Final Minutes

60th MEETING OF THE EFSA ADVISORY FORUM UTRECHT, THE NETHERLANDS; 8TH-9TH JUNE 2016

Chair: Bernhard Url

Members	
Austria	*Klemens Fuchs*
Belgium	*Benoît Horion*
Bulgaria	*Boiko Likov*
Croatia	*Andrea Gross-Bošković*
Cyprus	*Popi Kanari*
Czech Republic	*Jitka Götzová*
Denmark	*Flemming Bager*
Estonia	*Martin Minjajev*
Finland	*Matti Aho*
France	*Charlotte Grastilleur*
Germany	*Andreas Hensel*
Greece	*Eirini Tsigarida*
Hungary	*Maria Szeitzné Szabó*
Iceland	*Jon Gislason*
Ireland	*Pamela Byrne*
Italy	*Gaetana Ferri*
Latvia	*Aivars Bērziņš*
Luxembourg	*Patrick Hau*
Netherlands	*Antoon Opperhuizen*
Netherlands	*Jacqueline Castenmiller*
Norway	*Danica Grahek-Ogden*
Poland	*Jacek Postupolski*
Portugal	*Pedro Portugal Gaspar*
Slovak Republic	*Petra Gerekova*
Spain	*Ana Canals*
Sweden	*Per Bergman*
United Kingdom	*Penny Bramwell*

Observers	
Albania	*Pamela Radovani*
FYR of Macedonia	*Zoran Popovski*
Switzerland	*Barbara Engeli*
EC	*Jeannie Vergnettes*
EC	*Lorenzo Terzi*
ECDC	*Dominique Monnet*

AF Secretariat	
Stef Bronzwaer	*Jeff Moon*
Julia Finger	

EFSA Representatives	
Barbara Gallani	*Marta Hugas*
Juliane Kleiner	*Hans Verhagen*
*Ana Afonso**	*Tobin Robinson**
*Caroline Merten**	

** Teleconference*

Apologies:

Slovenia, Turkey, Romania, Malta, Switzerland, Lithuania, Serbia, Montenegro

1. OPENING OF MEETING

Bernhard Url, Chair of the meeting opened the 60th Advisory Forum (AF) meeting and welcomed new members to the plenary, namely Charlotte Grastilleur, new AF member representing France, Pamela Byre, CEO of the FSAI, representing Ireland and Danica Grahek-Ogden, former FP and now AF Member of Norway.

The Chair also welcomed Lorenzo Terzi from the European Commission and introduced Barbara Gallani, attending the AF meeting for the first time after having taken up her position as Head of the Communications and External Relations Department (COMMS) on 1 May 2016. Barbara also attended for the first time the AFCWG meeting, taking place 7-8 June and in parallel session to the AF in Utrecht.

The Chair gave the floor to Antoon Opperhuizen, AF member from the Netherlands, who welcomed participants to Utrecht and the Netherlands.

The Chair informed that the minutes of the 59th AF meeting, which took place on 8-9 March in Parma have been approved and published on EFSA's website.

In line with the requirements on independence, members were asked for additional Oral Declarations of Interest (ODoIs) and no additional interest was declared.

2. ADOPTION OF THE AGENDA

The draft meeting agenda was opened for additional items. The following items had been included under agenda item 13 Any Other Business (AoB): "Data Quality" and an update on the "Fellowship Programme" from EFSA's side and " Threshold for Allergens in food"

and "Red meat production chain analysis" by the Netherlands. The plenary then adopted the agenda.

3. MATTERS ARISING

3.a ED Progress Report

The EFSA Progress Report for the period 15 February to 31 May 2016 was shared with the EFSA Management Board (MB) and has been circulated among the AF members before the meeting. No matters were raised for discussion.

3.b Action Points from last meeting

The Action Points of the last meeting have been shared with the AF members with the final documents for the meeting. All Action Points have been or are being addressed.

