

Annex 2

Overview table of the Member States answers to the Questionnaire

Country	1.1				1.2					1.3		1.4		
	1829 institutes	1829 institutes members of EFSA net	1829 assessments	1829 reports published (Language)	2001 institutes	2001 institutes members of EFSA net	2001 assessments B	2001 reports B published	2001 assessments C	2001 reports C published	1829 institutes same as 2001 institutes	coordination RA	1829 interface RA - RM	2001 interface RA - RM
AT	4	yes	all notified	no (upon request)	3	yes, all 3	some in the past, now none	none (upon request)	all notified	would be	yes	ministry (CA)	RA and RM within ministry	input forwarded to ministry
BE	2	yes	6 (16 in process)	yes, EN	2	yes, all	3	yes	10	yes	yes	cooperation agreement CA's	biosafety council	biosafety council
BG	2				1	yes	none	would be in BG	none	would be in BG	no	no established coordination	commission of experts	consultative commission
CY	3	yes	none	none	3	yes	none	none	none	none	yes	n/a	regular meetings of Nat. committees	regular meetings of Nat. committees
CZ	1	yes	15	none	4	yes	12		13	summary and ERA conclusions	no	good contacts	ministry hosts committees for RA and RM	ministry coordinates RA and RM
DK	4	yes	yes since 1986	none	4	all					no	n/a	none, scientific advise for the discretion of CA	none, scientific advise for the CA discretion
EE	2	yes	none	none	2	yes	none	none	none	none	no	several members belong to both advisory committees	CA asks RA report	CA responsible for the interface, no experience yet
FI	5	4	all EFSA dossiers, but not in full	not on the web but public in FI	10	3 main ones	20	not on the web but public in FI	all EFSA dossiers	not on the web but public in FI	no	national decree for a common view by consensus under 1829. overlapping representatives for 2001	experts and control bodies are the same and operate under same ministries	members in the RA represent the ministries
FR	2	yes	all since 1999	yes, FR	2	yes	111	yes, FR	12	yes, FR	no	attendance to each others meetings and common meetings on particular topics	opinions sent to ministry of consumers affairs who takes the decision	opinions sent to ministry
DE	6				7		170	no (public access for 1 month)	1	yes	yes	BVL	BVL	BVL
EL	2	yes	none, comments on 20 EFSA dossiers	none	2	no			none		no	ministry coordinates for 2001 and another coordinates for 1829.	advice given to RM	
HU	3	2	none	no	3	2	18 ongoing	info yes, HU + EN	none	no	no	CA coordinates the work for 1829	CA 1829 coordinates, Biotech com. gives RA and RM advice, one veto ministry	CA 2001 coordinates, Biotech com. gives RA and RM advice, 1 veto ministry
IE	1	yes	none		1	yes	6	yes for 1 - potato, EN	none		no	informal meetings	advice to RM	CA
IT	2	yes	1	none	1	no	none	yes, IT	none	yes, IT	no (env yes)	members of both institutes are members for RA under both legislations	cooperation of institutes	interministerial evaluation commission

Country	1.1				1.2					1.3		1.4		
	1829 institutes	1829 institutes members of EFSA net	1829 assessments	1829 reports published (Language)	2001 institutes	2001 institutes members of EFSA net	2001 assessments B	2001 reports B published	2001 assessments C	2001 reports C published	1829 institutes same as 2001 institutes	coordination RA	1829 interface RA - RM	2001 interface RA - RM
LV	1	yes		none	2	yes	none	would be	none	would be	yes	same procedures	food centre	food centre
LT	5	yes		would be LT	4	yes	4				yes	n/a	ministries	ministries
LU														
MT	1	yes	none	n/a	1	yes	none	would be	no	would be	no	biosafety coordinating committee	food safety commission	biosafety coordinating committee
NL	8	7	all EFSA dossiers	yes, NL + EN	3	yes				yes, NL + EN	no	n/a	Dutch portal	the GMO office
NO	1	yes	24	yes NO	1	yes	2	yes (NO)	2	yes, NO	yes	n/a	advice given to RM	advice given to RM
PL														
PT	1	no			2	1 yes	1, 10 ongoing	none (upon request, PT)	none	no (upon request, PT)	no	close contact, new organisations	RA and RM are in the same organisation	
RO	1	yes	3 since 2007 (+ 17 national)	none	2	no	13	none	none	no	no	interministerial committee for exchange of info	RM (ANSVSA) is assisting the panel	Nat. Env agency in collaboration with involved authorities
SK	1	no	none	none	1	yes	1	yes, SK	none	yes, SK	no		advice given to RM	advice given to RM
SI	6	yes	none	none	1	yes	none	none	all notified	yes, SL	no	by consultation	advice given to RM (Health and Agriculture ministries)	advice given to RM (Env. ministry)

