Parma, 13 April, 2013
EFSA/AF/M/2013/460/PUB/FINAL

Minutes

FORTY SEVENTH MEETING OF THE ADVISORY FORUM DUBLIN (IRELAND), 6-7 MARCH 2013

MEMBERS OF THE ADVISORY FORUM

Chair: *Catherine Geslain-Lanéelle,* Executive Director, EFSA

Belgium	*Benoît Horion*	Latvia	*Aivars Bērziņš*
Bulgaria	*Boiko Likov*	Lithuania	*Snieguole Šćeponavicienė*
Cyprus	*Popi Kanari*	Luxembourg	*Patrick Hau*
Czech Republic	*Jitka Götzová*	Malta	*Ingrid Busuttil*
Denmark	*Anders Permin*	Netherlands	*Antoon Opperhuizen*
Estonia	*Piret Priisalu*	Norway	*Lars E. Hanssen*
Finland	*Matti Aho*	Poland	*Jacek Postupolski*
France	*Rozenn Saunier*	Portugal	*Jorge Reis*
Germany	*Andreas Hensel*	Romania	*Liviu Rusu*
Greece	*Eirini Tsigarida*	Slovakia	*Zuzana Bírošová*
Hungary	*Maria Szeitzné Szabó*	Slovenia	*Ada Hocevar Grom*
Iceland	*Jón Gíslason*	Spain	*Ana Canals*
Ireland	*Alan Reilly*	Sweden	*Leif Busk*
Italy	*Giancarlo Belluzzi*	United Kingdom	*Alisdair Wotherspoon*

OBSERVERS

Croatia	*Zorica Jurković*	Switzerland	*Michael Beer*
FYR of Macedonia	*Svetlana Tomeska Mickova*	Turkey	*Nergiz Őzbağ*
Serbia	*Vera Katić*		

European Commission	*Jeannie Vergnettes*	Chair of EFSA Management Board	*Sue Davies*
European Parliament	*Pilar Ayuso*		
European Parliament	*Marta Enguita*		

REPRESENTATIVES OF THE EUROPEAN FOOD SAFETY AUTHORITY

Advisory Forum secretariat: *Elena Marani, Jeffrey Moon, Saadia Noorani and Elena Zeraschi*.

Per Bergman	*Marta Hugas**
*Bernard Bottex**	*Karine Lheureux**
Theodorus Brock (Vice-Chair of the PPR Panel)	*Tobin Robinson**
Stef Bronzwaer	*Alberto Spagnolli*
Hubert Deluyker	*Andras Szoradi**
Herman Fontier	*Bernhard Url*
Anne-Laure Gassin	

(=by telephone)*

1 WELCOME AND OPENING OF THE MEETING

Catherine Geslain-Lanéelle opened the meeting and passed the floor to Minister Simon Coveney, Irish Minister of Agriculture, Food and the Marine. Mr Coveney welcomed the AF members to Dublin and Dublin Castle and noted the importance of the Agri-Food industry to Ireland, the credibility that EFSA had built in the last 10 years in the area of food safety and the need for continuing to work in a cooperative manner across Europe, citing the recent incident involving the fraudulent substation of beef with horsemeat and the consequential safety concerns on the presence of phenylbutazone in meat products. Catherine Geslain-Lanéelle welcomed the comments from the Minister and noted the need for continuing to work in a cooperative way and welcomed the support of the Food Safety Authority of Ireland in EFSA's work and in organising the meeting. Catherine welcomed new AF members from Estonia and Latvia who were attending the meeting for the first time and noted apologies from Austria and Montenegro.

2 ADOPTION OF THE AGENDA

The Agenda was adopted with the inclusion of items on the NEPT programme and the establishment of an AF Discussion Group on Scientific Cooperation.

3. FEEDBACK/QUESTIONS ON THE EXECUTIVE DIRECTOR'S PROGRESS REPORT

The Executive Director's Progress Reports to the Management Board meeting in December 2012 and March 2013 were shared with the AF members. No issues were raised.

4. EXCHANGE OF VIEWS WITH THE CHAIR OF EFSA'S MANAGEMENT BOARD AND EFSA'S LIAISON MEP

Catherine Geslain-Lanéelle introduced the Chair of the Management Board, Sue Davies, who briefly outlined the Board's priorities for the coming years in relation to the Multi-Annual Plan and the Board's recommendations relating to the external evaluation report; sustainability of EFSA's operations, increasing trust, enhancing EU risk assessment capacity and clarity and accessibility of EFSA communication. Catherine Geslain-Lanéelle also introduced Pilar Ayuso, EFSA's contact MEP and member of the ENVI Committee who outlined the continuing challenges for EFSA and the need for cooperation and sharing of science in meeting its objectives.