3.c ED Country Visits – DK, NO, GR, NL

Since the last meeting Denmark, Norway, Greece and the Netherlands had been visited by the ED. The Chair gave the floor to the AF members from these countries to give a verbal update on the visit. Denmark highlighted three topics discussed during the visit 17-18 March: Joint projects on Risk benefits, an expert meeting focussing on methodology and assistance and support by DTU, for example regarding terminology in food safety. A meeting with Danish industry representatives received positive feedback. Norway informed about environmental Risk Assessment (RA) as area identified for further cooperation, particularly regarding issuing of guidance documents and sharing of integrated data. On the busy agenda of the visit on 7 April were a meeting with Norwegian journalists, a meeting at the Ministry of Health and care, a meeting with the Food and Environmental Agency and a joint meeting with different ministries to exchange views on inter-ministerial cooperation and the use of RA in Risk Management (RM). Greece reported on a meeting with the Hellenic Food Authority, Art.36 organisations, Network representatives and the Scientific Council, in which Scientific Cooperation and the support of Focal Points (FPs) was discussed. The visit that took place on 14 April also included a visit to the Ministry of Agriculture with a discussion on LSD and Xyllela fastidiosa. A joint project was proposed in the area of listeria. The ED visit to the Netherlands took place on the day before the AF meeting with a visit to the Ministry, where the role of the AF and the alignment of national organisation with the AF was discussed as well as an integrated approach to RA and the production chain. Further meetings and visits took place with the NVWA, the National Institute for Public Health and the Environment (RIVM) and the Institute of Food Safety (RIKILT). Stef Bronzwaer informed that it is foreseen to share the flash reports of the ED visits with the AF after each AF meeting in order to keep the AF updated on the ongoing ED visits.

Action Point 1: EFSA to share flash reports of ED visits with AF

The Chair highlighted the adoption and publication of the EFSA Strategy, which is available on the EFSA website. Germany asked about financial implications of the EFSA strategy, as EFSA will need more funds to comply with the strategic objectives, particularly regarding international activities and the AF should support this. The Chair suggested to combine forces of EFSA and MS regarding international cooperation, as many MS are very active internationally. Regarding funds EFSA is following a multi-annual financial framework, thus the budget is fixed. The problem of under-funding and under-staffing has been addressed to the European Commission (EC) and also to the European Parliament (EP). Spain informed about international activities with Chile in which also the cooperation EFSA was mentioned. The Chair underlined the will to collaborate in these international activities. Germany suggested that a delegation of AF members should meet with the EFSA MB to discuss the funding needs to keep EFSA operational. The Chair agreed on the need to changes in the Founding Regulation, which

however will go beyond the Strategy 2020. He welcomed the inclusion of the views of the AF to this change.

The Commission confirmed that the budget issue raised is on his agenda and a well-known issue also related to the REFIT exercise. Finland asked the EC about the timetable and roadmap for REFIT and implementing changes. The Commission replied that a working paper of the EC is facing a delay, but is to be expected by the end of the year, the latest and will then be published for consultation. Spain asked about a report that was done by an external contractor and announced by the EC to be shared with MS but has not been received yet. The EC should also consider possible funding of data collection activities planned by EFSA. The Commission also confirmed that the EC was aware of the request of resources needed for data collection, which could be one of the recommendations.

4. ADVISORY FORUM OPERATION

4.a Operation of the Advisory Forum

The Chair gave the floor to Jeffrey Moon to give an update on the state-of-play of the revision of the operation of the AF, which entailed an update of the MB Operating Rules of Procedure. The update is meant to detail the full scope of the operation of the AF including its role regarding Scientific Divergence and the cooperation with Art.36 organisations and the role of the individual representatives. Internal consultation took place with input from the legal unit and an external sounding board of volunteering AF members from Belgium, France and Sweden. Jeffrey addressed the comments received by the MS, which will be considered when finalising the document after receiving further feedback from the MB on its meeting on 14-15 June and the AF. The final draft Decision is planned to be tabled for adoption by the MB in October 2016. The plenary was then invited to comment on the draft, which had been shared as a background document before the meeting. With regard to Art.5 dealing with FP, Sweden and France remarked that FPs are usually not engaging with stakeholders and consumers. Germany reminded that the original idea of establishing FPs was to have EFSA "ambassadors" in the MS, whose task was to support the AF member. France stressed the need to clarify the role to the AFCWG in the Decision. Greece and Cyprus pointed out that the role of the Permanent Representation in appointing AF members needed clarification. Belgium, France and Greece supported to change from majority votes to the need of consensus for AF decisions. Finland suggested to add to Art.1(3) regarding replacements, the possibility to get an alternate appointed by the competent authority itself, which would simplify procedures. On operational procedures, Belgium expressed that it would be good to have a deadline of 2 weeks ahead of a meeting to receive the most relevant documents, which need national consultation (Art.7(3)). Germany remarked that it is difficult to select forthcoming RA activities of importance for other MS (Art.14). According to the opinion of their legal experts, Italy supported the reference to the previous decision about the AF Secretariat. Clarification was also asked on Art.21, and reference to Art.36 organisations and rewording with regards to the practicality of ensuring the selection of the right organisations. Jeffrey explained that Art.21 was taken from the Founding Regulation, however a rewording will be explored. The sharing of information on forthcoming RA activities is still work in progress and difficult to reflect, and the role of the FP according to current practice will be reconsidered. Jeff invited MS to give further comments until the end of July. France finally expressed the need to have a rating number for the document to make sure that reference is always to the most recent version.

