications on general public health issues and evaluations of regulated products and claims. The Board adopted the Authority’s budget and Management Plan for 2011, outlining how EFSA will tackle this continuing growth while also supporting the Europe 2020 Strategy for smart and sustainable innovation. This includes plans to: deliver over 730 scientific outputs and 100 supporting publications in 2011, two-thirds of which will concern applications; increase dialogue with applicants and other stakeholders; and introduce streamlined, centralised services for applicants.

Linked to EFSA’s work on applications, we also discussed the possible introduction of fees for some of EFSA’s activities. While we recognise that fees could help ensure EFSA has the necessary funds for its growing workload, we stressed that fees should not jeopardise its independence.

The Board supported plans to further engage Member States in EFSA’s work. For example, we adopted the work programme for funding scientific co-operation and the rules of procedure for European networks of scientific organisations that facilitate the exchange of information, expertise and best practice. The Management Board supported plans by EFSA to enhance its medium-term planning so that Member States can be more easily involved in the Authority’s work and resources can be better pooled across Europe. In addition, we endorsed proposals to strengthen the collection, harmonisation and reporting of data from Member States that help risk managers make informed decisions to protect consumers. We also supported proposals to build on EFSA’s stakeholder engagement particularly through strengthening the activities of the Stakeholder Consultative Platform.

On behalf of the Management Board, I would like to thank the Executive Director, Ms Catherine Geslain-Lanéelle, and her staff, the members of the Scientific Panels, Working Groups and Scientific Committee and all the experts who contribute to EFSA for their dedication and professionalism in the face of growing workloads. I would also like to extend my thanks to my fellow Board members for their hard work during 2010.

On a personal note, I was honoured to be re-elected once more as Chair of the EFSA Management Board. Together with the seven newly appointed members and existing members, I look forward to continuing to guide EFSA as it delivers the independent and robust scientific advice that underpins the EU’s food safety system.

Professor Diána Bánáti
Chair of the EFSA Management Board
One of the more insightful reports for EFSA in 2010 relates to the Eurobarometer survey on perceptions of food-related risk. Commissioned by EFSA, it analyses how EU consumers view risks associated with food and measures their confidence in the public authorities mandated to protect public health. It throws up some interesting findings including the fact that Europeans associate food primarily with pleasure and sociability, and that the minority who are concerned with food safety risks worry most about chemical residues. Reassuringly, most citizens have confidence in the food safety agencies at both the national and European levels and feel protected by the EU’s food safety system. While this generally positive set of outcomes is very welcome, the survey also flashes a few warning lights; in particular, less than half of EU citizens think that scientific advice on food-related risks is independent of commercial or political interests. This lack of trust is part of a wider loss of confidence in scientific independence, as described in another 2010 Eurobarometer survey on science and technology which showed that more than half of EU citizens think that scientists are “too close” to industry.

While the vast majority of EFSA’s scientific outputs gain wide acceptance among risk managers, partner institutions and stakeholders, a small number are questioned in relation to the independence of our scientific advice or experts. One of the central pillars of EFSA’s independence is its system for Declaration of Interests (Dols) as articulated in its Policy on Declaration of Interests (2007). In 2010 we commissioned two independent reports, one to assess whether we are effectively implementing the policy and another to benchmark our system against those of similar organisations. The outcomes of the first report showed that, in general, EFSA is effectively implementing its policy with only minor compliance issues. The second re-affirmed that, when benchmarked against its peers, EFSA has one of the most robust systems to safeguard its independence. Both reports gave recommendations which will feed into the review of the Policy on Dols scheduled for 2011. The review will not only consider Dols, but also the full spectrum of checks and balances that EFSA has in place to safeguard its independence, integrating issues such as scientific and organisational governance and scientific decision-making into one overarching policy.

Member States make an increasingly important contribution to our work programme and year-on-year we continue to strengthen our engagement with them. This is reflected in the increasing budget for contracts and grants to Member State organisations (worth €7.8 million in 2010) and in the creation of new scientific networks covering, for example, GMOs and nanotechnologies. The contribution of Member States is evident in our data collection activities; in 2010 we launched the Comprehensive Food Consumption Database which will allow more precise estimates of exposure to hazards in food. Better medium-term planning has been prioritised, enabling Member States to identify areas of contribution to our work programme as early as possible.

The significant work programme that EFSA delivered in 2010 is testament to the dedication and professionalism of EFSA’s staff, scientific experts, partners and stakeholders. I look forward to continuing to work with them to protect consumers and strengthen trust in Europe’s food safety system.

Catherine Geslain-Lanéelle
EFSA Executive Director
I. INTRODUCTION
The European Food Safety Authority (EFSA) was set up in January 2002 following a series of food crises in the late 1990s. It was entrusted with a mandate to provide Europe’s risk managers with robust independent scientific advice and to communicate risks associated with the food chain to all interested parties and the public at large. In fulfilling this mandate, the Authority has already played and will continue to play a vital role in ensuring the highest standards of consumer protection and in building the confidence of consumers in the EU food safety system.

Since 2002, with support from Member States, EFSA has provided around 2,500 pieces of scientific advice and communicated widely on its work. In this way, the Authority has helped European Commission and Member State policy-makers take effective and timely risk management decisions backed by sound science. Globally, the Authority is also increasingly seen as an active partner, collaborating with key international players such as the World Health Organisation (WHO) and food safety organisations beyond the EU.

Today, with its broad remit, EFSA is facing an increasing number of requests and mandates for scientific and technical advice. This brings with it a need to increase relevant communication activities, ensuring that European consumers continue to be not only among the best protected but also among the best informed in the world regarding risks in the food chain. Having grown to reach the size and structure foreseen in its establishment plan and in the face of an ever increasing workload in 2010, EFSA began preparing to reshape itself to become more efficient in its work and to be ready for the requirements of the future.

**Improving efficiency and planning**

In the early years of its development, commensurate human and financial resources were allocated to the Authority to support it through its initial growth phase. Having reached its critical mass, EFSA now as a mature organisation can no longer rely on additional resources to cope with its increasing workload. Therefore, in 2010, EFSA took the opportunity to reflect on and assess its own internal processes in an effort to improve efficiency and better understand how to put the resources it does have to the best use.

With the help of an external contractor, EFSA drew up a detailed review of how it operates and is structured across all areas of the organisation. For example, the Authority undertook to look at the way it recruits and manages its people, how its complex IT systems are adapted to its needs and the different ways in which it engages with stakeholders.

The review is still under way and will continue throughout 2011 but early results have already indicated that changes to EFSA’s internal organisation, a stronger focus on strategic planning and a new approach to the allocation of human resources could lead to the biggest improvements. Care is also being taken to assess the way in which EFSA makes use of its network of external scientific experts, ensuring that their time is utilised as efficiently as possible.
This is particularly important in the current environment given that many scientific institutions at Member State level – the source for the vast majority of EFSA’s external experts – are under financial pressure themselves. The ultimate goal of the review, challenging though it may be, is to find the right path for the Authority to become more efficient whilst at the same time enhancing the relevance of its work for Europe’s risk managers, and all of this in the context of a growing workload and stable resources.

As part of its efficiency drive, in 2010 EFSA also analysed the regulatory frameworks that concern the assessment of the scientific basis for health claims made about foods and products and substances submitted by industry or Member States to the Authority for risk assessment. In total, there are currently 38 different workflows describing how applications for the evaluation of regulated substances are submitted to EFSA. The results of EFSA’s analysis will help to streamline existing processes and offer more support to applicants in their preparation of application dossiers.

Complementing these efforts to increase the efficiency of its work, in 2010 EFSA and the European Commission took initial steps to evaluate the introduction of a system of fees to finance some of the services the Authority provides, particularly those related to the risk assessment of applications from industry. The rationale for this new approach is two-fold: it could support EFSA in developing more service-oriented processes in the way it handles applications and also ensure that the Authority is able to continue to deliver independent and high-standard risk assessments in the face of a growing workload.

The Authority also engaged in dialogue with the European Commission and Member States to emphasise the need for better medium-term planning of its work. This is necessary for a number of reasons, not least because of the challenges EFSA faces in involving the necessary number of experts in its work every year. Similarly the Authority is working towards even closer co-operation with Member States to better leverage risk assessment resources in the EU. With this in mind, in 2010 EFSA delivered a report that summarises its scientific co-operation activities with Member States and looks at how best to manage its networks with national partners in the face of anticipated future challenges and objectives. The report states the need for a more proactive and forward-looking scheduling of its work, the ultimate objective being to move from an annual to a multi-annual system of resource planning.

**Measuring the impact of its work**

In 2010, EFSA developed a new methodology for assessing the impact of its work. The aim of the new methodology is to better understand, explain and illustrate the bearing the Authority has in the

---

area of European food safety. Of specific interest to EFSA is the impact its work has on EU food safety legislation and, ultimately, on the health of European citizens. Assessing EFSA’s influence in this way is particularly challenging given the complex geographical, demographical and political make-up of the EU as well as the time frame involved from issuing of scientific advice to EU decision making on food safety concerns and issues.

Running alongside the development of this new impact assessment methodology, EFSA also prepared a pilot study with the European Commission to determine the extent to which the Commission makes use of the Authority’s scientific opinions. Key indicators include: the number and percentage of opinions and other scientific outputs taken into account in risk management decisions at the EU level; the level of awareness about EFSA amongst key target audiences and confidence in the scientific basis of its work; the Authority’s performance in a crisis and in other situations when an urgent response is required; the reference to EFSA’s risk assessment methods, guidance documents and opinions globally, for example in the number of citations of the Authority’s work in scientific literature or in opinions of other relevant bodies; and the frequency and impact of scientific co-operation activities between EFSA and Member States.

Taken together, regular impact assessments of its work will help EFSA ensure that it operates in a focussed and efficient way and that the services it provides are as relevant and useful as possible for its many different partners and stakeholders.

**Keeping risk managers up-to-date with the latest scientific advice**

From time to time, EFSA provides updates on its earlier scientific opinions and advice. For example, in September 2010 at the request of the European Commission the Authority expanded on a 2008 opinion and 2009 statement by its Scientific Committee on animal cloning to take into account new scientific literature and information in this area. After a thorough review of the literature, discussions with experts and an analysis of information made available in a call for data, EFSA’s Scientific Committee concluded that the information available on the cloning of species other than cattle and pigs is still too limited to allow for the assessment of food safety and animal health and welfare issues. Furthermore, in the case of cattle and pigs, no new information had become available that would lead it to reconsider the conclusions and recommendations made in its 2008 opinion and 2009 statement.
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1. PROVIDING ROBUST SCIENTIFIC ADVICE AND RISK ASSESSMENT

EFSA’s mandate is to assess risks associated with the entire food chain. Accordingly, the Authority has not only built up a wealth of knowledge in risk assessment but can also access and make use of a wide network of over 1500 experts in the fields of food safety, nutrition, feed safety, animal health, animal welfare, plant protection and plant health. Being able to draw on this wide range of expertise ensures the Authority provides comprehensive advice for risk managers – advice that informs the policies and decisions they make to protect European consumers. Important examples from 2010 include the assessment of risks for animals and humans associated with Q fever and influenza H1N1 and EFSA’s guidance for evaluating substances used to decontaminate carcasses.

Most risk assessment is done in response to specific requests for scientific advice from the European Commission, the European Parliament and EU Member States. The Authority also undertakes scientific work on its own initiative where there is a need. This year, EFSA delivered 565 scientific outputs and supporting publications. International collaboration, consultation and joint opinions were a particular feature of EFSA’s scientific outputs in 2010. These ranged from opinions on lead as a contaminant in food or the food contact material bisphenol A, where the Authority took part in or hosted consultations with international experts, to joint opinions on transmissible spongiform encephalopathies (TSEs) issued in conjunction with the European Centre for Disease Prevention and Control (ECDC).

Pursuing the highest quality scientific advice

In June 2010, EFSA launched public Calls for Experts to renew the membership of its AnS and CEF Panels, first established in 2008, and to expand the reserve list of its Scientific Committee and its eight other scientific Panels.