Norway welcomed the recommendations of the Management Board and noted the resource problem of providing experts and posed the question of how to ensure the independence of new Board members. Sue Davies outlined the procedures used in the selection of board members, noting the selection process, the adoption of a Code of Conduct and the emphasis placed on EFSA being the primary interest of members.

Ireland welcomed the development of the Multi-Annual Plan and noted that self tasking is an area which should be developed further and noted the importance of research linked to the Framework Programmes, the developments in the area of data collection and the need for ensuring the best experts from all fields and advocated getting the correct balance been public and private expertise. Ireland also noted the major challenge and sustainability of having leading scientists work on a voluntary basis as EFSA experts. Sue Davies agreed on the need to contribute to the development of the Commission's framework programmes like Horizon 2020 and to look at ways of developing future expertise.

Germany noted the need for a more strategic approach in how to interact with the MS and welcomed the possibility of exchange of staff between MS institutions and EFSA. Germany also noted the need for greater interaction with laboratory services. Finland noted the high workload on assessing regulated products and the restraints on being able to recruit the best experts. Spain welcomed further opportunity for increasing scientific cooperation through grants and the work of panels and Focal Points to explore ways of increasing efficiency. Belgium noted the recommendations relating to cooperation with EU institutions, streamlining regulation workflows and data availability and questioned what concrete actions would follow. Denmark noted the situation on limitation of funding through

grants and the restrictions on private funding. Sue Davies agreed on the need to contribute to the development of the Commission's framework programmes like Horizon 2020.

Sue Davies also noted that it was important to make the best use of experts and ensuring collaboration with the MS trough the panels. She agreed that transparency was fundamental for independence, but that there is a need to get the right balance and agreed that there is a need to work on improving cooperation and collaboration at national levels in the areas of research, laboratory work and data sharing.

In relation to Regulated Products, the Commission noted that the impact assessment on fees had been published with the recommended option of maintaining the status quo. The requirement to change not only the founding regulation, Regulation (EC) 178/2002 and around 30 relevant regulations relating to authorisations as will as the perceptions of independence were seen as particular areas of concern.

5 STRATEGIC DISCUSSION ON EFSA'S WORK WITH MEMBER STATES

5.1 EFSA's Draft Multi-Annual Plan 2014-2016

Alberto Spagnolli presented an update on the development of EFSA's multi-annual plan and the draft plan was tabled for discussion with the AF members.

Ireland welcomed the comprehensive plan and highlighted the communications strategy as being an important area of development along with training development and suggested an analysis of communications during food crises. Anne-Laure Gassin noted that the use of social media was a standing item for the AFCWG meetings. Germany agreed on the importance of the communications aspect of EFSA's work.

Spain noted that scientific cooperation was not yet well developed in the plan and that while better use of scientific experts can be made by having preparatory work done for the panels, final opinions still needed to be done with the external experts. Sweden asked whether the Management Board had any discussions on issues such as social sciences in relation to 'other legitimate factors' relating to formation of opinions. Sue Davies noted that other factors influence perception of risk, but mostly 'other legitimate factors' are risk management issues and highlighted the importance placed in framing the questions in order to address public concerns in the context of science.

Catherine Geslain-Lanéelle noted the points made by the MS and indicated that the plan would be revised as necessary before the plan was shared with the Management Board.

Action 1: Draft MAP to be updated to reflect comments from the AF members before finalisation

5.2 Feedback on AF Discussion Group on future needs in research for risk assessment.

Stef Bronzwaer presented details on the development of the discussion paper which included outline details for a new grant scheme and proposals of research topics which might benefit from grant assistance or be suitable for consideration under the Horizon 2020.

Norway welcomed the approach being taken and suggested that in relation to communications, the communication of 'uncertainty' should be a focus. Germany welcomed the proposals on a new grant scheme and emphasised the need for reducing the administrative burden on managing grant applications. Germany also highlighted the fact that if more than 50% contribution from the applicant would be required, there could be difficulties in finding participation. Germany further questioned the limitations and ownership of the data/project outcomes and suggested that IT development would be needed to make a more effective system to enable electronic submissions of applications.