Action Point 2: MS to comment on draft Operational Rules of Procedures until the end of July

4.2 Preparations for Declaration of Commitment

Greece, who took part together with Ireland, Cyprus and Germany in the Discussion Group on drafting the Declaration of Commitment, designed to update the 2006 Declaration of Intent, presented the outcome to the plenary. The proposed draft is structured around an introductory text followed by 20 concise bullet points of commitment to explicit actions. France expressed concern regarding the term "commitment" and Greece reminded about the agreement on the AF meeting to show on occasion of the 10th anniversary a stronger engagement than the former intention. The Chair added that the document is an agreement of its members and neither a scientific document nor a legal obligation. France asked clarification on "coherent approach" (l.63) and "communications" (l.49), which was clarified by Greece. On question by Hungary it was also clarified that the AF legally appoints the FP (l.25). Finland suggested tosoften the wording of ll.53-55 on data sharing and pooling of knowledge. Luxembourg remarked that pre-notifications and communications (l.49) should be channelled by EFSA. The Chair thanked for the comments, which will be considered in refining the Declaration, noting that more important than the wording was the spirit of the Declaration. Spain questioned whether the Declaration could be signed by the AF member and the alternate as in many cases it was the alternate that attended meetings. It was clarified that the document would be signed on behalf of' the AF member if they were not present. The draft will be finalized including AF comments by the end of July to be ready for signature on the meeting on 28-20 September in Bratislava.

Action Point 3: MS to comment on draft Declaration of Commitment until end of July

5. Progressing the EU Risk Assessment Agenda (EURAA)

The Chair passed the lead to Hans Verhagen, to co-chair the session. Hans gave the floor to Latvia to give an update on behalf of the AF Discussion Group on EU Risk Assessment Agenda (DG EURAA). The DG had its last meeting on 28 April when a concept paper and Terms of Reference (ToR) for the DG were drafted, both shared as background documents for the meeting. The DG suggested renaming the third pillar to implement the EURAA into "engagement" instead of "consultation", making it more pro-active. The role of Risk Managers in the process should be considered and the Heads of Food Agencies included. The DG acknowledged the work of the FPs, having created a detailed overview of funding opportunities on national, regional and pan-European level. The funding portfolios were shared as a background document with the AF. Stef Bronzwaer added that the ToR was introduced to continue the work of the DG to steer the EURAA further. Discussions will now focus on further steps to translate the identified priorities into clear actions. Annex B of the concept paper listed the priorities identified by MS under the Delphi Headings and the projects suggested by MS during the World Café session on the 58th AF meeting in Luxembourg. MS are now invited to examine the table regarding areas in which they would like to lead a project. In a second consultation round from September to December MS can sign up to the project ideas that have been proposed in the first round.

On question from Latvia, if the procedure has been discussed with FPs, Stef explained that FPs are aware of the implementation process as they have been heavily involved regarding the identification of funding opportunities, but have not been informed about the further steps yet. Finland remarked that not all items mentioned during the World Café session have been taken up in the table and suggested a revision with the possibility to insert further topics. Germany shared the discussion that had taken place on national level, as infrastructure as a topic itself has not been addressed, however it is important to improve infrastructure across all sectors, for example regarding open data. Ireland agreed, underlining the importance of infrastructure for sharing data. Stef confirmed that EFSA is in contact with national services to eliminate infrastructural problems and suggested to include the topic under the heading of data collection and also under the overall framework.

Finland proposed to include the plan of a repository of RA models at EFSA. On question from Greece on consulting Art.36 organisations only or broaden consultation, Stef invited to share the process with all possible stakeholders, however shared projects will be restricted to the participation of Art.36 organisations. Spain remarked that a restriction to Art.36 organisations is contradicting the idea of obtaining funding from outside EFSA. Hans Verhagen explained that EFSA basically takes the role of a facilitator, however, if grants will be launched, they are only applicable for Art.36 organisations. On question from the Slovak Republic it was clarified that Thematic Grants are separated from this exercise.

Discussions will continue at the next AF meeting.