EFSA’s Panels are responsible for providing independent scientific advice in all areas of the Authority’s remit. The call attracted leading scientists from across Europe from a broad range of national and international scientific bodies. From July 2011, those that were successful will join AnS and CEF Panels for their second term and continue to deliver the high-quality scientific advice that the Authority is renowned for.

Independence

The independence of EFSA’s work can be seen in all aspects of the Authority’s governance. To illustrate, it is evident throughout the workflows in place for the risk assessment process, examples being in the large number of public consultations it holds every year to support its scientific advice and in the regulations for EFSA staff.

In 2010, EFSA initiated a wide-ranging review to further strengthen its internal procedures regarding independence. In addition to carrying out interviews with EFSA staff and conducting the regular internal analysis of audit reports and statistics on conflicts of interest, the Authority also
commissioned external contractors to look at how effective it is at implementing its independence-related procedures. The results of the external reviews, which examined in detail the DoI processes of 181 EFSA experts and benchmarked EFSA in this area against other similar organisations around the world, were reassuring: they confirmed that EFSA’s systems are effectively applied and efficient in identifying possible conflicts of interest.

EFSA commissioned a Eurobarometer survey in 2010 on consumer perceptions of food-related risks which indicated that less than half of EU citizens (47%) think that scientific advice in this area is independent of commercial or political interests. Recognising the important contribution that EFSA makes in delivering scientific advice, in 2010 the Authority started a process to bring together all aspects of its independence-related procedures. These procedures will be reflected in a new, more holistic Independence Policy that not only deals with the important issue of independence of scientists but also takes into account the various workflows and implementing procedures – such as collegial decision-making – that cut across the organisation and that contribute to its effective functioning as a risk assessment body. The new EFSA Independence Policy will be submitted for public consultation in the summer of 2011 before being adopted by the Management Board at the end of the same year.

**EFSA’s advice in practice: Making seafood safer with less animal testing**

An area in which EFSA has contributed substantially to the increase of food safety over the last years is that of marine biotoxins, its four-year assessment of which was completed in 2010. Marine biotoxins are poisonous substances produced by different algae that can accumulate in shellfish. Consuming shellfish contaminated in this way can be fatal, underlining the clear public health need for EFSA to determine safe levels for different marine biotoxins.

EFSA’s Panel on contaminants in the food chain (CONTAM) assessed the levels that exist for six different types of toxins in shellfish. The Panel concluded that for two of the six types of toxins, consumers were not likely to experience adverse health effects at levels currently permitted in the European Union. However, for the remaining four types, the Panel concluded that people could be at risk of ill health.

This year, in a related opinion on an emerging group of marine biotoxins – the brevetoxin (BTX) group – EFSA also looked at the effectiveness of animal testing of mice, traditionally used by scientists in the detection of these toxins. The CONTAM Panel concluded that this type of test was inappropriate for detecting BTX-group toxins, not only for scientific reasons but also because of animal welfare concerns and highlighted alternative methods that may be used.
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Working in an integrated way to deliver scientific advice

EFSA’s integrated approach was most evident in 2010 in its response to the request from the European Commission for scientific advice on Q fever. Q fever is an infectious disease that can spread from farm animals to humans. Prior to 2010 there had been a marked increase in human cases of this disease, some of which had even led to severe illnesses such as pneumonia and hepatitis. In delivering its risk assessment on animal and public health issues related to Q fever, EFSA not only drew on the expertise of scientists from its Panels on animal health and welfare (AhAW) and Biological Hazards (BIOHAZ) but also worked very closely with scientists from its sister agency the ECDC.

EFSA’s advice, published in May 2010, concluded that Q fever has a limited impact on animal and public health although it can be significant for some risk groups. The Authority also suggested measures to control Q fever in animals in the future. EFSA continues to co-operate with ECDC on Q fever in the context of gathering and sharing information on zoonoses and every year a summary of their joint work is presented in the Annual Community Summary Report on Zoonoses and Food-borne Outbreaks.

This year, EFSA was also tasked with requests for urgent scientific advice. These included: the possible risks to public and animal health from contamination in the food chain due to ash-fall following the eruption of the Eyjafjallajökull volcano in Iceland (see also p. 46) and the risks for public health due to the presence of chloromequat in table grapes from India. In all cases, EFSA responded to the requests with timely advice allowing the European Commission to act rapidly in making risk management decisions.

Providing risk assessments for new areas of science

In 2010, EFSA’s Scientific Committee started to develop a guidance document on nanotechnology, a quickly advancing area of science related to the control of matter on an atomic and molecular scale. The food industry is looking at ways to improve the mechanical, sensorial and nutritional properties of food by using this technology in new methods of food processing. Before products developed in this way are authorised for placement on the market, the specific properties and characteristics of the nanomaterials being used need to be assessed for any potential health risks.

EFSA received the mandate for this work from the European Commission and it will be finalised in 2011 following a public consultation. A main focus of the guidance document will be to help future applicants who submit applications for products using nanotechnology. The work is
Endocrine active substances (EAS) are chemicals that can interact with the hormonal system producing an effect on the system itself, organs or tissues in the body. This effect may or may not be inherently adverse. Research on EAS has been carried out globally over decades, particularly in the US, looking at potential negative health effects associated with the use of such chemicals. However, some scientific research also points to potential health and nutritional benefits of EAS, for example in the case of isoflavones which are substances found in leguminous plants such as soybeans and red clover.

At EFSA, different panels are required to assess EAS in different contexts. In view of this, EFSA set up a task force to establish a common approach within the Authority towards EAS and to ensure that EFSA’s risk assessments are both in line with and complementary to work carried out in this area by other international scientific bodies.

In total, 3,888 descriptors of risk were found across EFSA’s scientific outputs. EFSA formed a working group to analyse the database and make suggestions for ways in which the organisation could reduce the overall numbers of expressions used and increase harmonisation and consistency. The results will be used by EFSA to raise awareness of the need for consistent drafting of scientific outputs and to initiate a discussion about the different meanings of scientific terms.

This topic is also of wide interest to EFSA’s stakeholders according to feedback received from Member States and national food safety authorities. For this reason, the results have been shared with the Authority’s Advisory Forum of national food safety representatives. In addition, experts from EFSA are taking part in an international working group that looks at ways to improve and standardise the expression of risk and uncertainty in scientific assessments, also an important consideration for related communications.

Assessing the risks and benefits

Endocrine active substances (EAS) are chemicals that can interact with the hormonal system producing an effect on the system itself, organs or tissues in the body. This effect may or may not be inherently adverse. Research on EAS has been carried out globally over decades, particularly in the US, looking at potential negative health effects associated with the use of such chemicals. However, some scientific research also points to potential health and nutritional benefits of EAS, for example in the case of isoflavones which are substances found in leguminous plants such as soybeans and red clover.

At EFSA, different panels are required to assess EAS in different contexts. In view of this, EFSA set up a task force to establish a common approach within the Authority towards EAS and to ensure that EFSA’s risk assessments are both in line with and complementary to work carried out in this area by other international scientific bodies.
II. KEY ACHIEVEMENTS IN 2010

In September 2010, this task force published a scientific report which included a range of recommendations for the way in which EFSA should assess risks associated with EAS going forward. The report also looks at risk communication, identifying the need to ensure an appropriate balance is struck between communicating potential health risks and potential health benefits related to EAS.

This year, EFSA’s Scientific Committee also prepared a guidance document on risk-benefit assessments of food. This important EFSA guidance outlines a scientific approach for determining the net health impact of foods which provide both benefits and risks to health. For example, fruit and vegetables provide key nutrients but can sometimes also contain potentially harmful substances such as nitrates. Risk managers need to be able to accurately quantify the balance between the benefits and risks of certain foods in order to make appropriate decisions regarding their safety.

This guidance document – which was submitted for public consultation in February 2010 – recommends a three-step approach to assess the risk-benefit of food. Firstly, it recommends an initial evaluation to identify whether a risk-benefit assessment is actually needed; then a refined assessment to quantify estimates of risk or benefits at different levels of exposure; and finally, a full comparison of the risk and benefit to establish a net health impact. EFSA’s guidance on risk-benefit assessment of food makes a significant contribution to the scientific body of knowledge in this complex area.
An increasingly important share of EFSA’s scientific outputs concerns the safety evaluation of products and substances submitted for placement on the European market as well as the assessment of the scientific basis for health claims made about foods. Industry applications for active substances used in pesticides, genetically modified organisms and health claims are all subject to assessment by EFSA prior to their authorisation in the EU. In 2010, nearly two-thirds of the Authority’s scientific outputs were related to such applications.

**2. EVALUATION OF PRODUCTS, SUBSTANCES AND CLAIMS SUBJECT TO AUTHORISATION**

**Re-evaluating approved substances**

Existing EU law foresees the regular re-evaluation of certain products such as GMOs, pesticides or feed and food additives. This task – which is carried out by EFSA on an ongoing basis – ensures that legislation regarding these products incorporates the latest scientific knowledge and understanding. It also ensures that substances that were placed on the market prior to the creation of EFSA are subject to the same rigorous evaluations as new substances.

EFSA received 407 applications for the re-evaluation of feed additives in 2010, concerning some 1,500 feed additives, which will be evaluated in the next years. The Panel follows guidance documents, developed to further increase transparency and efficiency, for the evaluation of feed additives when carrying out risk assessments. These documents provide useful guidance to industry in the preparation of their applications.

**Managing resources to stay on time**

Under EU law, national risk assessments of active substances used in pesticides must be peer-reviewed by EFSA. The large number of these assessments coming from Member States and the need to respond to them according to a tight schedule represent a significant challenge for EFSA. In 2010, the Authority met this challenge and was able to handle all incoming dossiers on time thanks to support from Member States and the careful reallocation of staff to this particular task. This led to 73 conclusions on active substances used in pesticides within the year.

EFSA was also heavily involved in 2010 in the assessment of health claim applications. During the year, the Authority assessed 930 generic health claims submitted to EFSA by the European Commission as part of a list drawn up by Member States of 4,637 such claims and published 104 related opinions.
EFSA also assessed 20 claims concerning the reduction of diseases, children’s development and health and those based on newly available scientific evidence.

Beyond pure assessment of health claims, and as part of its ongoing dialogue with stakeholders, EFSA also undertook to organise a technical meeting on gut and immune function to improve industry’s understanding of its work. The event attracted almost 200 participants and was also webcast, reaching out to over 2,500 viewers. This meeting addressed two main questions: which claimed effects are considered beneficial for human health and which scientific approaches are appropriate for the substantiation of health claims?

Looking closely at environmental issues

In 2010, environmental issues became a particularly important topic for EFSA. Broadly speaking, EFSA looks at the interaction between humans and their environment in two ways. The first concerns the possible impact of human action on the environment, for instance through the use of products such as pesticides or the accidental import of plant diseases. An example of EFSA’s work in this area would be the assessment of an application from industry for a GMO or an active substance in pesticides that has the potential to affect the environment in which it is used. The second way relates to the impact of the environment on human health through the presence of environmental contaminants in the food chain, for example where environmental pollutants such as metals and nitrates have the potential to contaminate food and feed. In this case, EFSA may seek to assess possible exposure to such contaminants through food as well as related health effects.

An important example of EFSA’s work in this area is the Authority’s updated guidance on the environmental risk assessment (ERA) of genetically modified plants, published in November 2010. Under EU legislation for the release of genetically modified organisms (GMOs) into the environment, all GMO applications have to be assessed not only for possible adverse effects on human and animal health but also for their impact on the environment. The GMO Panel considers, for example, if GM plants have adverse effects on non-target organisms, if they are more persistent or invasive than their conventional counterparts or what their impact may be on biodiversity.

EFSA’s GMO ERA guidance is the culmination of two and a half years’ work by scientists from across Europe and also incorporates input from
Member States and a broad range of stakeholders received during technical meetings and public consultations. It strengthens the requirements for the ERA of GM plant applications with respect to the generation, collection and analysis of data and the evaluation of possible effects on non-target organisms.

In September 2010, EFSA’s Panel on Plant Protection Products and their Residues (PPR) adopted a scientific opinion for the ERA of pesticides. The opinion defines so-called "specific protection goals" which are the technical criteria that risk assessors use to determine the effect a pesticide has on a given environment.