France welcomed the MS inputs into the proposals and supported Germany in relation to the comments on decreasing the administrative burden. In relation to funding, France questioned whether funding would be limited to public institutions only or to public/private institutions, how the AF would be involved in the selection of proposals and whether the new scheme would be in addition to the existing grant scheme or replace it.

Cyprus supported the comments of Germany regarding the level of contribution, noting that 50-60% contribution from EFSA should be considered a minimum, with any lower contribution posing an obstacle for organisations to participate.

Hubert Deluyker noted that under the new Financial Regulation the administration procedures had been reviewed and simplified. Stef Bronzwaer acknowledged the comments on administrative burden. In relation to ownership, Stef indicated that the beneficiary owns the output, but they should be in the public domain. The rate of co-financing and the sources of external funding is an issue still to be determined and there will be further discussion with MS in the coming months. The new grant scheme would very likely come in addition to the existent grants

Stef Bronzwaer indicated that comments on the proposals could be made until 5 April and further consultation will be undertaken with the EFSA's Panels and Networks with the expectation that calls for proposals will be operational from 2014.

Catherine Geslain-Lanéelle concluded with a proposal that a short document be developed explaining how the new grant scheme would work to be shared with the AF members, Focal Points, Article 36 organisations and Panels.

Action 2: AF members to comment on proposed new grant scheme (by April 5) and on Horizon 2020 priorities by 8 March

5.3 Cooperation in the Pesticides area

5.3.1 The work of the Pesticides Panel, Unit and Networks

Herman Fontier of EFSA's Pesticides Unit and Theo Brock, Vice Chair of the PPR Panel presented an overview of the panel and network activities in the area of pesticides.

In relation to the question posed on interaction with the PPR panel activities, Germany noted that a more 'personal' invitation to contribute comments on scientific opinions and guidance would be welcome. On access to data, Spain indicated that if data is requested to be in a prescribed form under official control programmes, it will be made available. Problems may arise when data is required in a particular format, but this has not been communicated to MS. France asked how the decision to undertake a public consultation is taken. Theo Brock replied that public consultation is undertaken on major outputs and always for guidance documents.

Sweden noted that in relation to framing of questions, there was frequent consultation with the Standing Committee on Food Chain and Animal Health and asked if this was typical. Theo Brock indicated that discussion on protection goals was not easy or clear and it is necessary to obtain clarity to provide suitable options.

Finland noted that it was acceptable for data gathered through monitoring programmes to be used by EFSA in scientific opinions, but would not be keen for it to be used in other scientific publications. Germany noted the format of data being important for it's intended use and the need for a common catalogue to be established. Germany also noted that data from MS sent to the Commission was aggregated for EFSA use. The Commission noted that in the area of contaminants, there was clear guidance on what data should be communicated and clarification could also be provided in the area of pesticides.

Catherine Geslain-Lanéelle thanked Herman Fontier and Theo Brock for presenting the work of the Panel and Network.

5.3.2 Trends recorded from the pesticide residues monitoring in Cyprus

Cyprus presented information on results from the pesticide residues monitoring programme, highlighting in particular seasonal problems with watermelons and the use of peppermint either as a food ingredient or as an infusion.

Herman Fontier indicated that the information presented by Cyprus would need to be considered further and that the first attempt at a cumulative exposure assessment would be published in the near future.

5.4 Meat Products Authenticity Study – Lessons Learned

Ireland presented a detailed review of the current incident involving the use of undeclared horse meat in beef products stressing the importance of cooperation between MS and the need for a sound basis in science when publicising adverse test results.

Ireland noted that the use of DNA testing should become normal practice and the difficult issues relating to acceptability of 'carry over' product (between production of different products) and the impact for certain consumer groups such as religious groups need to be considered. The provenance of meat raises questions on it safety as it may not be fit for human consumption due to it bypassing food safety controls and therefore presenting a microbiological or parasite risk. The UK supported the concerns on 'carry over' product and referred to what were 'achievable, detectable and acceptable' limits.

Finland noted that the basis for the crisis was lack of concern by food business operators on quality and origin of ingredients, which were risk management issues.

Italy noted the concerns on traceability, control and the use of veterinary drugs. Spain note that although the incident was not primarily a food safety issue, there was confusion in the communications message and argued that the national food agency was best suited for managing the incident.