Action Point 4: EFSA to circulate template for expressions of interest in leading projects under the EURAA

Action Point 5: AF Members to send expressions of interest to afsecretariat@efsa.europa.eu until September

6. Risk Assessment Session

The Chair gave the floor to Juliane Kleiner to facilitate the RA Session, a standing item on the agenda of AF meetings to exchange information on forthcoming RA activities and highlight any potential areas of divergence. Participants had received an overview of EFSA mandates received and upcoming MS RA activities collated since the last meeting. Juliane highlighted consultation on guidance regarding GMO levels, expected to be finalised in 2017. Sweden remarked that the guidance is rather related to RM, as levels do not refer to RA. Juliane explained that EFSA is principally looking on what is needed from a scientific point of view to see if data requirements are needed for low level RA. France informed about having released their own opinion on traces of GMO in food and feed and would be happy to contribute.

Juliane informed on request from the Netherlands to update an EFSA opinion on BPA,. EFSA is currently setting up a working group to draft a first statement which is meant to be adopted by the CEF Panel in 2016. The statement is no re-evaluation but addressing the two questions from the Netherlands. The RA protocol to be established also involves Germany, France, Netherlands and Sweden, before the draft will be open for consultation of all MS. A re-assessment of BPA is foreseen for 2018. Finally, Juliane underlined a good example of cooperation in the area of nutrition, where an exchange of documents between EFSA and the UK 9on which topic?) led to an explanation of differences due to different methodologies. As soon as the opinions are drafted, a joint statement will be released explaining the differences in values according to the methodologies.

Hans Verhagen updated on an overlapping mandate in the area of Antimicrobial Resistance (AMR) and ANSES will be invited to join the EFSA-EMA working group. France clarified that it is not planned to duplicate the opinion, but to focus on alternatives. The Netherlands asked about the outcome of an overlap between EFSA and Germany in the area of Cloramphenicol. Hans explained that EFSA and Germany started to exchange views in order to clarify positions.

Juliane then gave the floor to Norway to provide a brief overview of the on-going work and new mandate in relation to Chronic Wasting Disease (CWD). Norway informed that CWD has been identified in one reindeer and two moose. Currently very little is known about the agent and the potential of spreading. The Norwegian Scientific Committee for Food Safety has been involved and a project group has been set up. EFSA's BIOHAZ Unit has appointed an observer and was kept in the loop. The request is split in two phases: Current work is focussing on food safety aspects, possibility of spread to other areas and species and recommendations for sampling to be undertaken during deer and reindeer shooting and slaughter season; phase 1 document is going to be published on 30 June.

In September phase 2 starts when phase 1 document regarding the agent and food safety will be revised as a consequence of forthcoming sampling results. Long term measures of different species and the assessment of environmental impact of the strategies are part of phase 2 as well. The UK informed about having done similar work and information from UK work has been used by Norway. Further links will be made to align efforts. Finland announced having a surveillance system in place. Norway remarked that a mere Scandinavian approach would be too narrow.

MS then were invited to mention other topics of interest. Germany informed about new attempts of the BfR in RA activities concerning the resistance in e-coli, lupin-alcaloids and a proposal of setting maximal amounts of vitamins and minerals in food supplements. RA regarding the occurrence of tropan-alcaloid in food and feed, cyalin-alcaloids are almost finished.

Ireland stated to also working on maximal levels of minerals and vitamins in supplements. Belgium announced to have recently published maximum limits for food supplements.

Italy informed about risk evaluation about the use of antibiotics in bees. As the use is permitted in Italy the request is particularly difficult. Italy will ask for contribution of other MS via the FPs Network. The Netherlands announced the release of an opinion on Hepatitis E in meat products and invited MS that would like to interact on this topic to contact them. Malta is conducting RA on hepatitis B in pigs..

Hans Verhagen drew attention to cooperation of the Baltic countries and Poland on African Swine Fever: Two reports are expected by October 2016 respectively October 2017. The ToR for a working group starting in autumn to work on mixtures will be published soon. Estonia added that two new projects on African Swine Fever have been launched and results are expected in two years.

***

The Chair opened the afternoon session by welcoming Harry Paul from the NVWA, the hosting institution. Harry welcomed the AF to the Netherlands and highlighted three priority topics in the Netherlands: First, the development of chain management from food to the consumer in the Netherlands and the separation of RA, which stays independent from RM, though both act under the same umbrella organisation. Second, the developing methods for Risk Communication and third, the use of antibiotics. The Netherlands are monitoring the use of antibiotics and successfully worked for its reduction, though an increase of illegal antibiotics has been noted. In summary, Harry underlined the importance of independent RA and a permanent interaction of RM, RA and risk communications. The Chair thanked Paul for his speech adding that the next step in RA is to identify risk mitigation options.