In the development of both the GMO guidance and the PPR opinion, EFSA went to great lengths to ensure Member State and stakeholder involvement. This was realised through conferences, workshops that were webcast live and in official public consultations, all of which were important steps in explaining EFSA’s risk assessment approach and proactively addressing potential concerns.

To improve efficiency and exploit synergies in the way EFSA carries out environmental risk assessments, the Authority promotes cross-Panel work to better address the various aspects of such assessments and to share relevant data. Given the growing role ERA plays in EFSA’s activities, it is committed to undertake further efforts in this area to improve the ways in which it addresses environmental issues.

**Following global developments**

In 2010, bisphenol A (BPA) was once more the subject of significant scientific and political debate. BPA is used in plastic packaging such as re-usable drinking bottles, infant feeding bottles or storage containers. EFSA first issued an opinion on BPA in 2006 in which it set a Tolerable Daily Intake (TDI) and concluded that intakes of the polycarbonate through food and drink were well below safe limits, even for infants and children.

In recent years, scientists across the world have carried out extensive research on BPA, some of which is conflicting and has pointed to potentially adverse health effects in humans. This has led to controversy in the scientific community about the safety of BPA, discrepancies in decisions taken by risk managers at a national level and considerable interest by media and the general public. In view of the large number of studies carried out on BPA, the European Commission asked EFSA to re-evaluate its safety on three separate occasions.

EFSA’s latest update on the safety of BPA, published in September 2010 in an opinion by the Panel on food contact materials, enzymes,
flavourings and processing aids (CEF), was based on a detailed and comprehensive review of recent scientific literature and studies related to the toxicity of BPA at low doses. The Panel concluded that there was no new evidence in the scientific literature that would lead them to recommend a revision of the TDI for BPA.

Also in late 2010, in response to the ongoing debate, EFSA supported the World Health Organisation (WHO) in the organisation of an expert meeting to review toxicological and health aspects of BPA. At the end of this exchange, both the WHO and EFSA shared similar conclusions. EFSA continues to monitor and analyse all the new published literature on BPA on a monthly basis. The example of BPA shows the strength of the Authority’s global collaboration, not only through supporting similar work undertaken by the WHO but also through maintaining close contact with other food safety authorities, for example with the USA and Canada where additional studies on BPA are being carried out and more data are being collected.

The opinion on BPA also demonstrates how EFSA deals with uncertainty within its Panels. In the 2010 opinion on BPA, one CEF Panel member expressed a minority opinion, recommending that the current TDI be changed to a temporary TDI to take into account uncertainties in the literature about adverse health effects at low levels.

EFSA’s latest work on BPA was supported within the Authority through the collection, analysis and evaluation of data and published literature – a capability EFSA has developed over the years to serve its various Panels and Units. To further improve the way the Authority carries out systematic literature reviews in the area of food safety, EFSA developed guidance documents and put in place appropriate pilot schemes. This led to the re-organisation and transformation of EFSA’s library in 2010 to support more efficient and consistent retrieval, evaluation and analysis of information.
For EFSA, scientific co-operation is a central tenet of much of its work. It allows the Authority to tap into the bigger pool of scientific knowledge that is available at Member State level. Through this system, the Authority makes use of the best available expertise and data related to risk assessment of food and feed safety for the benefit of all European consumers. A collaborative approach with national experts also allows a strong sense of involvement in the Authority’s work.

To enhance co-operation on risk assessment, EFSA operates a series of networks of expertise. These networks facilitate scientific co-operation through the exchange of information and best practice in specific scientific areas. They also help support work with and by Member States by co-ordinating activities that may lead to the development and implementation of joint projects.

Currently there are networks in the areas of: animal health and welfare; BSE/TSE; emerging risks; GMOs; microbiological risk assessment; nanotechnology; plant health; harmonisation of risk assessment methodologies; two networks on pesticides; and three networks on data collection looking at chemical occurrence, food consumption and zoonoses.

EFSA collaborates with Member States through its Advisory Forum of national food safety representatives, where discussions increasingly go beyond the Authority’s current programme of work to address broad, strategic issues. This year, Norway and Iceland also became full Advisory Forum members.

Co-operation with Member States is also greatly facilitated by EFSA’s network of Focal Points in each Member State. The Focal Points are the interfaces between EFSA and national food safety authorities and they provide support to Advisory Forum members in the implementation of joint projects between EFSA and Member States. The Focal Points have become key vehicles for the sharing of information between Member States and EFSA, for attracting scientists to EFSA’s expert database and for leveraging the Article 36 network, a list of European organisations capable of assisting the Authority in the tasks it carries out.

In addition to collaborating with Member States, EFSA also works with other closely related EU agencies and bodies such as the European Centre for Disease Prevention and Control (ECDC), the European Chemicals Agency (ECHA) and the Joint Research Centre (JRC). EFSA exchanges information, co-operates on matters of mutual interest and in some cases produces joint scientific outputs with these institutions (for example, the joint EFSA/ECDC Annual Community Summary Report on Zoonoses and Food-borne Outbreaks – see also p. 23). To formalise this type of inter-agency co-operation,
EFSA has signed Memoranda of Understanding with ECDC and ECHA and a collaboration agreement with the JRC. In 2010, EFSA renewed its Memorandum of Understanding with ECDC.

**Getting the right partners for the right tasks**

The success of EFSA’s collaborative approach can also be seen in the increasing number of applications from experts to be included in EFSA’s expert database. Interest has grown steadily since its launch in June 2008, reaching a total of 3,020 applications from over 60 countries by the end of 2010. Of those experts that applied, 2,597 were included in the database. This database not only promotes cooperation between EFSA and Member States but also between individual Member States themselves as each country can access and use the database for its own purposes.

Another important example of EFSA’s commitment to co-operation can be seen in its Article 36 network. In 2007, a total of 234 organisations were included in this list; by the end of 2010, the number had risen to almost 400. This expanded list not only offers a wider knowledge base for EFSA to draw on but also facilitates co-operation between the Authority and relevant organisations in the Member States. In 2010, EFSA spent €7.8 million on contracts and grants assigned within this system. During the year, EFSA also launched an extranet workspace for its Article 36 network to make easier networking opportunities and participation for members in the Authority’s calls for proposals.

2010 also saw an important development take shape that will help attract and motivate the experts the Authority relies on for its scientific work. Last year, EFSA made progress in having the publication for its scientific outputs – the EFSA Journal – recognised as an electronic scientific journal, taking steps to ensure that it is covered by the indexes of major international citation databases. This means that experts involved in delivering outputs published in the Journal will have their contribution recognised and cited in a similar way to other leading academic journals. In 2010 the EFSA Journal was included in three of these citation databases: Food Science and Technology Abstracts, CAB Abstracts and SciFinder. This achievement also underlines the quality of EFSA’s work and the recognition it receives internationally for its scientific outputs.

**Seeking harmonisation across Europe**

Developing networking and stronger co-operation with Member States in the area of risk assessment is a key priority of the EFSA Management Board and discussions of this nature have also regularly taken place in the Advisory Forum in recent years. The underlying concern is to find a way to ensure that EFSA and the national food safety agencies can rely on the risk assessments each of them carry out, developing trust in and understanding more about the methodologies used for risk assessment by different national authorities and exchanging best practice to guarantee that assessments are done in a proper and scientifically sound way.

With this in mind, EFSA set up a network on harmonisation of risk assessment approaches...
between Member States. Ultimately, the aim is for the Authority to develop into a co-ordinator of risk assessment work within Europe and an intermediary between national authorities and EFSA’s international networks and partners.

Such co-ordination also helps avoid the emergence of diverging opinions between risk assessments, which can send mixed messages to risk managers, other risk assessors, stakeholders and consumers. In many cases, this is due more to differences in terminologies being used or in the starting points for risk assessments (for example, due to differences in the remits of national agencies compared to that of EFSA or in the type of data being assessed) rather than to fundamental dissimilarities in approaches.

Increasing harmonisation of risk assessment work within Europe also increases efficiency in the way developments in fields of risk assessment are addressed. This is true, for instance, in relation to research in new areas such as genomics or proteomics or in the validation of alternative testing methods, for example to replace animal experiments.

Knowing more about food consumption in Europe

An important achievement for EFSA was the publication of its Comprehensive Food Consumption Database (CFCD). The database contains very detailed information on food consumption from over 20 Member States and will serve as a vital tool for the Authority to estimate consumer exposure to potential hazards in food.

The database was put to the test in 2010 in EFSA’s risk assessment of marine biotoxins to estimate exposure of European consumers to shellfish. It was also used to determine health risks for infants from the presence of nitrates in leafy vegetables and in the evaluation of possible risks from the contamination of feed and food with ash following the eruption of the Eyjafjallajökull volcano in Iceland.

The development of EFSA’s CFCD – which is continuously being enhanced with updated information from national dietary surveys – makes EFSA’s Concise Food Consumption Database obsolete. The latter has been in place since 2008 but contains a less refined level of information on consumption of different foods. To further improve food consumption data collection, efforts are now also being made to harmonise the way in which new dietary data are collected and reported by Member States (see also p. 20). This is done under a new joint initiative with Member States – the so-called EU Menu project – for which several pilot projects have already been launched. Finally, analysing the information contained within the CFCD together with information on the composition of different foods will, in addition to facilitating assessment of exposure to hazards, also allow the Authority to assess nutrient intake levels in different populations across Europe. These valuable insights will play an important role in the support of nutrition and public health policy development in Europe.

Post-market monitoring of risks

Risk monitoring is an aspect of data collection work in which EFSA collaborates closely with Member States. In general, pre-market risk
assessments by the Authority, where they relate to specific substances or products, are based on data submitted by applicants, for example from laboratory tests or field trials. However, if there is a need for follow-up post-market monitoring, this is often undertaken by Member States who submit data directly to EFSA for re-evaluation.

Ongoing monitoring for risks and re-evaluation of products that have already been authorised for placement on the market, such as pesticides or other substances, is an important element in the European food safety system. It allows for new information or issues to be considered and, in some cases, might signal the need for EFSA to revise its advice concerning the safety of the product in question.

**Annual monitoring reports and ad hoc studies on contaminants**

Effective data collection and close co-operation with Member States are also critical for the preparation of the major yearly reports EFSA is asked to compile on microbiological and chemical contaminants. In 2010, the Authority published its yearly report on veterinary drug residues, its second yearly report on pesticides and the latest in its series of annual reports on zoonoses and food-borne outbreaks.

The Annual Community Summary Report on Zoonoses and Food-borne Outbreaks, to give it its full name, is a good example of the work EFSA carries out in collaboration with Member States and other scientific organisations. It is published jointly each year by EFSA and ECDC and comprises data collected from competent bodies in various EU countries. In providing this data to EFSA, national-level risk managers not only enable the Authority to compile the most comprehensive reports possible but also benefit themselves from EFSA’s subsequent data analysis which allows them to take follow-up actions where appropriate regarding zoonoses and food-borne diseases.

Europe is probably the largest region in the world where such a systematic cycle of monitoring and reporting on zoonoses and food-borne diseases exists. This cycle is combined with targeted and detailed “baseline” studies which gives risk managers an accurate picture of the state of play on which they can base intervention decisions. Over the years, this approach has led to a considerable reduction in the occurrence of *Salmonella* in the food chain and, more importantly, to a statistically significant decrease of *Salmonella* in humans: cases in humans fell by 17% in 2009 compared to 2008, marking a decrease for the fifth consecutive year.
In 2010, EFSA’s Management Board adopted the Communications Strategy 2010-2013. This important document – which replaces the Authority’s previous communications strategy from 2006 – was conceived to reflect both changes to the Authority itself, which has grown considerably in recent years, and also to the landscape in which it now operates.

The review of the communications strategy was informed not only by the Authority’s learning and experience over past years but also by a wide range of input from all the organisations and individuals with which EFSA comes into contact. For example, a qualitative research study – Image of the European Food Safety Authority – carried out among its key target audiences in 2009 and published in 2010 proved to be extremely insightful. The objective of this research was to gather feedback on how the Authority is perceived and valued by risk managers, other risk assessors, Member States, stakeholders and the media.