2.1		2.2		2.3		2.4		2.5		2.6		2.7		2.8									
Country	1829 number of experts	2001 number of experts	1829 CV's published by your MS	2001 CV's published by your MS	1829 scientific panel	2001 scientific panel	1829 consensus	2001 consensus	1829 discussion (or Written procedure)	2001 discussion (or Written procedure)	1829 duration experts	2001 duration appointment	1829 government officials	1829 academics	1829 independent consultants	2001 government officials	2001 academics	2001 independent consultants	1829 DOI	1829 DOI published	2001 DOI	2001 DOI published	once/annually/ per topic
AT	12 + ad hoc	12 + ad hoc	no	no	yes	yes	yes	yes	no, WP	no, WP	∞	∞	yes	yes		yes	yes		no		no		
BE	10 +SBB+ ad hoc	varies + SBB + ad hoc	no	no	no	yes+minority opinion	yes+minority opinion	both	both	4, ∞	4	yes	yes		yes	yes		yes	yes	yes	no	annual	
BG	13	15		no	yes	yes	yes	yes	yes		4	yes	yes		no	yes			yes	yes	no	per topic	
CY	7 + ad hoc	7+ ad hoc	no	no	yes	yes	yes	yes	yes	yes	∞	∞	yes	1 private sector, 3 NGO	yes	1 private sector, 3 NGO	yes	yes	yes	yes	yes	once	
CZ	12	15	yes	no	yes	yes	objections than vote	objections than vote	WP	WP, objections go in discussion	5	2		yes	yes	yes	yes	yes	yes	no	yes	no	per topic
DK	3 to 7	3 to 7	yes, not all	yes, not all	no	no	no	no	WP	WP	∞	∞	yes	yes		yes	yes		no	no	no		
EE	13	17	no	no	yes	yes	majority	majority	WP	both	∞	∞	yes	yes		yes	yes	3 NGO	no		no		
FI	5 to 10	3 to 10	upon request	upon request	no, for food yes	no	no, for food yes	majority	both	both	3	∞	yes	yes		yes	yes		for food yes	for food yes	no	no	per topic
FR	19	11	no	no	yes	no	yes + minority opinion	majority + minority opinion	yes	yes	3	3	no	yes	no	yes	yes	yes	yes	yes	yes	no, but available upon request	
DE	10 + 6 stakeholders	10 + 6 stakeholders	no	no	yes	yes	majority	majority	WP	WP	3	3	no	yes		no	yes		no		no		
EL	6	not yet	no		yes		yes		both		3		yes	yes	yes				yes	no			once
HU	3	4	no	no	yes	yes	yes	yes	yes	4	4	yes			yes				no	no	no	no	
IE	3-more	14	no	no	yes	no	CA considers advice	CA considers advice	both	both	5	3	yes	yes		yes	yes	NGOs	yes	no	yes	no	per topic
IT	varies	20	no	yes	yes	yes	yes	yes	yes	both	3	4	yes	yes	yes	yes	yes	yes	no	no	yes	no	
LV	many		some	some	yes	yes	yes	yes	both	both	∞	∞	yes	yes		yes	yes		not yet	not yet			
LT	11	11	yes	yes	yes	yes	yes	yes	both	both	∞	∞	yes						no		no		

Country	2.1		2.2		2.3		2.4		2.5		2.6		2.7		2.8									
	1829 number of experts	2001 number of experts	1829 CV's published by your MS	2001 CV's published by your MS	1829 scientific panel	2001 scientific panel	1829 consensus	2001 consensus	1829 discussion (or Written procedure)	2001 discussion (or Written procedure)	1829 duration appointment experts	2001 duration appointment	1829 government officials	1829 academics	1829 independent consultants	2001 government officials	2001 academics	2001 independent consultants	1829 DOI	1829 DOI published	2001 DOI	2001 DOI published	once/annually/ per topic	
LU																								
MT	3	12	no	no	yes	yes	yes	yes	both	both	3	3	yes			yes	yes	yes	yes	no	yes	no	per topic	
NL	2, 3, 12, 12, 12	12	no	no	no, yes for ERA	yes for ERA	yes	yes	WP	WP	4, ∞	4	yes	yes		yes	no, yes for ERA	not all	yes for ERA	no	annually			
NO	12	12 + 2 for ERA	yes	yes	yes	yes	yes + minority opinion	yes + minority opinion	yes	yes	3	3	yes	yes		yes	yes	yes	yes	yes	yes	yes	annually, per topic	
PL																								
PT		3		no	yes	no				both	∞	n/a	to be defined			yes					no			
RO	7	in progres	ye	would be	yes	yes	yes	majority	both	both	∞	4		yes		not decided yet			yes	yes			annually, per topic	
SK	3	15	no	no	no	yes	yes	yes - voting	WP	both	∞	∞		yes			yes	yes	no		no			
SI	varies	14 + ad hoc	no	no	no	yes		yes + minority opinion		WP		4				no	yes	no		yes	no	per topic		