***

7. Strategic Issues Session Antimicrobial Resistance (AMR)

Activities in area of AMR in the Food Chain

The Chair invited Marta Hugas to facilitate the session dedicated to AMR, with the objective to share information on the different activities being undertaken in this area by the EU agencies, the MS and to have a RM perspective of the EC.

EFSA's activities on AMR in the Food Chain: RA and data collection

Marta opened the session by presenting an overview of the activities of EFSA. EFSA has established an umbrella project for the coordination of AMR activities, led by the BIOHAZ Panel and the BIOCONTAM Unit. Marta explained the three related work packages and depicted EFSA's work in different aspects of the area of AMR. Marta informed that EFSA is collaborating with ECDC and EMA on antimicrobial use and resistance (JIACRA), on which a first joint scientific report was published in January 2015 and a second one is

expected for June 2017. Marta then gave an overview of key mandates over the last 10 years in the area of AMR and underlined EFSA's role in detecting emerging risks in this area and in supporting risk managers to decide on best strategies to apply and possible control options as well and the importance of interagency collaboration to have an integrated approach with all players in the food chain and establish good and harmonised data monitoring systems both for resistance and consumption of antimicrobials.

The Netherlands referred to geographical, so-called GRIT analysis, showing that there are places with high load of medication of humans, going into animal and environment and asked AMR spread from humans to animals has been taken into consideration. Dominique Monnet, Representative from ECDC confirmed that it has been flagged to the EC to involve the European Environment Agency (EEA) which has not been involved up to now. Cyprus expressed being in favour of support of EFSA and the EC considering environmental aspects.

ESVAC: European Surveillance of Veterinary Antimicrobial Consumption

Marta gave the floor to Jordi Torren, from EMA, to present via teleconference the ESVAC (European Surveillance of Veterinary Antimicrobial Consumption) project, a project based on the EC request to EMA on collecting consumption data to develop harmonised approach for collection and reporting of data on use of antimicrobial agents based on national sales figures, as well as estimates on consumption in at least the major groups of animal species. Jordi explained the main ESVAC indicators, based on the amount in mg ingredient sold per population correction unit (mg/PCU) and an overview on the outcome of the studies. Jordi gave an outlook on the future of the programme concluding that data on sales of antimicrobials are powerful tools to encourage countries to take action on the use of antimicrobials in animals. All five ESVAC reports are available on the EMA website. On question from Latvia Jordi confirmed also working a lot on minor species, for example bees and aquaculture, which is rather difficult.

ECDC's activities on AMR, 2016

Marta introduced Dominique Monnet from ECDC, who presented ECDC's activities on AMR to the plenary. ECDC is running an AMR and Healthcare-associated infections (HAI) programme through three networks. Dominique presented information and results of various surveillance measures and further activities regarding epidemic intelligence and response support, ad-hoc studies and surveys, country visits and public health training. ECDC has issues systematic reviews and guidance documents and Dominique presented the directory of online resources for prevention and control of AMR and HAI, which is accessible via the ECDC website. Dominique concluded by highlighting collaboration on EU and international level and the European Antibiotic Awareness Day initiative.

Stef Bronzwaer asked if data on illegal counter use of antibiotics is available. Dominique explained that preparatory actions are on-going and a final meeting with final data will be held the next week. Overall data shows an improvement of the situation.

Perspectives of the EC

Marta welcomed Martial Plantady, from DG SANTE, attending the meeting by teleconference and invited him to give an overview on the actions on behalf of the EC. Martial underlined that AMR is a priority for the EC, who is implementing a 5-year action plan, which is at its final stage with an external evaluation. It became clear that the current action plan generally addressed the needs, particularly the need for new animal health policy in veterinary medicine. Much effort has been done to produce guidelines, a key element to give guidance to the MS. The action plan underlined that the monitoring and surveillance system and the raise of public awareness for AMR was successful. Martial informed that the EC is developing a new strategy for 2016 to renew and further activities on AMR that bring added value.

Finally, the future strategy foresees enhanced EU- international action. Therefore AMR is put high on the agenda in relation with other countries, also in the context of trade negotiations, for example in partnerships with Brazil, India or China. This could be the opportunity for the EU to become the driving force and a credible partner on the international floor.

Finland noted missing research on biosecurity and safe production measures. The Netherlands supported this remark adding that also environmental aspects should not been left apart. Martial confirmed that biosecurity and safe production measures have to be discussed and that close contact is kept with the ERA for developing a strategy on environmental issues.