The Authority also commissioned a Eurobarometer survey (the second in five years) that provided fresh information on consumers’ perceptions of food and their confidence in public bodies in the field of food safety. The results of this survey were carefully considered in the development of the new communications strategy, as were the views from discussions and consultations at various levels with EFSA staff, its experts, the Advisory Forum, the European Commission, stakeholders and the public at large.

Based on the information received, and particularly that from the image study, it became clear that EFSA’s target audiences have a broad view of how the Authority communicates that includes everything it publishes or presents in any form and not just in its communications related to scientific outputs. It also became clear that there are information gaps and queries regarding its
work even amongst its most immediate target audiences. In particular, in the future EFSA will seek to improve the way in which it gives context to its work. This includes explaining more clearly why it undertakes (or is asked to undertake) certain tasks and how its scientific outputs add to the body of knowledge in a given area.

EFSA’s discussions with Member States and its stakeholders also served to reconfirm its approach to communicating with different target audiences. Given the sheer size and disparate nature of the EU population, it is impractical and not effective for EFSA to attempt to communicate directly with consumers on an individual basis; far more effective is to utilise the extensive networks of national food safety agencies at a Member State level where communications can be tailored more appropriately based on a thorough understanding of national audience needs. EFSA’s new communications strategy allows for this approach in the recommendations it makes for co-ordinating activities with national partners. One particular focus in the future will be to leverage communications opportunities more effectively with Member States through the EFSA Focal Points.

Finally, in gathering feedback during the finalisation of the communications strategy, it also became clear that there is a growing public debate about the independence of science, the place of science in society, and the question of whom to trust regarding food safety issues. Broadly speaking, as was shown in the Eurobarometer survey, European consumers place their trust in national food safety authorities and EFSA. However, there are concerns nevertheless about independence of science in the area of food safety. For this reason, the concept of independence – which has always and will continue to remain a core value of EFSA – was added as an overarching theme in EFSA’s reviewed communications strategy.

**Simplicity, coherency and visibility**

One of the perennial challenges faced by EFSA in its role as a risk communicator is to translate the complex scientific work it carries out into simple, meaningful communications that can be easily understood by a wide range of different audiences. The Authority also has a responsibility to ensure
that people clearly understand the role it plays in the European food safety system. To this end, EFSA produced a video for its website that explains what the organisation does and how its work fits into the wider European regulatory system for food safety. The video was well received and similar audiovisual content has already been planned for 2011.

Communicating in a coherent way is another key challenge for EFSA. To foster greater coherence in risk communications across the EU, EFSA strengthened its collaboration with Member States through the working group on communications of its Advisory Forum (established in 2003) and through common projects. For example, by sharing information and approaches to communications early on, both EFSA and national food safety authorities were able to deliver consistent messages on BPA (see also p. 18). In this instance, the Authority circulated a “reactive Q&A” amongst working group members which addressed many of the common questions that were being raised at the time concerning the controversial chemical.

The steps EFSA took to share the findings of its Eurobarometer survey (see also p. 24) with national authorities was another good example of how coherent communications can be effective. By circulating the survey before publication, EFSA gave national authorities the time to analyse the results for their respective countries and tailor their own media activities accordingly. This approach led to a large number of articles in the media on the Eurobarometer study from 20 Member States.

EFSA strives to increase its visibility amongst relevant audiences, something it achieved in 2010 not only through traditional means such as media relations but also in refinements it made to the EFSA Journal. The Journal is a one-stop-shop for all of the Authority’s scientific documents (see also p. 21) and improvements made to it during the year have allowed the documents it contains to be indexed more widely in online scientific databases. This has already proved to be a useful way of showcasing EFSA’s work and establishing links with the scientific community.

Getting the balance right

Another important priority for EFSA is to ensure that it communicates on all aspects of its work in a balanced way. Especially on its website, EFSA needs to organise its work in top level themes to more effectively illustrate the areas in which the Authority works. While EFSA’s contributions so far in the field of public health, animal health or plant health are recognised, its work on environmental...
risk assessment and its role in product innovation – for example, through its assessment of regulated substances – needs to be presented more clearly.

**Understanding the perceptions of European consumers**

The Eurobarometer survey (see p. 24) was carried out in June 2010 with nearly 27,000 interviews representing citizens of Europe aged 15 or above. It showed that, like in 2005, the majority of Europeans associate food with pleasure and taste and an idea of sharing and that in general they do not spontaneously associate food with risk. Overall EU citizens were more concerned about the economic crisis or environmental pollution than about possible food safety risks. When asked about their food safety concerns, EU citizens mentioned chemicals or pesticides, followed by possible food poisoning. When prompted by a list of possible issues, pesticides, pharmaceutical or chemical contaminants continue to be the major concerns in many Member States, but new issues such as animal cloning also cause worry. People feel they have little control over contamination of food or over new technologies, but they are generally confident about being able to address diet and health-related issues themselves, although they would like public authorities to do more in this area.

When it comes to trust in the information they obtain, the majority of EU citizens trusts doctors and health professionals as well as personal contacts such as family and friends. Most people also trust consumer organisations, scientists, environmental groups and national and European food safety agencies such as EFSA. Overall, there is broad agreement that public authorities do a lot to ensure that food is safe in Europe. Public authorities are also seen to act quickly, to base their decisions on scientific evidence and to do a good job in informing people about food-related risks. However, the survey also showed that there is no such thing as a “European consumer” – there are noticeable differences between countries. For example, in France and Germany the main concerns about food-related risk are pesticide residues in fruit, vegetables or cereals, whereas in the UK, Sweden and Finland respondents cited the welfare of farmed animals when asked the same question.

**Speaking with one voice**

This year, EFSA also progressed on its risk communications guidelines. Such guidelines are necessary for the Authority to better pursue its
key objectives, particularly in the area of promoting coherence in risk communications. These guidelines will lead to a shared understanding within EFSA – and between EFSA and national food safety bodies – about how to handle risk perception and risk communications issues. Although there is a rich body of academic literature on this topic, there is less information on more practical approaches to risk communications. This gap will be filled by EFSA’s guidelines which will be finalised in 2011.

It is envisaged that the main users of the guidelines will be EFSA’s Advisory Forum’s Working Group on Communications. However, they will also help in outreach and capacity building with national food safety bodies, not all of which have the same level of resources, expertise and human resources and which may benefit from using the guidelines as a reference document for their own risk communications.

The guidelines will lend themselves well to this purpose since they are illustrated by means of case studies and practical examples from Member States. They explain clearly how different kinds of issues can be handled, which tools can be used, and how different concerns can be prioritised from a communications perspective. The document will also contain a checklist to remind even seasoned professionals of the necessary steps to take or possible tools that are available when planning.

**Listening to its partners and stakeholders**

This year, EFSA also continued to ensure effective working relations with the European Commission, the European Parliament and the Council of EU Ministers. The present Commission began its work in February 2010 and in April EFSA was honoured to welcome the Commission President José Manuel Barroso to its premises in Parma. The Authority also established constructive working relationships with John Dalli, the new Commissioner responsible for Health and Consumers. This included a visit by the Commissioner to EFSA in March and an address to the Authority’s Advisory Forum in September. In addition, EFSA’s Executive Director held meetings with Commissioner Dacian Cioloș, responsible for Agriculture and Rural Development, and Vice-President Antonio Tajani, responsible for Industry and Entrepreneurship.

Another highlight for EFSA was the visit in June of the European Parliament’s Committee on the Environment, Public Health and Food Safety (ENVI), one of the parliamentary committees that oversee EFSA’s work. The European Parliament is at the very heart of EU food safety legislation and relies on the Authority to provide it with the technical expertise needed to develop the laws that protect
European citizens and promote an innovative and dynamic agro-food sector. The European Parliament also attributes financial resources to EFSA and determines how they are used.

EFSA is very attentive to the concerns of the Members of the European Parliament (MEPs) and aims to ensure that they are regularly informed about the Authority’s progress, activities and conclusions. This is particularly important as its scientific advice is often utilised within the political debate in Brussels on certain key regulatory issues, for example GMOs or novel foods. EFSA was reassured to learn that the issues raised by the MEPs that visited EFSA – transparency, independence and credibility – are all in line with the Authority’s own priorities going forward.

EFSA also continued to strengthen engagement with its many stakeholders through dedicated conferences, workshops and webcasts on topics such as GMOs and nutrition, as has been outlined above (see also p. 18, 48).

An important vehicle for stakeholder involvement has been EFSA’s consultative stakeholder platform. In co-operation with its members, EFSA embarked on two new initiatives aimed at stimulating further stakeholder involvement in the Authority’s activities and at encouraging greater stakeholder contribution to EFSA’s scientific work. The first initiative, called the Rolling Work Plan, lists all EFSA activities and events organised for and with the Stakeholder Platform and other stakeholder organisations throughout the year. The second initiative was the creation of a Working Group to look at ways to increase the engagement of stakeholder organisations and consumers in EFSA’s activities.
III. OUTLOOK
Although the Authority has already gained considerable experience in providing timely and accurate scientific advice over recent years, it continuously strives to further improve its support to European risk managers, its co-operation with Member States and stakeholders, its dealings with applicants and, of course, its service to European consumers.

In 2011 and beyond, EFSA will follow up on the various insights and recommendations it received in the context of reviews undertaken in 2010. These include: its efficiency review in the framework of EFSA’s reorganisation programme; the external review foreseen in EFSA’s founding regulation which takes place every six years; and the review on EFSA’s Declaration of Interests policy. In 2011, EFSA will also develop its Science Strategy, a document that will help the Authority concentrate, consolidate and optimise the use of its resources, experts and data.

**Getting national experts on board**

One enduring challenge for EFSA is dealing with the increased workload faced by its Panels and the Scientific Committee. As outlined above, in 2010 the Authority already undertook steps to improve efficiency and in 2011 it will continue to look at measures to streamline its work processes and maximise resources. These are likely to include new approaches for co-operation with Member States, the outsourcing of parts of its work, further training and re-allocation of its own staff and the restructuring of workflows.

The involvement of Seconded National Experts (SNEs) in EFSA’s work is another efficiency measure that the Authority is particularly keen to explore. In addition to providing scientific support to EFSA, SNEs will gain a very good idea of the way EFSA operates, experience that they will take back with them to their respective national institutions.
This provides a practical approach to fostering training and building capacity both at national and European levels and should also help to increase the sense of involvement and understanding Member States have with the work of EFSA.

**Improving effectiveness and efficiency**

Improvements in the way EFSA supports applicants is an area that the Authority has already identified as key in better managing the increase in its workload generated by new applications from industry. In 2011, EFSA will create a dedicated applications desk to make more efficient the way in which it handles requests from applicants and other stakeholders. The applications desk will free up the time of EFSA’s scientific staff to focus less on administrative and more on scientific issues and also improve the overall application process and dialogue with applicants. This will be complemented and supported by a large-scale restructuring of the Authority – the so-called e³ project – that not only covers the handling of applications but also extends to all areas of the organisation aiming to enhance EFSA’s overall efficiency and effectiveness.

**Explaining the broader issues**

Regarding communications, in 2011 EFSA will continue to implement its Communications Strategy 2010-2013. However, the year will be significant because the Authority will turn its attention to communicating in a more thematic way, integrating communications on individual outputs in a broader context in order to make EFSA’s work more meaningful and relevant. There will also be a concerted effort to better explain EFSA’s role and how its work “fits in” with that of other actors in the European food safety system, namely the European Commission and Member States.

**Looking at European consumers in more detail**

The Eurobarometer survey which was commissioned in 2010 (see p. 24) was analysed thoroughly to provide initial results. However, the wealth of information generated through
the survey has not yet been fully tapped into and in 2011 the Authority will pursue additional research on these data with an external risk-perception expert from its advisory group on risk communications. The objective is to look more closely at the interrelationship between different factors affecting consumers’ perceptions, such as the impact of people’s trust in the food safety system on their perception of risk or the link between worry and trust. Similarly, EFSA plans to investigate whether it is possible to identify patterns or associations in risk perception and consumer concerns about food and food safety across Europe. This could then help both EFSA and its partners in Member States authorities to better understand consumer concerns, prioritise risk communications activities and tailor communications messages more effectively.