Bernhard Url advised the members that the Commission had given a mandate to EFSA and EMA to conduct a risk assessment on phenylbutazone in horse meat. EFSA will be preparing a statement through a joint working group with the work to be completed by 15 April. Anne-Laure Gassin noted the importance of giving meaningful information when communicating risks and underlined the difference of bute being present in horsemeat leading to involuntary use (as in residues) as opposed to voluntary use (as in medicines).

The Netherlands indicted that a national risk assessment had been conducted and shared the details with the members. Germany emphasised the importance of a coordinated response between laboratories when dealing with such EU wide incidents. Romania supported Germany on this point.

Catherine Geslain-Lanéelle thanked Ireland for sharing the experience and lessons learned and suggested that further activities were needed in the area of veterinary drug residues in terms of expressing the risk correctly.

Action 3: The Netherlands to send final advice on "Risks to public health from horsemeat" to the AF Secretariat for circulation to AF members.

5.5 EFSA's Position Paper on Whole Genome Sequencing

Marta Hugas presented information on EFSA's paper on Whole Genome Sequencing in particular noting a mandate for BIOHAZ to support on establishing a molecular data base in specific areas, a self task on current view and prospective methods in molecular typing and outbreak investigation and surveillance and holding a colloquium on whole genome sequencing.

Denmark asked if there would be involvement from ISO. Italy welcomed the initiative and outlined national activities in the area and expressed a willingness for collaboration. The Netherlands agreed that harmonisation was important in data storage and wondered who would own the data, noting the need for public access and not to leave development in the hands of private companies.

The UK agreed with the details outlined in the paper and urged EFSA to engage in the Global Microbial Identifier (GMI) project initiative which included action plans, road maps and pilot studies being developed, with the next meeting being held in the US in September. Ireland also supported the initiative and noted the high level of activity in the international arena.

Marta Hugas stated EFSA intended to work with the National Reference Laboratories and agreed that data storage was a critical issue, informing the members that there were ongoing discussions with the Commission on access to current databases. Marta advised that EFSA was aware of the activities of GMI and had participated in its last meeting.

The UK highlighted discussions from a workshop on the topic organised by the FSA Chief Scientist, held in 2012, and how advances in the technology, knowledge and capability were starting to drive more routine use of whole genome sequencing approaches. Sweden proposed that action be taken quickly to ensure that it was not a case of developing a new system which would quickly be obsolete. Bernhard Url noted that mandate would be for systematically collecting data on food and human isolates and agreed that any system should be adaptable to include new technology.

Germany agreed in principal to the work outlined but recognised that a great deal of work would need to be done. Latvia suggested that the lessons learned for the 'pulse-net' system could be helpful. Finland recognised the need for urgent action and asked how 'patented' sequences would be dealt with as if private companies hold patents on genome sequences it would not be possible to store data in public access databases.

Catherine Geslain-Lanéelle noted that the recommendations on following international activities would be followed and the AF would receive updates on progress of the work. Consideration would also be given to the use of Article 36 grant for additional cooperation activities.

Action : UK to send web link relating to the GMI project for circulation by the secretariat

5.6 Self Review of Networks

Jeffrey Moon presented the conclusions and recommendations of the 'self review' of EFSA's Scientific Networks, including the proposal to establish a network in the area of Food Ingredients and Packaging (FIP).

France presented a proposal to establish a network on 'nutrivigilance' covering adverse reporting of products such as food supplements, novel foods and food for particular nutritional purposes.

Spain welcomed the review of networks and noted the importance of harmonisation and coordination at national level, remembering that participants represent the Member State and not as individual experts. Ireland welcomed the work of the networks as means of collaboration and agreed with the recommendations. Norway supported the comments of Spain and Ireland and would welcome the role of Focal Points in improving the national coordination of networks. Greece and Sweden welcomed the recommendations of the report and the possible role for Focal Points.

Belgium requested clarification on the need for coordination at national level, as the networks covered specific areas of expertise, but noted the need to provide support of representatives. Belgium noted that the FIP area covered a wide remit and the mandate would need to be appropriate. The UK also noted the broad area covered by FIP and was unsure of what role the Focal Points could play in better coordination of the networks at national level but noted that the situation was different in each MS.

Slovakia shared national experience of AF member and Focal Point working in close cooperation to achieve good coordination and support among network representatives.

Spain, Ireland, Belgium, The Netherlands, Luxembourg, Greece, Sweden, Cyprus, Denmark and Slovakia supported the proposal from France on 'nutrivigilance'.