Stef Bronzwaer closed the discussion by underlining that the agencies show a one-health- approach driven by cooperation and are now ready for playing a global role. A topical approach on AMR is thus considered in EFSA's international strategy and will be of major importance on the upcoming WHO conference in China in November.

Activities in the area of AMR: Member State Activities

AMR policy in the Netherlands

Marta welcomed Rosa Peran form the Ministry of Health to present details on the conclusion of Presidency discussions on AMR on behalf of the Netherlands. Rosa gave a background on AMR in the Netherlands and why the topic was on their priority list during the EU presidency. Council conclusions are expected next week.

AMR: Actions undertaken by ANSES (alternatives to AM)

Marta gave the floor to Charlotte Grastilleur, AF member from France, who presented the actions undertaken by ANSES in the area of AMR, with particular focal on alternatives to AM. The action plan "Ecoantibio" 2013-2017 aims at reducing the use of antimicrobials for animals. Currently the benefits of alternative treatments which may lead to reduce the use of antimicrobials in animal health are being assessed. Therefore the state of the art of existing practices and substances has been analysed through an in the field survey on target species and pathology of interest. As a next step the regulatory status of the identified substances is being investigated and finally an assessment of efficacy and safety will take place.

On question from Latvia, Charlotte confirmed involving also private laboratories. Denmark remarked having experienced alternatives to AM, but regretfully this caused problems with livestock.

Monitoring and analysing Antimicrobial consumption data

Marta invited Klemens Fuchs, AF Member from Austria to give a presentation on monitoring an analysing of antimicrobial consumption data in Austria. Submission of data on sales from industry to vet pharmacy and on prescription to animals at farm by the vet pharmacies is kept in a data base since 2015. A part form these obligatory data sets, also data on application by farms is collected on a voluntary base. Klemens gave an overview on the collected and analysed data by active ingredients and species.

AMR: Science and Evidence in FSA

Marta gave the floor to Penny Bramwell, AF member from the UK, who gave an overview on scientific activities in the area of AMR, partners involved and the work done so far. Main conclusions drawn from the spectrum of research outline that the control of AMR in the food chain is primarily dependent on the control of the use of antibiotics in food animals and humans but the complex nature of the food supply chain and global sourcing of food introduces difficulties in tracing the source of AMR. A "One Health Approach" is recommended based on effective monitoring of AMR in humans and animals

to determine if changes in AMR seen in bacteria in food are also seen in bacteria that cause infections in humans and animals aiming minimising the risk to public health.

Approaches to tackle antimicrobial resistance in Germany: Data collection and risk assessment

Marta gave the floor to Andreas Hensel, AF member from Germany, who gave an update on approaches to tackle AMR in Germany. AMR is recognized as an important public health topic in Germany, which led to action on different levels. A decrease in antimicrobial usage in livestock can be seen. One major current challenge is horizontal gene transfer.

The Chair asked the plenary if there is any estimation on the percentage of illegal use of AM. Austria estimated 20 per cent. Germany remarked that the illegal use is irrelevant to the topic itself, as food is imported from all over the world. As the worldwide use of AM is not balanced, international collaboration in this sector is highly needed. Finland mentioned the struggle to see AM in pets, mainly cats and dogs, which is difficult to measure.

The session was then wrapped up by Marta, thanking for all contributions and the presentations. Further communication on the topic will take place and the discussions will also be reflected on EFSA's website. Marta stressed that joint forces in the EU but also internationally are crucial to tackle the problem and invited MS to share any activity on national level through the AF.

Action Point 6: MS to share any national activity in the area of AMR

***

The Chair then closed the meeting for the first day.

***

8. Emerging Risks

The Chair opened the meeting of the second day, welcoming Ana Afonso, Tobin Robinson and Caroline Merten, attending the meeting via teleconference and presenting an overview of activities in the area of Emerging Risks. An overview of the emerging risks identification process adopted by EFSA and a summary of the issues, discussion points and recommendations from the last Emerging Risks Exchange Network (EREN) meeting in April 2016 were presented. Some of these issues were as well discussed in the stakeholders discussion group on emerging risks in May 2016.

EFSA aims at improving collaboration with both risk assessors and risk managers in the MS on emerging issues identification and prioritization and it was proposed to have a dedicated session with the AF on the 62nd plenary meeting in December. In this context how to best avoid duplication of efforts on data collection and improve data exchange and accessibility could be discussed further. It is also envisaged to establish a review process for prioritization of follow up actions on identified emerging issues and to develop further methodologies for identification of emerging issues.