**Moving into its new home**

The year 2011 will also see EFSA move into its new building. To date, the Authority’s staff has been spread over four buildings which has presented several challenges, not least for the organisation of day-to-day meetings and internal communications. In a new, purpose-built home, interaction between EFSA staff should become easier and improvements in the overall efficiency of EFSA’s work are expected. Most importantly, having a single home and a more tightly knit workforce will improve the working conditions not only for EFSA staff members but also for its external scientific experts, on whom the Authority relies to deliver the scientific advice which EU risk managers depend on to protect consumers and ensure a safe food supply chain.
ANNEX I – ORGANISATIONAL CHART AS FROM 01/05/2011
ANNEX II – ACRONYMS
AHAW  Panel on Animal Health and Welfare
AMU  Assessment Methodology Unit
ANS  Panel on Food Additives and Nutrient Sources Added to Food Sources Added to Food
BIOHAZ  Panel on Biological Hazards
BPA  Bisphenol A
BSE  Bovine Spongiform Encephalopathy
BTX  Brevetoxin
CEF  Panel on Contact Materials, Enzymes, Flavourings and Processing Aids
CFCD  Comprehensive Food Consumption Database
CONTAM  Panel on Contaminants in the Food Chain
DATEX  Data Collection and Exposure Unit
DoI  Declaration of Interest
EAS  Endocrine active substances
ECDC  European Centre for Disease Prevention and Control
EMRISK  Emerging Risks Unit
ENVI  The European Parliament Committee for Environment, Public Health and Food Safety

ERA  Environmental Risk Assessment
EU  European Union
FEEDAP  Panel on Additives and Products or Substances used in Animal Feed
GMO  Panel on Genetically Modified Organisms
IT  Information Technology
MEPs  Members of the European Parliament
NDA  Panel on Dietetic Products, Nutrition and Allergies
PLH  Panel on Plant Health
PPR  Panel on Plant Protection Products and their Residues
PRApER  Pesticides Risk Assessment Peer Review Unit
Q&A  Questions & Answers
SC  Scientific Committee
SCO  EFSA Scientific Cooperation Unit
SNEs  Seconded National Expert
TDI  Tolerable Daily Intake
TSE  Transmissible Spongiform Encephalopathy
WHO  World Health Organisation
Zoonoses Unit
ANNEX III – EFSA’S OPINIONS AND SCIENTIFIC DOCUMENTS 2010
Overview of EFSA’s scientific outputs - 2010

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Category</th>
<th>AHAW</th>
<th>AMU</th>
<th>ANS</th>
<th>BIOHAZ</th>
<th>CEF</th>
<th>CONTAM</th>
<th>DATEX</th>
<th>Em Risk</th>
<th>FEEDAP</th>
<th>GMO</th>
<th>NDA</th>
<th>PLH</th>
<th>PPR</th>
<th>PRAPeR</th>
<th>SC and AF</th>
<th>SCO</th>
<th>Zoonoses</th>
<th>Total</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Opinions of the Scientific Committee/Scientific Panel</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>29</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>32</td>
<td>9</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>36</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>135</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>5</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>292</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Statements of the Scientific Committee/Scientific Panel</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>3</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>4</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>12</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Guidance of the Scientific Committee/Scientific Panel</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Statements of EFSA</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td>2</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Guidance of EFSA</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Conclusions on Pesticides Peer Review</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>73</td>
<td></td>
<td>73</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Reasoned Opinions</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>68</td>
<td></td>
<td>68</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Scientific Reports of EFSA</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>8</td>
<td></td>
<td>2</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>45</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Event reports</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>External Scientific Reports¹</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>3</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>38</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Technical reports</td>
<td>2</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>3</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>12</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>17</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>33</td>
<td>29</td>
<td>34</td>
<td>17</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>44</td>
<td>23</td>
<td>140</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>21</td>
<td>145</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>565</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Total scientific outputs of EFSA: 565

¹ Reports produced for EFSA by external parties under specific EFSA procedures.
Scientific Committee

The main task of the Scientific Committee is the preparation of scientific advice in the area of new and harmonised approaches for risk assessment of food and feed. It also provides strategic advice to EFSA’s Executive Director.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Scientific outputs 2010</th>
<th>Quantity</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Guidance of the Scientific Committee</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Statements of EFSA</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Scientific Reports of EFSA</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Technical Reports</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

One of the key achievements for the Scientific Committee in 2010 was the adoption of a guidance document on human health risk-benefit assessment of foods in June 2010. An update was requested on scientific developments related to the cloning of farmed animals for food production purposes and a statement endorsed by the Scientific Committee was published in September 2010. Work has continued on the preparation of a guidance document for the safety assessment of applications involving the application of nanoscience and nanotechnologies to food and feed. A draft guidance document was finalised at the end of the year to be sent for public consultation in early 2011. Work is also continuing on the wider applicability of the threshold of toxicological concern (TTC) concept, the development of a testing protocol for 90-day whole food feeding, and genotoxicity testing strategies. Work was started on the development of guidance on statistical approaches to assess adverse or biological relevant effects, harmonisation of risk assessment terminology and default values used in risk assessment. A training workshop on the benchmark dose (BMD) approach was organised for EFSA panel experts and staff.

Discussions within the Scientific Committee and the Advisory Forum have called for the development of a common approach within EFSA towards endocrine active substances. An EFSA scientific report was issued in September and its recommendations were endorsed by the Scientific Committee. Work was started to review the compendium on botanicals. Work was also started by an internal taskforce to review current practices of environmental risk assessment within the different Panels, with the aim of identifying commonalities and possible discrepancies.

Work is in progress by an external contractor on the applicability of physico-chemical data, quantitative structure-activity relationships (QSARs) and read-across in TTC assessments. To support the work on harmonisation of risk assessment terminology, a project was outsourced to review 219 EFSA opinions published between 2008 and the beginning of 2010.

The Advisory Forum met four times in 2010. The strategic discussions addressed EFSA’s work in different scientific areas and major progress was made in medium-term planning for better anticipation of the workload of EFSA in the coming years and further strengthening scientific co-operation between EFSA and the Member States. The Advisory Forum secretariat also coordinated preparation of EFSA’s proposal to DG Research on research priorities and facilitated the completion of the national experts’ work on assessing the literature and anecdotal evidence on aspartame.

For further details please refer to the attached DVD.
Animal health and welfare

The Panel on animal health and welfare (AHAW Panel) provides independent scientific advice on all aspects of animal diseases and animal welfare. Its work chiefly concerns food producing animals, including fish.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Scientific outputs 2010</th>
<th>Quantity</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Opinions of the AHAW Panel</td>
<td>10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Scientific Reports of EFSA</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>External Scientific Reports</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The AHAW Panel adopted ten scientific opinions and one panel statement. In relation to animal welfare, the panel adopted opinions on the welfare of animals during transport, the practice of harvesting feathers from live geese for down production, the welfare aspects of the management and housing of grandparent and parent stocks raised and kept for breeding purposes, the influence of genetic parameters on welfare, and stress resistance in commercial broilers.

On animal health, the AHAW Panel adopted scientific opinions on the increased mortality events in oysters (*Crassostrea gigas*), the influenza A H1N1 pandemic and its potential implications for animal health, the geographical distribution of ticks with proven involvement in the transmission of animal diseases and zoonoses in Eurasia, the role of tick vectors in the epidemiology of African swine fever (ASF) and Crimean-Congo haemorrhagic fever (CCHF) in Eurasia, the risk of introduction of African swine fever into the EU, especially from the Caucasus or Eastern Europe, and a panel statement on bovine besnoitiosis, an emerging disease in Europe. An opinion on Q fever was adopted jointly with the BIOHAZ Panel. The AHAW unit also jointly issued an EFSA scientific report on the new influenza A H1N1 with the BIOHAZ unit. Two technical reports were published on public consultations on the practice of harvesting feathers from live geese for down production, and health and welfare aspects of genetic selection in broilers. Four external reports were published on: information systems for broiler welfare; genetic selection aspects and epidemiology of different agents causing disease in aquatic animals; animal welfare assessment guidelines on housing and management; and a review of previous opinions of the AHAW Panel concerning the application of quantitative tools, part of the series on Good Practice in Conducting Scientific Assessments in Animal Health Using Modelling.

The AHAW Scientific Network on risk assessment in animal health and welfare held its first meeting in November 2010 and included discussions on the following: the need for retrospective comparative review of risk assessments conducted by AHAW and the national agencies on common questions; methodological aspects of risk assessment for animal welfare; and specification of data required for risk assessment in animal health. It was agreed to include these issues in the 2011 work programme for the network. At the November meeting, a technical session was organised on good practices in conducting scientific assessments in animal health using modelling.

For further details please refer to the attached DVD.

---

1 Reports produced for EFSA by external parties under specific EFSA procedures.
Food additives and nutrient sources added to food

The Panel on food additives and nutrient sources added to food (ANS Panel) deals with questions of safety in the use of food additives, nutrient sources and other substances deliberately added to food (for flavourings and enzymes, see p. 45).

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Scientific outputs 2010</th>
<th>Quantity</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Opinions of the ANS Panel</td>
<td>29</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Statements of the ANS Panel</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Statements of EFSA</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The ANS Panel adopted two scientific opinions (trivalent chromium and sodium ascorbate) and a statement on nitrates in meat products. Linked to the panel statement on identified divergence between the risk assessment of lycopene by EFSA and JECFA, an EFSA statement on the revised exposure assessment for lycopene as a food colour was finalised.

The ANS Panel adopted 27 scientific opinions (22 in the field of food additives and five in the field of nutrient sources) and one panel statement (erythritol).

The panel finalised 13 re-evaluations of food colours in accordance with the work-plan set in EU regulation 257/2010 and decreased the acceptable daily intake (ADI) on amaranth following the completion of its re-evaluation of azo dye food colours.

The evaluation of new applications for food additives and nutrient sources included substances naturally present in plants such as steviol glycosides, allyl isothiocyanate and modified gum acacia.

Three public calls for data were published in 2010 (miscellaneous food additives, patent blue V, and calcium carbonate). In addition, three public calls for data launched in 2009 were finalised in 2010: these related to emulsifiers, to stabilisers and gelling agents; to preservatives and antioxidants; and to miscellaneous waxes. They were required for the re-evaluation of food additives within the timeframe set by regulation EU 257/2010.

For further details please refer to the attached DVD.
Biological hazards including TSEs

EFSA’s Panel on biological hazards (BIOHAZ Panel) deals with biological hazards related to food safety, food-borne diseases, transmissible spongiform encephalopathies (TSEs), food microbiology, food hygiene and associated waste management issues.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Scientific outputs 2010</th>
<th>Quantity</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Opinions of the BIOHAZ Panel</td>
<td>18</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Statements of the BIOHAZ Panel</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Guidance of the BIOHAZ Panel</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Scientific Reports of EFSA</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>External Scientific Reports</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The BIOHAZ Panel adopted 15 scientific opinions. In relation to food-borne zoonoses, the panel adopted four opinions on *Salmonella* in different animal populations as follows: quantitative microbiological risk assessment (QMRA) of *Salmonella* in slaughter and breeding pigs; quantitative estimation of the public health impact of setting a new target for the reduction of *Salmonella* in laying hens; the link between *Salmonella* criteria at different stages of the poultry production chain; and *Salmonella typhimurium*-like strains.

Further opinions were adopted on parasites in fishery products and on Q fever jointly with the AHAW Panel. Three opinions on food hygiene were adopted relating to the food safety considerations of novel A H1N1 influenza virus infections in humans and food hygiene parameters in the production of fish oil.

An opinion on food irradiation was linked to an opinion adopted by the CEF Panel. The scientific opinion on the list of qualified presumption of safety for biological agents intentionally added to food or feed as notified to EFSA was updated.

Six opinions on transmissible spongiform encephalopathies (TSEs) were adopted: a revision of the quantitative risk assessment of the bovine spongiform encephalopathy (BSE) risk posed by processed animal proteins; BSE/TSE infectivity in small ruminant tissues; analytical sensitivity of approved TSE rapid tests – new data for assessment of two rapid tests; the results of an EU survey for chronic wasting disease in cervids; the second update on the risk for human and animal health related to the revision of the BSE monitoring regime in some Member States; and a joint opinion on a possible epidemiological or molecular association between TSEs in animals and humans was issued in collaboration with ECDC.

