

## 66<sup>th</sup> Advisory Forum meeting 5-6 December, 2017

### Notes for agenda item 12

#### Background:

A presentation on EFSA's strategic and work planning was given at the 66<sup>th</sup> Advisory Forum meeting (5-6 December 2017 – Parma).

The objective was to identify the possibilities and ways for the AF members to provide their inputs to the EFSA's Work Planning and Strategy setting cycles.

The workshop engaged member discussion:

- *AF involvement*
- *Timelines*
- *Awareness on Shared results, KPIs and targets*

#### Presentation:

Ilias Papatryfon presented an overview of the AF involvement in EFSA's annual plan, followed by indications on the objectives of the breakout sessions.

Jeff Moon and Stef Bronzwaer presented relevant KPI's of the Strategic Objective 3<sup>1</sup> to allow a common understanding.

#### Breakout sessions in 4 groups:

Facilitators: Jeff Moon, Stef Bronzwaer, Ilias Papatryfon and Selomey Yamadjako.

**First part:** The AF involvement in EFSA Performance Cycle.

Members were asked to reflect on the proposed time line and actions: to see if they are realistic and that the expected inputs from the AF are clear.

The proposed timeline on AF involvement reached an overall agreement with the following comments.

#### Outcomes of the discussion:

General comments:

- An involvement via comprehensive consultation 4 times a year seems relevant but could be difficult to sustain and clarity should be given on the mechanism for consultation and feedback in practice; it should not take over the agenda but rather be integrated with the other agenda items
- EFSA should bring clarity of what is being asked to MS at each stage.

---

<sup>1</sup> [Strategy 2020 & SO3](#)

- Members would welcome the presentation of the intervention logic with the links between the overall results/targets and the work programme
- It is suggested to communicate to the AF only the main and relevant highlights from the quarterly reports.
- It was suggested to adjust the cycle with the budget cycle in MS (feasible?).
- MS would like to have EFSA's work plan (2019) well in advance in order to be able to take it into consideration (precise timeline for consultation to be provided ?)

March:

- The identification of key drivers should be reworded as a "quick horizontal scanning" of changing challenges, priorities, etc.
- It was questioned if the topics tackled during the March meeting would not be too ambitious, especially in relation with the availability of resources and the early timing in the year.

June:

- An extra opportunity for the AF members to provide inputs via an electronic format in the G&P planning would be welcomed.
- It was mentioned that sessions could be too ambitious especially regarding the G&P discussions.

October:

- It was suggested to bring the feedback survey (last on the list of actions) on top of the list as from the survey cascade the updates and other actions

December:

- Could bring forward the discussion on the "horizontal scanning" as a first opportunity for the AF and in preparation of the March meeting.

**Second part:** The discussion focused on Strategic Objectives 3 *"Cooperation and expertise management: Build the EU's scientific assessment capacity and knowledge community"*.

The questions to be answered were the following:

- Are shared expected results appropriate, are they relevant, is anything missing?
- Are KPIs relevant, is anything missing, are they clear and measurable?
- Are targets realistic and ambitious enough?

**Outcome of the discussion:**

1) Intermediary impact: "Increased efficiency at European and international level"

- The search for more efficiency has 2 objectives a) to avoid incident and b) to avoid duplication. This should be reflected with 2 different KPIs.
- For what concerns the RA database, the KPI should be reformulated or another indicator should be added to reflect the regular/ continuous

update of the entries in the database done by the MS. It was mentioned that EFSA has no mean to influence the activity being performed by the MS.

- To avoid duplication between MS and EFSA in performing risk assessments, a procedure should be set in place and be monitored. It was requested that MS RAs should be more used by EFSA than it is done at the present time; a challenge to be assessed is how to align this with the current regulatory framework
- EFSA to inform the MS of the mandates it receives at an earlier stage to allow planning of the authorities.
- In the first KPI, instead of "number of MS" active in sharing it should be mentioned "number of countries".

2) Intermediary impact: "Increased satisfaction of MS, EU and international partners with regard to the building and sharing of risk assessment capacity and a knowledge community at organisational and individual level, in general and via specific tools (e.g. grants)"

- In relation with the number of pages visited, it should refer to "scientific content" pages.
- It was mentioned that the evaluation of the MS satisfaction through yearly survey could be time and effort consuming. Maybe beyond MS capacity. A combination of survey and deep interviews could be included. It was reminded that the approach via a comprehensive survey vs a limited number of deep interviews was a recommendation of the AF in 2017, and that efforts would be made for leaning the approach (e.g. reducing the number of questions).

3) Outcome: Building and sharing capacity within the risk assessment community at organisational level.

- It was stated that a RA agenda depends so much on external factors and fluctuates a lot that is very hard to assure that all projects are taken up in the Research agenda index.
- In relation with the Art 36 activities it was requested to add an indicator on the collaboration between MS.
- It was mentioned that the target on the number of joint projects seems to be too ambitious.
- For the RA agenda take-up, some clarity should be given if the number of joint projects are cumulative and continuous or are we talking only of new ones.
- Rather than indicating the number of joint projects/partners, EFSA should indicate the number of incentives it introduces to encourage this.
- A question was raised on whether the target on the number of international partners is not too ambitious.
- It was asked if the "number of projects not funded by EFSA" should be taken into consideration as EFSA can't really influence it.
- It was questioned whether the "number of support letters" should be mentioned under the Outcome indicators category, as it is more of an activity/output indicator; here or not. On the contrary, the previous

indicator "number of research recommendations taken up by MS/EU/International research programmes/funding schemes should be re-introduced.

4) Outcome: Building and sharing within the risk assessment community at individual level

- Questions were raised on whether the impacts of the BREXIT or the new Independence policy have been taken into consideration in the targets set for the number of experts in panels?
- A suggestion was made to add an indicator on the the gender balance by 2021, reflecting on education policies in certain countries paying more attention to STEM
- It was asked to rephrase the wording in the baseline towards cumulative panel expert impact factor
- The wording of "building and sharing within the RA community at the individual level" does not match with the indicator "Panel and working group ..". It was unclear by the wording if it is the individual expert or the panel in the impact factor.
- It was mentioned that public employees may come out –due to the nature of their activities - low on the impact factor and it should be considered.
- For "the expertise pool coverage" indicator, increased attractiveness could be assessed by publication recognition.

5) Outcome: Strengthened capacity using innovative ways.

- No comments (no time to address it)