Catherine Geslain-Lanéelle concluded that the AF members supported the recommendations of the network 'self review' with an additional recommendation to be included on the relevance and added value of networks. She noted that the role and responsibilities of Focal Points in contributing and supporting networks should be developed further and that while there was agreement for the need to establish a FIP network, the Terms of reference would need to reflect the broad cope of the topic. Catherine noted the support for the proposal on establishing a 'nutrivigilance' network and proposed that a pilot be undertaken with volunteer MS. This could be supported through a grant.

Action 4: FIP to provide draft mandate with Terms of Reference for establishing a network in the area of FIP for discussion at 48th AF meeting

Action 5: Recommendations of the 'self review' of networks to be finalised based on comments from the AF

Action 6: Pilot project on 'nutrivigilance' to be developed with volunteer MS for further discussion

5.7 Cooperation in the EMRISK area

Tobin Robinson provided an overview of the activities in the EMRISK area, including bee health, chemical mixtures, red meat and energy drinks. On red meat, Tobin advised that the link with cancer was not considered an emerging issue and that it was not clear that it came within the remit of EFSA.

Sweden asked that a written summary be provided of the views on red meat and asked whether it was within EFSA's remit to undertake a review of the current work available in order to better inform risk management. Hubert Deluyker indicated that it would be up to the Commission to determine whether EFSA should be given a mandate for technical assistance on the matter.

Ireland questioned whether the horsemeat issue would have been picked up through the EMRISK network. Tobin outlined the difficult aspects of fraud and trying to anticipate specific problems at any given time, but looking at key drivers for information on areas where fraud may occur.

Catherine Geslain-Lanéelle agreed that EMRISK would provide a written update on red meat issue to Sweden to conclude the item.

Action 7: EMRISK to provide feedback to AF members on red meat and cancer following next meeting of the EMRISK standing working group

Action 8: Energy drinks to be included on the Agenda of the 48th AF meeting

5.8 EFSA's e-submission project

Karine Lheureux introduced EFSA's current activities in relation to the electronic submission of documents relating to regulated products to EFSA, and requested information from the MS on their experience with e-submission and what tools are currently being used at national level for this purpose.

The Netherlands suggested that other non-food areas, such as pharmaceutical control agencies, may have more experience in this area. Hubert Deluyker suggested that there may be a need to coordinate at national level and provide feedback to EFSA on experience with e-submission projects.

Catherine Geslain-Lanéelle proposed that members consider the questions presented and provide feedback within the next month.

Action 9: MS to provide information on 'e-submission' implementation and experiences at national level by 12 April

6 OTHER MATTERS RAISED BY EFSA AND THE MEMBER STATES

6.1 Endocrine Active Substances (EAS)

Bernard Bottex presented details of the work of the Scientific Committee on endocrine active substances, highlighting the outcomes to be included in the Scientific Opinion adopted by the Scientific Committee on 27-28 February and outlining the proposals for a stakeholder meeting on 20 March.

Germany provided information detailing an optional model for considering EAS subject to different regulations.

Sweden appreciated the update from the Scientific Committee and asked for clarification on the next steps. Catherine Geslain-Lanéelle clarified that it would be up to the Commission to take the information and decide further actions. Sweden noted the importance of communications in relation to the Scientific Opinion.

The Netherlands welcomed the information from Germany and the possibility of further collaboration indicating there was a national request to look at such aspects. Spain also welcomed the information which would be of benefit for the national Agency.

Catherine Geslain-Lanéelle noted the importance of communication aspects associated with the publication of the Opinion and reiterated the details of the proposed stakeholder meeting and press briefing to be held in Brussels.

Action 10: Germany to send information on approach to assessment of endocrine active substances to be shared with AF members

6.2 EFSA's Transparency Initiative

Hubert Deluyker presented EFSA's developing activities to continue to address the issue of transparency with proposals to establish two consultation groups involving AF members, The Commission, and possibly Members of the European Parliament in the area of Data Access and Quality Review. He informed the members of the forum about a stakeholder event being organised in October.

Norway supported this important work. Germany supported the approach and questioned whether Quality Management System (QMS) would be implemented across EFSA. Catherine Geslain-Lanéelle advised that QMS was being developed as part of the multi annual plan for implementation by 2016.