In addition, a technical report was published on the comparison of the Australian monitoring programme for carcasses with the requirements of Regulation (EC) No 2073/2005 on the microbiological criteria on foodstuffs.

For further details please refer to the attached DVD.

1 Reports produced for EFSA by external parties under specific EFSA procedures.
In the area of decontamination treatments, the BIOHAZ Panel adopted five opinions, two of which were guidance documents: one opinion on the use of recycled hot water as a decontamination technique for carcasses jointly with the CONTAM Panel and one revised guidance opinion on safety and efficacy evaluation of decontamination substances.

In relation to animal by-products (ABP), two opinions were adopted assessing alternative methods for ABPs and one opinion on the format for applications on new alternative methods for ABPs.

Meetings of the Microbiological Risk Assessment (MRA) and BSE-TSE Networks were held in June and November respectively. Key items discussed in the MRA network meeting included recent trends in listeriosis in the UK and other Member States, and antimicrobial resistance. In the BSE-TSE network meeting, the TSE epidemiological situation in the EU, the zoonotic potential of TSE agents and the review of the BSE surveillance system were discussed. A workshop on “Animal By-Products: Biogas and Composting Rules” was held in November 2010 in collaboration with the European Commission.

Presentations on the work in progress in meat inspection were made at the Commission’s roundtables on the review of meat inspection in spring and autumn 2010.

For further details please refer to the attached DVD.
Food contact materials, enzymes, flavourings and processing aids

The Panel on food contact materials, enzymes, flavourings and processing aids (CEF Panel) deals with questions on the safety of use of materials in contact with food, enzymes, flavourings and processing aids, and also with questions related to the safety of processes.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Scientific outputs 2010</th>
<th>Quantity</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Opinions of the CEF Panel</td>
<td>32</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Guidance of the CEF Panel</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Scientific Reports of EFSA</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The CEF Panel adopted three generic opinions in 2010, one of the key achievements being the timely adoption of an opinion on bisphenol A (BPA). A preliminary document was shared and discussed with representatives of the Member States during a meeting in spring 2010.

The CEF Panel also adopted an opinion on the chemical safety of irradiation to complement the BIOHAZ Panel opinion on efficacy.

An opinion on the safety of melamine was adopted jointly with the CONTAM Panel.

The CEF Panel adopted 29 opinions concerning applications, 19 of which covered the evaluation of new flavouring substances as well as additional data provided for the re-evaluation of substances of the Flavourings Evaluation Programme (terminated in December 2009). Nine opinions covered substances used to manufacture materials in contact with foodstuffs.

In addition, the first opinion on a recycling process, dealing with a closed loop recycling of polypropylene was adopted. A guidance opinion on data needed for the evaluation of flavourings was adopted by the CEF Panel after a public consultation.

The re-evaluation of flavouring substances and preparatory work in the area of food contact materials (FCMs) were outsourced in areas such as toxicity data, physico-chemical data and migration data.

A contract was launched and awarded to constantly monitor new scientific literature on BPA and to prepare monthly reports.

Two contracts were assigned in order to collect the outcome of the Danish and French risk assessment of food enzymes. In addition, a contract was signed to verify the identification of substances evaluated by Member States, Switzerland and Norway and compiled by the ESCO Working Group on non-plastic FCMs. A report on the outcome of the public consultation for the CEF guidance on data needed for the evaluation of flavourings was also published.

For further details please refer to the attached DVD.
Contaminants in the food chain

The Panel on contaminants in the food chain (CONTAM Panel) is responsible for questions on contaminants in the food and feed chain, and undesirable substances such as natural toxicants, mycotoxins and residues of unauthorised substances not covered by other panels.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Scientific outputs 2010</th>
<th>Quantity</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Opinions of the CONTAM Panel</td>
<td>9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Statements of the CONTAM Panel</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Statements of EFSA</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>External Scientific Reports(^1)</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The CONTAM Panel adopted 12 scientific outputs (ten scientific opinions and two panel statements). In relation to contaminants in food, the panel adopted three opinions on lead, polybrominated biphenyls, and the use of recycled hot water for decontamination of carcasses (adopted jointly with the BIOHAZ Panel) and two statements on nitrate in leafy vegetables consumed by children and the toxicity of ochratoxin A.

Three opinions on emerging marine biotoxins (ciguatoxins, cyclic imines and brevetoxins) and one statement on shellfish consumption completed a series of risk assessments addressing marine biotoxins which started in 2006 and has resulted in 12 scientific opinions overall.

Three opinions addressed contaminants in food and feed: melamine (adopted jointly with the CEF Panel), seeds of Ambrosia spp. in animal feed (adopted jointly with the PLH and NDA Panels), and glycerine as a co-product from biodiesel production.

The CONTAM unit contributed to two EFSA Statements on possible risks for public and animal health from the contamination of the feed and food chain due to possible ash fall following the eruption of the Eyjafjallajökull volcano in Iceland, and the toxicological assessment of nicotine, based on considerations received from China.

Three scientific reports summarising available information on the occurrence and toxicity of T-2 and HT-2 mycotoxins were published.

\(^1\) Reports produced for EFSA by external parties under specific EFSA procedures.

For further details please refer to the attached DVD.
Additives and products or substances used in animal feed

EFSA’s Panel on additives and products or substances used in animal feed (FEEDAP Panel) provides independent scientific advice on the safety and/or efficacy of additives and products or substances used in animal feed.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Scientific outputs 2010</th>
<th>Quantity</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Opinions of the FEEDAP Panel</td>
<td>36</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Statements of the FEEDAP Panel</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Guidance of EFSA</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Technical Reports</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The FEEDAP Panel adopted 36 scientific opinions in the framework of Regulation (EC) No 1831/2003 and four Panel statements related to the safety evaluation of feed additives.

A total of 14 opinions on new products or extensions of use of authorised products and seven opinions for modification of the terms of authorisation of an authorised product were adopted. In addition, four opinions were adopted concerning the evaluation of supplementary information submitted by the applicants after inconclusive opinions.

Regarding the re-evaluation of feed additives under Article 10, a total of 389 dossiers were received and 11 opinions were adopted by the FEEDAP Panel in 2010.

In order to prepare for the re-evaluation, a new IT tool was deployed to improve the management, distribution, archiving and reporting of data related to applications and dossiers. With regards to the re-evaluation process, close liaison with the EC and the European Union Reference Laboratory (EURL) was maintained throughout 2010 in order to improve collaboration and increase the efficiency of the processing of applications.

Two external reports of Article 36 projects were received: on the collection and synthesis of scientific data and information on the potential of microorganisms and enzymes used in food and feed to induce respiratory sensitisation; and a series of monographs on the biological role, content in feed and requirements in animal nutrition of 27 trace and ultra-trace elements.

The final report on a procurement project for the pre-assessment of the environmental impact of zinc and copper used in animal nutrition was also received.

For further details please refer to the attached DVD.
The GMO Panel adopted 14 scientific opinions of which nine concerned GM plant applications under 1829/2003 covering ten application dossiers. The other opinions concerned the general ban on GMOs in Portugal, a request from the Commission related to an application for RF3-oilseed rape submitted under Directive 2001/18, an environmental risk assessment (ERA) of non-target organisms, an ERA of GMO plants, and a guidance document on the allergenicity of GM foods. The new ERA guidance document is the culmination of two and a half years’ work and it includes input from two public consultations as well as six consultation meetings with MS experts, applicants and NGOs. The scientific focus was on the further elaboration of the choice of receiving environments, long-term effects, statistical considerations for field trials and the ERA of non-target organisms. Other scientific outputs of the GMO unit in 2010 included ten technical reports concerning application dossiers (“overall opinions”) each of which included comments from Member States, a post-market environmental monitoring plan, a validation report for the detection method, and other annexes.

The Scientific Network for Risk Assessment of GMOs held its first meeting in November with experts from the Member States focusing on the topics of stacked events, new traits, new technologies, animal feeding trials, non-target organisms and long-term effects. EFSA organised five technical meetings to discuss applications with MS experts and applicants as well as four consultation meetings on guidance development with Member State experts, applicants and NGOs. Supporting the work of the GMO Panel on guidance development for GM animals, three outsourcing projects on GM fish, GM insects, and GM mammals and birds, were finalised, each giving rise to an external report. In addition, EFSA organised two dedicated workshops with international experts on GM fish, and GM mammals and birds. Two outsourcing projects in support of GM plant applications were launched, one on the development of a fauna database to aid the ERA of non-target organisms and the other on the development of statistical software related to comparative risk assessment. The unit issued three technical reports on public consultations related to: the guidance documents on the allergenicity of GM foods; the ERA of GM plants; and the scientific opinion on the ERA of non-target organisms. Two reports on technical meetings and one workshop report were also published.

For further details please refer to the attached DVD.
Dietetic products, nutrition and allergies

The NDA Panel deals with questions related to human nutrition, dietetic products and food allergies. It also advises on associated subjects such as novel foods, dietary recommendations for nutrients and energy, and the EU’s regulation on Nutrition and Health Claims.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Scientific outputs 2010</th>
<th>Quantity</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Opinions of the NDA Panel</td>
<td>135</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Scientific Reports of EFSA</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The NDA Panel adopted three generic scientific opinions: the appropriateness of azo-colours for inclusion in a list of food ingredients with a potential to cause allergic reactions; lactose thresholds in lactose intolerance; and one joint opinion on Ambrosia with the CONTAM and PLH Panels. In relation to dietary reference values (DRVs), two calls for tender were launched.

The first of these was on the collection, collation and analysis of data required for the establishment of DRVs and the lot focusing on growth data for children and adolescents in the EU was successfully awarded. The second call comprised a literature search and review related to specific preparatory work in the establishment of DRVs and all three lots (lot 1: vitamins A, C, E, K; lot 2: manganese, molybdenum, chromium; lot 3: magnesium, potassium, fluoride) were successfully awarded.

The NDA Panel adopted 132 opinions, 104 of which were related to Article 13.1 functional claims covering 930 individual claims. In October, EFSA was asked to reprioritise the work on Article 13 health claims and to finalise assessment of Article 13.1 claims other than botanicals by June 2011. Eight opinions were adopted on childhood and risk reduction claims and 12 opinions were adopted on claims based on newly developed science and/or proprietary data. EFSA also responded to many scientific comments made by applicants and members during the commenting phase of previously published opinions as laid down in the Health Claims Regulation. These comments were forwarded by the European Commission to EFSA in order to allow the Commission services a full consideration of all scientific comments made before proceeding with the authorisation or rejection of health claims. In the context of the procedure for the authorisation of health claims, the NDA Panel also adopted one opinion on the conditions of use of a claim on calcium and vitamin D and the reduction of the risk of osteoporotic fractures. In the area of the safety assessment of novel foods, the NDA Panel adopted seven opinions corresponding to seven applications.

The NDA Panel organised two workshops on guidance for health claims (one technical meeting with stakeholders on recent developments related to health claims and one on scientific requirements for health claims related to gut and immune function) and issued a draft guidance document for public consultation. In relation to DRVs, the summary reports of five public consultations on principles for deriving DRVs for fats, carbohydrates, and water and a guidance document on establishing food-based dietary recommendations were published in 2010 together with the related opinions.

For further details please refer to the attached DVD.
Plant health

The EFSA Panel on plant health (PLH Panel) provides scientific advice on risks posed by pests which can harm plants, plant products or biodiversity in the EU.

The PLH Panel adopted eight scientific opinions in 2010 including a guidance document of crucial importance for the panel’s work on a harmonised framework for PRA and the evaluation of risk reduction options. Two opinions covering full PRAs including the identification of risk management options were adopted, one for the oriental chestnut gall wasp (Dryocosmus kuriphilus) and the other for pine pitch canker (Gibberella cincinata). Three opinions linked to the evaluation of third country dossiers were delivered, namely on the quantitative pathway analysis of US wheat for karnal bunt caused by the fungus Tilletia indica, a study proposal by the USA on the pine wood nematode (Bursaphelenchus xylophilus) in military wood packaging material, and a Japanese derogation request on EU import requirements for bonsai and topiary trees that are host plants for citrus long-horned beetle (Anoplophora chinensiris).