The UK asked if the involvement of industry has been foreseen, as in the UK industry is a rich source of intelligence in the area of emerging risks. The EFSA stakeholder group discussion group is composed of industry, consumer associations and NGOs. Information exchange with the EFSA Scientific Network on emerging risks is encouraged but the role of stakeholders in the identification process must be further improved. A new policy on stakeholder engagement will intensify the work with the stakeholder groups.

The Netherlands asked for further explanation on the issue of TTX in the Mediterranean, having not been aware of this. Caroline explained that this refers back to a presentation of the Network representative from the Italian representative in the last EREN meeting. TTX was detected recently in Greece and Italy and is moving further north in Europe.

France added that biotoxins are an emerging risk in general: due to global warming toxins are likely to spread fast from the Red Sea to the Mediterranean.

France offered to give a presentation on biotoxins in the next plenary meeting, as this is a key issue for cooperation.

Bulgaria stressed the importance to focus on LSD, an emerging risk that has been underestimated for a long time and since 2015 became the most important across Europe, spreading rapidly. The disease is highly dangerous and should be put on top of the agenda of the EC. The EC acknowledged to have not paid enough attention to LSD in the past and signalled support. The Netherlands also confirmed support, highlighting that the spread calls on urgent action and asked for suggestions of immediate actions. The Chair informed that a workshop on LSD had been organised by EFSA in Brussels in May, with participation of the affected and threatened countries in the EU and its neighbourhood and the outcome can be distributed among the AF.

Tobin Robinson remarked that the issue of LSD was first mentioned in the stakeholder group in 2012 followed by a mandate of the EC, which shows the effectiveness and importance of the system.

The plenary agreed on having a dedicated session on emerging risks in its December meeting. The Chair proposed to take Animal Health and Welfare (AHAW) on the agenda of the September meeting, to discuss LSD also from this point of view.

Action Point 7: EFSA to share outcome of workshop on LSD in Brussels

Action Point 8: EFSA to schedule session on Emerging Risks for 62nd AF meeting

Action Point 9: EFSA to schedule presentation from France on biotoxins for 61st AF meeting

Action Point 10: EFSA to schedule AHAW for 61st AF meeting

9. Communications – Advisory Forum Communications Working Group

Update AFCWG 50th meeting

Bernhard Url opened the regular session on communication activities, welcoming Barbara Gallani, recently appointed Head of Department of Communications and External Relations to the meeting. Barbara had attended the 50th meeting of the Advisory Forum Communications Working Group (AFCWG) that had taken place back-to–back with the AF on 7-8 June, which included a joint session in which members of both groups actively engaged in breakout groups to discuss risk communication approaches. Barbara explained the particular focus of the AFCWG for 2016 on improving preparedness and coordination on diverging views and exploring further alignment with the AF.

Future Direction of the AFCWG

Stef Bronzwaer presented a proposal of future alignment of AFCWG and AF for the plenary to discuss. As the term "Working group" is not fitting and obsolete, it was proposed to apply the governance model of an EFSA Scientific Network. This model would potentially allow for greater autonomy, a stronger focus on 'the science of risk communications', more flexibility to invite experts to the meetings, and greater clarity regarding its role with regard to the AF. In the Network, members would be organisations appointed by the AF with a representative, instead of individuals, however the current practice regarding meetings and reporting back to the AF would continue.

The Chair, having visited the AFCWG plenary the day before, added that discussions on the proposal revealed concern of the members regarding the terminology "Scientific" Network and possible implication on the nature of discussions and particularly on membership, which would not serve the objective of the group to share best practices.

The Chair emphasised that the concept was not related to the scientific aspect of a network but to keep the group operational in exchanges views on risk communication. The governance model of an EFSA Network offered broader opportunities than a Working Group.
Norway shared the concern regarding terminology, as removing AF from the name of the group would not create closer ties but on the contrary favour a self-evolvement of the communication group detached from the AF. Sweden agreed stressing not to neglect this semantic aspect and include AF in the name or at least obviously in the ToR. Greece supported this, explaining that risk communication is beyond a scientific field and thus the group needs more generic governance than a Scientific Network. Italy agreed adding that risk communication included political aspects. Also Spain considered the model of a Scientific Network not broad enough, as Networks, according to the EFSA Decision, were set up for a particular scientific remit on a temporary basis. On question from the Czech Republic, the Chair explained that EFSA's 15 Scientific Networks follow a clear set of financial rules on conditions and reimbursement, which similarly exists for EFSA Working Groups operating upon a mandate from the EC, noting however the AFCWG was not operating under these administrative procedures.