Country	3.1 <i>MS risk assessment guidance</i>	3.2				if not, explain	Differences between 1829 and 2001 RA	particular MS activities relevant for development of RA methodologies	3.4 <i>particular future developments in GMO risk assessment</i>	3.5 <i>what to be discussed on 13 november 2007</i>
		MS RA relies on OECD	MS RA relies on FAO/WHO	MS RA relies on CODEX	MS RA relies on EFSA					
AT	no	yes	yes	yes	yes		none	40 research projects	stacked events, toxicology, allergenicity, monitoring, soil-microflora	standardisation, biological relevance
BE	yes (5)	yes	yes	yes	yes		none	no		allergenicity testing, unsound feeding trials, baseline ERA
BG	no	yes		yes	yes		none			
CY	no		yes	yes	yes		none	no	nothing expected	none
CZ	no	yes		yes	yes			no	use experience in nutrition to extrapolate results from animals to human	benefits, long term consumption
DK	no	yes	(other: nordic reports)	yes	yess				benefits, guidelines for testing whole foods	
EE	no (1biosafety by 2008)	yes			yes			no	no	none
FI	1 (ERA)	yes		yes	yes		none	research on environment, developing environmental risk assessment framework and models for risk assessment	see agenda methodologies for environmental monitoring	monitoring, general surveillance and case-specific monitoring
FR	1 (now EFSA)			yes	yes			benefits, food allergies	benefits	interaction HT crops and biodiversity, resistance, case-specific monitoring versus general surveillance
DE	1 (antibiotic resistance genes)	yes			yes			no	no	none
EL	no				yes				profiling methods	new methods for testing unintended effects, review limitations of current methodologies
HU	1 (ERA)			yes	yes		none	no. (but for the pannon region: environmental impact studies to be carried out)	detailed protocol	standard protocols
IE	no				yes		none	n/a	GM animals, Medicinal products in plants	none
IT	no	yes		yes	yes		prevalent parts for 1829 is food/feed, under 2001/18 is cultivation	arrays technologies and exposure assessment	omics, exposure	none
LV	under development		yes	yes	yes		will be different in some issues		common approach where possible	none
LT	no	yes	yes		yes			a project "Risk assesment of GM plants, methodology and conclusions".	to participate for GMO risk assessment in future projects	none
LU										

Country	3.1	3.2				3.3			3.4	3.5
	<i>MS risk assessment guidance</i>	<i>MS RA relies on OECD</i>	<i>MS RA relies on FAO/WHO</i>	<i>MS RA relies on CODEX</i>	<i>MS RA relies on EFSA</i>	<i>if not, explain</i>	<i>Differences between 1829 and 2001 RA</i>	<i>particular MS activities relevant for development of RA methodologies</i>	<i>particular future developments in GMO risk assessment</i>	<i>what to be discussed on 13 november 2007</i>
MT	no	yes			yes		none	no	satndard harmonized procedures for all EU applications	none
NL	no	yes	yes	yes	yes		none	FP6, Safefoods is sponsored by Rikilt on unintended effects, improve detection methods for non-authorized species	NTO assessment	harmonization of feeding trials, statistics, pharma plants, GM animals
NO	yes from 1998 to 2002, since 2004: EFSA	yes	yes	yes	yes		none	no	no	plant protection in relation to ERA, social benefits
PL										
PT	no				yes			research projects on GMO's	more detailed and defined approach for risk assessment	GM trees, GM fish
RO		yes	yes	yes	yes			more science in the RA methodologies	cooperation with EFSA	
SK	ref. to EFSA + 1 unformal brochure	yes		yes	yes	2001/18: each RA made by other org., is assessed by rules of Ministry of Env.		no	simplified procedures for using of GMO's wih long time and with safe use	none
SI	no	yes	yes	yes	yes		none	8 nat. Projects, 1 GM trees project	methods for testing non-target organisms and baseline env. conditions	none