The panel also provided scientific advice on the appropriateness of a composting method for the elimination of the pine wood nematode from the bark of pine trees, proposed by the Portuguese authorities, and on the effect on the environment of the further distribution of Ambrosia spp., the latter co-adopted with the CONTAM and NDA Panels. To support the PLH Panel’s scientific opinions, a grant for an analysis of data quality and methodologies and resulting uncertainties for pest risk assessment was awarded in response to an Article 36 call.

In addition, a new service level agreement was signed to provide EU maps and other data on the occurrence, distribution and practices for forestry trees, endangered species and plant biodiversity. The resulting outputs will assist the panel in delivering more accurate quantitative assessments.

The Scientific Network for Risk Assessment in Plant Health held its first meeting in October 2010. Discussions included data collection, information exchange to enhance co-operation, and emerging plant health risks. Two public consultations were conducted: on the draft guidance document for harmonised pest risk assessment and on EFSA’s actions on the COPHS (Chief Officers of Plant Health Services) guidelines. The results were taken into consideration in the final outputs and the corresponding EFSA scientific reports were consequently published. A joint scientific conference was organised with the Plant Health Panel of the Norwegian Scientific Committee for Food Safety to discuss plant health risk assessment from a Nordic perspective.

For further details please refer to the attached DVD.
Plant protection products and their residues

The PPR Panel provides independent scientific advice on the risk assessment of plant protection products (commonly known as pesticides) and their residues, looking at risks for the user/worker, the consumer and the environment.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Scientific outputs 2010</th>
<th>Quantity</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Opinions of the PPR Panel</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Guidance of the PPR Panel</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Scientific Reports of EFSA</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Event Reports</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>External Scientific Reports¹</td>
<td>8</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The PPR Panel adopted five scientific opinions and one guidance document in the fields of toxicology, ecotoxicology and fate.

The most important achievements concerned the establishment of specific environmental protection goals using an ecosystem services approach, the development of a soil ecoregion concept and the exposure assessment of operators, workers, bystanders and residents to pesticides.

Two EFSA scientific reports were published on a modelling approach to estimate pesticide emissions from glasshouses to surface water in Mediterranean countries and on selection of scenarios for exposure of soil organisms to plant protection products.

PPR organised and published the reports of stakeholder workshops on protection goals for environmental risk assessment and pesticide emissions from protected crop systems.

Three public consultations were concluded on the use of field persistence and soil accumulation studies with pesticides for exposure assessment of soil organisms; on a probabilistic methodology for the dietary exposure assessment of pesticides; and on the assessment of exposure of workers, operators, bystanders and residents to pesticides.

The respective public consultation reports were published. Eight external scientific reports were also issued resulting from Article 36 grant agreements, procurement contracts and service level agreements with the JRC. These reports explored the applicability of alternative methodologies not involving animal testing in mammalian toxicology and various aspects of the behaviour of pesticides in the environment (emissions from protected crop systems, crop interception and persistence in soil).

¹ Reports produced for EFSA by external parties under specific EFSA procedures.

For further details please refer to the attached DVD.
Assessment methodology

The Assessment Methodology Unit (AMU) provides technical support in the field of statistics, modelling, data management and risk assessment. It contributes in particular to the development and application of new or refined risk assessment approaches in the field of food and feed safety.

### Scientific outputs 2010

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Scientific outputs 2010</th>
<th>Quantity</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Guidance of EFSA</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Scientific Reports of EFSA</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>External Scientific Reports&lt;sup&gt;1&lt;/sup&gt;</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Technical Reports</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

AMU provided support in the form of three scientific reports and seven internal reports for opinions from the PLH, AHAW, BIOHAZ, ANS and CEF Panels. This included support to BIOHAZ for scientific reports on modelling (*Model-based comparative assessment of the Australian and European hygiene monitoring programmes for meat production*), which quantitatively compared the efficiency of the microbiological monitoring programmes of Australia and Europe) and a scientific report on the quantitative risk assessment of *Salmonella enteritidis* in shell eggs in Europe. To support the CEF Panel, AMU issued also a scientific report on the statistical re-analysis of the Biel maze data of the Stump et al. (2010) study on bisphenol A and two technical reports to support PLH opinions.

The AMU unit supported statistical reviews of several dossiers submitted to the NDA and FEEDAP Panels (four internal reports). Those reviews and occasional re-analysis are reported to the panel for their information via internal reports. Methodological support on the revision on the guidance document on persistence in soil was given to PPR (one internal report).

The methodology for systematic reviews in food and feed safety risk assessment has been analysed and published previously in a guidance document. This document was discussed during a workshop with EFSA panel members and scientific staff. Consequently, AMU launched and signed a procurement contract on the implementation of systematic reviews and through this project further training will be delivered to both EFSA staff and experts. During 2010, considerable efforts were made to increase the support given by the EFSA library. This includes the establishment of framework contracts for electronic journals and databases, while procedures for literature requests and systematic literature searches were developed. AMU organised a joint workshop with the Spanish Food Safety Agency (AESAN) in Seville on scientific support for the risk surveillance of imports and it attracted 120 attendees from both EU and third countries. To provide methodological support on emerging risks in animal and plant health, AMU published an external report on the inventory of data sources relevant to the identification of emerging diseases in the European aquaculture population and launched an Article 36 project on the development of a commodity-based hazard identification protocol for emerging risks in plant and animal health.

This need was identified from analysis of the necessary components of a risk assessment methodology for emerging risks in plant and animal health and projects currently in progress or planned in this area. Finally, AMU provided data management support to the Annual Report on Pesticide Residues and statistical support (documented in internal reports) to several Zoonoses working groups and the Scientific Committee.

---

<sup>1</sup> Reports produced for EFSA by external parties under specific EFSA procedures.

For further details please refer to the attached DVD.
Data collection and exposure

The Data Collection and Exposure (DATEX) Unit deals with the collection, collation and analysis of data on food consumption and chemical occurrence in food and feed for exposure assessments at European level.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Scientific outputs 2010</th>
<th>Quantity</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Guidance of EFSA</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Scientific Reports of EFSA</td>
<td>8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>External Scientific Reports 1</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

DATEX contributed to several CONTAM Panel opinions by collecting occurrence data for dietary exposure to various substances (seven internal reports).

These included melamine, marine biotoxins (brevetoxins, ciguatoxins and cyclic imines) and the first of five groups of brominated flame retardants (PBBs; the remaining groups will follow next year).

Using the new EFSA Comprehensive European Food Consumption Database, DATEX made an important contribution to the drafting of the statement reconsidering the consumption figures of shellfish used in the marine biotoxins opinions.

DATEX supported preparation of the CONTAM Panel statement on possible public health risks for infants and young children from the presence of nitrates in leafy vegetables and contributed to the statement of EFSA on the possible risks for public and animal health from the contamination of the feed and food chain with ash-fall following the eruption of the Eyjafjallajökull volcano in Iceland.

Support was provided to the ANS Panel in the revised exposure assessment on steviol glycosides and to the CEF Panel for estimating the dietary exposure to melamine in melaware (two internal reports).

Two important milestones were achieved in the harmonisation of data collection for chemical contaminants and residues with the publication of the Guidance on Standard Sample Description (finalised in 2009 and published in 2010) and the Guidance on Data Exchange. These two guidance documents will form the basis of continuous Europe-wide harmonised data collection.

The Commission provided a new mandate encompassing all contaminants of interest in food safety with bi-annual reporting. Grant agreements were signed with six Member States to support the electronic transmission of chemical occurrence data. On request of the European Commission, DATEX analysed and reported the 2009 acrylamide monitoring data. An updated report on furan was also issued.

Two reports on monitoring results of dioxins and non dioxin-like PCBs were prepared. Two technical reports were drafted in response to requests from the Commission on heavy metals and polycyclic aromatic hydrocarbons (PAHs).

For further details please refer to the attached DVD.

1 Reports produced for EFSA by external parties under specific EFSA procedures.
The EFSA Comprehensive European Food Consumption Database was completed and validated. Food consumption data on infants and children from the Expochi (a project to create a relational network of different individual food consumption databases for children) Article 36 project were also integrated. The Comprehensive Database was used in pilot phase in 2010 with publication scheduled for 2011. Activities to prepare the next steps in food consumption (the fully harmonised EU Menu project) include a pilot study for adolescents, adults and elderly that will be carried out under an Article 36 grant signed in 2010 and procurement with IARC on data collection methodology.

The Working Groups on Food Classification and Total Diet Studies continued their activities with reports expected in 2011. Four external reports on childhood exposure to lead, chromium, selenium and colours from Expochi and one on statistical modelling of usual intake were published.

For further details please refer to the attached DVD.
Emerging risks

The Emerging Risks (EMRISK) Unit is responsible for establishing procedures to monitor, collect and analyse information and data in order to identify emerging risks in the field of food and feed safety with a view to their prevention.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Scientific outputs 2010</th>
<th>Quantity</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>External Scientific Reports ¹</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Technical Reports</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

EMRISK published three reports in 2010. The first described the development of a system for the routine monitoring of data submitted to the Rapid Alert System for Food and Feed and the second the collection and analysis of import data for the identification of emerging risks. The third report provided an overview of EFSA’s progress in establishing a process for the identification of emerging risks and an outline of how it is planned to take this forward.

EMRISK is also responsible for coordinating EFSA’s preparation for answering urgent requests. In 2010, one internal training session was organised and the feedback report from the external contractor for the 2009 exercise with Member States was published.

The 2010 training was planned and executed in collaboration with an external consultant, funded through procurement, and in consultation with a working group. The procedures for responding to urgent requests are under regular revision, building on experience gained through the training exercises and following real cases. The procedures were updated, and shared with the Scientific Committee and Advisory Forum, with a view to publishing them for the first time in early 2011. In total, two working groups were initiated and a further one was renewed in 2010.

A Member State network and a stakeholder consultative group on emerging risks were also set up. Further development of the emerging risks media monitoring tool MediSys was initiated with the JRC through a service level agreement.

¹ Reports produced for EFSA by external parties under specific EFSA procedures.

For further details please refer to the attached DVD.
Pesticide risk assessment peer review

The Pesticide Risk Assessment Peer Review (PRAPeR) Unit is responsible for the peer review of active substances used in plant protection products. The assessments, including the peer review, are sent to the European Commission to decide whether the substance should be included on the EU’s positive list of permitted substances that may be used in products across Europe. The Unit is also involved in the risk assessment of consumers exposed to pesticide residues in food, which forms the basis for the setting of maximum residue levels (MRLs) under EU law. The unit is also responsible for preparing the annual report on pesticide residues.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Scientific outputs 2010</th>
<th>Quantity</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Statements of EFSA</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Conclusions on Pesticides Peer Review</td>
<td>73</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Reasoned Opinions</td>
<td>68</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Scientific Reports of EFSA</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Activities in pesticide peer review in 2010 included: new active substances; substances resubmitted for inclusion in Annex I of Directive 91/414/EEC following an initial non-inclusion decision; substances already included in Annex I with inclusion periods expiring; substances included in Annex I for which EFSA conclusions were due to be delivered by 31 December 2010 (the so-called ‘green track’ of stage 3 of the review programme of existing active substances, i.e. substances complying with the criteria of clear indications of no harmful effects); and substances for which confirmatory data have been submitted after inclusion. EFSA received assessment reports for 33 resubmitted substances and one substance for Annex I renewal. These reports were reviewed and consultation was opened with Member States, applicants and the general public to provide feedback to the European Commission. EFSA also reviewed and opened consultation with Member States and the general public on 22 assessment reports for “green track” substances of stage 4 of the review programme of existing active substances. A request was received from the European Commission to organise a peer review with Member State experts and provide conclusions on 64 resubmitted substances and two substances for Annex I renewal. The Authority was also invited to provide comments to the European Commission on the assessment of confirmatory data submitted by the rapporteur Member States for 15 substances.