Belgium raised concerns over the initiative on data access and the possibility of data transmission being restricted due to concerns over access. Germany raised a question on how older Opinions will be reviewed. Finland welcomed the possibility of consultation on self tasking mandates, advocating a pilot scheme. Per Bergman noted the consultation carried out by the US FDA on key mandates. Hubert Deluyker underlined the need for a clear policy on where to give access and where not in a consistent and transparent manner.

Catherine Geslain-Lanéelle concluded noting the support for the creation of two discussion groups to work in parallel with the stakeholder platform ahead of the planned meeting in October.

Action 11: Two Transparency preparatory groups to be established relating to process transparency and data sharing: To include representatives of the AF , the Commission and European Parliament

6.3 Observers attendance at Scientific Committee and Panel meetings

Andras Szoradi presented details of EFSA's ongoing initiative to encourage observers at Scientific Committee and Panel meetings noting both good and bad experience.

Sweden asked if there had been any cases of experts being lobbied as a result of an open meeting. The UK shared national experience of open meetings which are held regularly indicating that such occurrences had not been noted. Per Bergman and Hubert Deluyker noted that lobbying from NGOs did occur, not in relation to open meetings, but as part of normal correspondence and contact from stakeholders. Theo Brock shared his experience of an open meeting of the PPR Panel which caused no particular anxiety to the members.

6.4 Work Programme Sharing 2013

France introduced the ANSES work programme for 2013 and proposed better sharing of major work activities in coming 6 to 12 months, noting that the sharing of mandates on the IEP and among Focal Points was not being used to best effect.

Anne Laure-Gassin noted that the AFCWG share information on major outputs from a communications perspective. Stef Bronzwaer proposed that the use of the existing tools be reviewed in order to determine the best way to capture such information.

Catherine Geslain-Lanéelle encouraged MS to use the current tools for sharing information with updates to be provided at future meetings.

Action 12: MS to use existing 'work planning' tools to inform on proposed major work activities on a routine basis. EFSA to consider current tools available for presenting best way of sharing information at the 48th AF meeting

6.5 Barium in mineral water

Poland presented details of the occurrence of Barium in food and water and the intake levels in Poland, particularly with reference to the levels in natural mineral waters of the Carpathian Mountains.

The Commission indicated the possible need to discuss within the SCoFCAH if there was a need to reconsider levels established in the mineral waters Directive.

Catherine Geslain-Lanéelle noted that the problem was one that potentially affects other countries in the region and proposed that further consideration of the matter was likely to be needed in those countries.

Action 13: Neighbouring countries to provide any information on Barium intake levels to Poland.

6.6 Request for EFSA to assess the safety of botanicals

France introduced the proposal to EFSA, supported by Germany, Denmark, Luxembourg Belgium and Spain to consider risk assessments on 'botanical' supplements.

Hubert Deluyker advised that the matter had been discussed with the Scientific Committee who advocated a tiered approach.

Catherine Geslain-Lanéelle stated that EFSA advocated a structured, prioritised approach and requested that the MS opened a dialogue with the Commission, being aware of the potential impact on resources. A reply from EFSA to the MS is to be provided.

Action 14: Letters to MS and the Commission regarding proposed activities in relation to assessment of botanicals to be shared with MS

7 ANY OTHER BUSINESS

7.1 Advisory Group on Risk Communication

Anne-Laure Gassin noted the renewing of the Terms of reference and Mandate for the Advisory Group on Risk Communication and sought the views of members in identifying experts from a range of fields (social science, communications and other relevant areas) who could participate in the group.

7.2 Human Library

Ireland informed the members of an initiative to target SME to a food safety 'open day' involving experts being on hand to act as a 'human library' to answer questions on any aspect of food safety, but noted the difficulty in reaching the target audience.

Per Bergman thanked Ireland for sharing their experience which would help in EFSA's considerations on how to interact with stakeholders.

7.3 Symposium on Lead in Game Meat

Germany advised members of a symposium to be held on 18-19 March relating to the topic on lead in game meat, with a risk assessment to follow.

Sweden informed members that advice had been issued to pregnant women on this issue.

7.4 National Experts in Professional Training (NEPT) Programme

Stef Bronzwaer provided an update on the NEPT scheme allowing professional training of national experts professional training with EFSA for between 3 and 5 months and reminded AF members to consider the scheme which is ongoing.

8 CLOSURE OF THE MEETING

Catherine Geslain-Lanéelle thanked the Irish AF member for hosting the meeting Dublin Castle and the AF members and observers for their active contributions.

Catherine also thanked the AF Secretariat and EFSA staff who contributed from Parma for their support.