A series of scientific meetings and teleconferences was held with Member State experts in relation to new and existing active substances. In response to the challenging timelines associated with the resubmission and renewal programmes, the PRAPeR Unit further increased the use of telemeetings, organising 24 tele-conferences with Member State experts, out of a total of 37 expert meetings. Overall, the PRAPeR Unit delivered conclusions on 73 substances in 2010, including one new active substance, 61 resubmitted substances, seven substances already included in Annex I with inclusion periods expiring, three existing active substances included in Annex I but for which the peer review had been postponed, and one substance for which confirmatory data were submitted. This number is slightly lower than expected because of delays in the resubmissions programme to EFSA.

In 2010, 96 MRL applications were submitted by the European Commission pertaining to the amendment of MRLs. In response to these requests, EFSA issued 68 reasoned opinions (addressing 76 requests on 309 MRLs). Work on an additional nine...
requests was initiated but had to be interrupted (clock-stop) because essential information was missing in the documentation provided. In addition, EFSA provided six reasoned opinions, two statements and one scientific report on specific requests falling under Article 43 of Regulation (EC) No 396/2005.

These outputs refer to requests from the European Commission asking EFSA to provide advice on the EU position to be taken in the Codex Committee on Pesticide Residues (CCPR Meeting), the acceptance of Codex MRLs for bromopropylate, triforine and methidathion, the consumer risk associated with residues of chlormequat on Indian grapes, and a contribution to the scientific debate regarding residues of nicotine residues on Chinese mushrooms. EFSA was also asked for advice regarding the setting of legal limits for biphenyl contamination of tea and herbal infusions with biphenyl and MRLs for chlorantraniliprole related to an emergency situation in France. The reasoned opinions issued by EFSA were the basis for revising MRLs in Annex II or III of Regulation (EC) No 396/2005 whereby the European Commission has adopted eight new MRL Regulations on Pesticide Residues in the Standing Committee.

Regarding the review programme under Article 12 of Regulation (EC) No 396/2005, three reasoned opinions were finalised and completeness checking was finalised for 87 dossiers. The lower number of outputs finalised compared with Management Plan 2010 was due primarily to the failure to identify a suitable contractor to provide scientific and technical support and the prioritisation given to completing the programme on EFSA conclusions. In 2010, the second Annual Report on Pesticide Residues for the reference period 2008 was published. The report summarises the results of approximately 70,000 samples of nearly 200 different types of food which were analysed in the 27 Member States and two EFTA countries (Norway and Iceland). The results demonstrated that 96.5% of the samples comply with the legal MRLs; 3.5% of the samples exceeded them. EFSA implemented a new data format to report the results of the residue monitoring activities at Member State level which in future will allow for a more detailed analysis of the monitoring data and greater accuracy in assessing the exposure of European consumers. Based on the results submitted, EFSA calculated the actual consumer exposure to pesticide residues via food and identified potential risks related to certain pesticide/crop combinations containing critical concentrations of residues.

For further details please refer to the attached DVD.
Scientific co-operation

The objective of the Scientific Co-operation (SCO) Unit is to foster scientific co-operation, projects and exchange of scientific information between EFSA and national food safety agencies in EU Member States.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Scientific outputs 2010</th>
<th>Quantity</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Event Reports</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Technical Reports</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The Focal Points continued to collect and share risk assessment data, increase EFSA’s visibility within the Member States, and generally support the work of the Advisory Forum members. The Focal Point agreements were renewed with all 27 Member States. The status of Iceland and Norway changed from observers to members in 2010 and Norway signed its first Focal Point agreement. The importance of the Information Exchange Platform (IEP) continued to grow with over 830 documents uploaded by Focal Points by December 2010, including almost 700 risk assessment documents.

Monthly internal reports were issued to update all users of the IEP (EFSA units, Panel and network members, and experts in Member States) on newly posted information.

The 2010 evaluation report and the implementation thereof will help to further improve this tool. In 2010, EFSA allocated approximately €7.8 million for grant and procurement activities. Two new IT tools were launched to support Article 36 networking as well as the management of the list of Article 36 organisations capable of assisting EFSA in its tasks. The list enlarged to almost 400 organisations broadening the knowledge base at EFSA’s disposal. The Expert Database was successfully promoted at national and international level to attract scientific experts; as of the end of the year the total number of applications stood at 3,000.

The unit issued four internal quarterly reports to update EFSA management on progress as well as an annual report on the evaluation of the expert database. Two Scientific Colloquia were organised on food classification and emerging risks and preparations for the second Expert Satisfaction Survey were started. Development of the EFSA Journal continued and it is now indexed in three key bibliographic databases relevant to EFSA’s work (CAB Abstracts, Food Science and Technology Abstracts and SciFinder), thereby increasing the visibility of the Authority’s scientific work. In the context of medium-term planning, a report on scientific co-operation between EFSA and the Member States was prepared following discussions and consultations with the Advisory Forum and Scientific Committee. The report provides a basis for future discussions on scientific co-operation activities.

For further details please refer to the attached DVD.
Zoonoses data collection

The Zoonoses Unit analyses and reports data of zoonoses, antimicrobial resistance, microbiological contaminants and food-borne outbreaks. The data is submitted by Member States and other reporting countries in accordance with Directive 2003/99/EC.

Scientific outputs 2010

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Quantity</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Scientific Reports of EFSA</td>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>External Scientific Reports(^1)</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Technical Reports</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The Zoonoses unit provided support for opinions from the AHAW, BIOHAZ and PLH panels (four internal reports). These included data management and spatial analyses of the data for AHAW’s opinion on ticks as vectors of African swine fever and Crimean-Congo haemorrhagic fever as well as PLH’s opinion on oriental chestnut gall wasp in the EU. Data extractions and assistance with data analyses were provided for the BIOHAZ Panel.

The Zoonoses unit published three Community summary reports in 2010. The *Summary Report on Zoonoses and Food-borne Outbreaks* was prepared with ECDC. The main finding was the statistically significant decreasing trend in salmonellosis cases in humans, most likely due to successful *Salmonella* controls in poultry populations in the EU. The two other Community summary reports dealt with antimicrobial resistance in bacteria from animals and food in the period 2004-2008; these reports were the first EU-level analyses in this area and revealed that resistance to antimicrobials is common among these bacteria. Three EU-wide baseline survey reports published in 2010 demonstrated that a high proportion of broiler carcasses are contaminated with *Campylobacter* and that slaughterhouses have an impact on the contamination level. In the case of methicillin-resistant *Staphylococcus aureus* (MRSA) in pigs, the prevalence was associated with trade in breeding pigs. Further guidance was provided to Member States on the specific type of data for which trends over the years should be monitored and a project was launched to get consensus on the best methods for the analysis of antimicrobial resistance data. A new web application for data reporting was successfully deployed and three reporting manuals and an internal report were provided to Member States specifying the agreed amendments to the application. Furthermore, a plan to modernise the automatic data transfer was agreed with Member States and an internal report on a survey on the possible introduction of the XML format was issued. The quality of the data was improved through extensive data validation and six external reports on harmonised reporting and monitoring of parasites, rabies, Q fever and food surveys were published. In May, the unit received a new mandate to propose epidemiological indicators in relation to meat inspection and the work was started in cooperation with other EFSA units.

\(^1\) Reports produced for EFSA by external parties under specific EFSA procedures.

For further details please refer to the attached DVD.
### Budget Execution 2010

- €73.8 million or 98.8% of the €74.72 million budget (after integration of the EFTA contribution to EFSA’s budget) was committed. The commitment level stands at the target set for the year (€74.0 million). Under Title I Personnel and Title II Infrastructure, the budget was fully executed. Under Title III Operations, the execution rate reached 96.5% with, in particular, the commitments under the scientific co-operation programme having reached 95.3% of the €8.2 million appropriations available.

- €61.6 million or 83.5% of the €73.78 million payment appropriations (after global transfer and EFTA contribution to EFSA budget) were paid. This payment level stands 11% below the target (€68.7 million) for the following main reasons:
  - Major data processing and IT operational support projects were initiated in November and will therefore trigger payments for an amount of €4.3 million only next year.
  - Delays in contracting the Scientific Co-operation Activities and lower payment levels under the existing grant and procurement programme led to an under-spend of the related differentiated credits amounting to €1.3 million.
  - Payments for an amount of €1.1 million under specific projects in Administration and Communication were postponed to next year.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Title</th>
<th>Commitment Appropriation</th>
<th>Amount Committed</th>
<th>% Committed</th>
<th>Payment Appropriation</th>
<th>Amount Paid</th>
<th>% Paid</th>
<th>RAL</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Personnel</td>
<td>37,573,452</td>
<td>37,570,152</td>
<td>100.0%</td>
<td>37,573,452</td>
<td>36,350,027</td>
<td>96.74%</td>
<td>1,220,125</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Infrastructure</td>
<td>11,538,018</td>
<td>11,537,644</td>
<td>100.0%</td>
<td>11,538,018</td>
<td>7,070,946</td>
<td>61.28%</td>
<td>4,466,698</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Operations</td>
<td>25,603,650</td>
<td>24,700,316</td>
<td>96.5%</td>
<td>24,670,130</td>
<td>18,195,968</td>
<td>73.76%</td>
<td>6,504,348</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total:</td>
<td>74,715,120</td>
<td>73,808,112</td>
<td>98.8%</td>
<td>73,781,600</td>
<td>61,616,941</td>
<td>83.51%</td>
<td>12,191,171</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### Budget Execution 2010 (Millions €)

- **Personnel**: 37.57
- **Infrastructure**: 37.57
- **Operations**: 37.57

### Payments

- **Personnel**: 36.35
- **Infrastructure**: 7.07
- **Operations**: 25.60
### ABB Execution 2010

**Activity 1** = Provision of scientific opinions and advice and risk assessment approaches  
**Activity 2** = Evaluation of products, substances and claims subject to authorisation  
**Activity 3** = Data collection, scientific cooperation and networking  
**Activity 4** = Communication and dialogue  
**Govern 5** = Governance

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Activity</th>
<th>Commitment Appropriation</th>
<th>%</th>
<th>Amount Committed</th>
<th>%</th>
<th>Payment Appropriation</th>
<th>Amount Paid</th>
<th>%</th>
<th>RAL</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Activity 1</td>
<td>13,193,480</td>
<td>17.66%</td>
<td>13,049,143</td>
<td>98.9%</td>
<td>13,193,480</td>
<td>10,582,520</td>
<td>80.2%</td>
<td>2,466,623</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Activity 2</td>
<td>18,712,141</td>
<td>25.04%</td>
<td>18,549,377</td>
<td>99.1%</td>
<td>18,712,141</td>
<td>17,355,991</td>
<td>92.8%</td>
<td>1,193,386</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Activity 3</td>
<td>23,557,510</td>
<td>31.53%</td>
<td>23,058,340</td>
<td>97.9%</td>
<td>22,623,990</td>
<td>18,200,373</td>
<td>80.4%</td>
<td>4,857,967</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Activity 4</td>
<td>7,946,120</td>
<td>10.64%</td>
<td>7,846,498</td>
<td>98.7%</td>
<td>7,946,120</td>
<td>6,132,305</td>
<td>77.2%</td>
<td>1,714,193</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Govern 5</td>
<td>11,305,869</td>
<td>15.13%</td>
<td>11,304,754</td>
<td>100.0%</td>
<td>11,305,869</td>
<td>9,345,751</td>
<td>82.7%</td>
<td>1,959,003</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total</strong></td>
<td>74,715,120</td>
<td>100.00%</td>
<td>73,888,112</td>
<td>98.8%</td>
<td>73,781,600</td>
<td>61,616,941</td>
<td>83.5%</td>
<td>12,191,171</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Note:** The table above provides a detailed breakdown of the financial commitments and payments made by the European Food Safety Authority (EFSA) in 2010, categorized under different activities. The percentages indicate the proportion of each category relative to the total amount committed or paid. The RAL column represents the ratio of the amount paid to the committed amount, providing insight into the efficiency of payment.
ABB Appropriations 2010 (%)

- Activity 1 = Provision of scientific opinions and advice and risk assessment approaches
- Activity 2 = Evaluation of products, substances and claims subject to authorisation
- Activity 3 = Data collection, scientific cooperation and networking
- Activity 4 = Communication and dialogue
- Govern 5 = Governance
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