Germany remarked that the AFCWG received a clear mandate 10 years ago, but due to independent needs evolved differently. The main problem noted was the lack of a clear information flow to feed back to the AF. Irrelevant to a future change in name, the set – up should continue as a group supporting the AF. Croatia expressed concerns regarding the term "Scientific" as this would entail the appointment of scientists instead of communicators. Denmark replied that the terminology is not crucial, but a set-up that allows communicating best practice and draws on the advice of external experts was essential. Finland and the Netherland seconded this aspect and suggested focussing on the ToR, as the current way of working has led to duplications in AF and AFCWG. The ToR must prevent the establishment of another group or Network drifting away from the guidance of the AF, instead a very strong link of both groups must be tied, for example via a liaising officer. Germany suggested also including research work on social sciences into the ToR.

The Chair thanked members for their contribution concluding that the content of the communication group has to be considered. The ToR should design this content and give the group a more strategic role with explicit link to the AF. Also new developments like social sciences could be brought to the group, as a change in governance also gives the opportunity to open up to a new era. This renders the name rather irrelevant. EFSA will draft a proposal and share it with the AFCWG on the 61st meeting in September.

Action Point 11: EFSA to draft ToR for AFCWG and share it with AF

10.Risk characterization of ciguatera food poisoning in Europe

The Chair gave the floor to Ana Canals, AF member from Spain, to update on the project of risk characterization of ciguatera food poisoning in Europe, an EFSA framework partnership agreement signed on 19 April 2016, with AECOSAN (Spain) as leading and coordinating institution in partnership with ASAE (Portugal). After an introduction on ciguatera, Ana explained the project in its specific agreements, its governance and partners and collaborators. A kick-off meeting has been held in Madrid on 31 May- 2 June and the project is foreseen to run until 2020. The project follows an holistic approach involving various players: EFSA and EU institutions aim at establishing risk characterization of ciguatera in Europe including recommendations to finally build up a framework for the future prediction of ciguatera. The objective is to provide risk managers with better tools and strategies for environmental and public health and the scientific community with high standard scientific papers regarding ciguatera. Spain asked the AF members to provide a list of persons nationally in charge of reporting food-borne outbreaks to EFSA. On a second step these reporting authorities will be contacted

by Spain to update information on food-borne outbreaks due to ciguatoxins and marine biotoxins in general. The cooperation with the MS is crucial for the success of the project, as ciguatera is widely underreported. France announced having much data from the Caribbean and Reunion with many cases reported and would be glad to cooperate.

Action Point 12: AF to collect contacts of national reporting institutions for foodborne outbreaks and send contact details to Spain

11.The conclusion of EFSA's first European Neighbourhood Programme

The Chair gave the floor to Stef Bronzwaer to present the main outcomes of the European Neighbourhood Programme (ENP) that was concluded in January 2016. The EFSA ENP Programme grounds on the European Neighbourhood Policy (ENP) of the EU aiming at the support of stability, security and prosperity and democratic, sustainable development of countries close to the borders of the Union. The EFSA ENP programme run from 2014-2016 targeted national food safety authorities as well as scientific, academic and civil society organisations in the following beneficiaries: Algeria, Azerbaijan, Israel, Jordan, Moldova, Morocco, Palestine, Armenia, Belarus, Egypt, Georgia, Lebanon, Libya, Tunisia, Ukraine, Syria. An ENP food safety conference with participants from 14 ENP countries and contribution of MS took place in Parma in November 2014. Due to recent political developments the ENP policy is currently under revision of the EC. No dedicated funding for EU Agencies will be available until 2018; however EFSA will keep cooperation with the ENP countries through the TAIEX instrument. MS are invited to express their interest in hosting an event for ENP countries through TAIEX funding. Latvia underlined the importance of cooperation with the neighbouring countries, giving an opportunity of better response to cross-border animal diseases.

Spain informed about a proposal on a seminar through SAMEFOOD open for ENP countries particularly countries in the Mediterranean. Stef thanked for the proposal and agreed on having a dedicated meeting with Spain and the SAMEFOOD coordinator as well as preparing a TAIEX proposal.

Action Point 13: EFSA and Spain to organise meeting with SAMEFOOD coordinator

Action Point 14: EFSA to draft proposal to TAIEX for SAMEFOOD event

12.GENERAL SESSION

12.1 Endocrine Disrupters – Outcome of an international expert meeting

The Chair gave the floor to Germany to inform about the outcome of a BfR expert meeting reach Scientific Consensus on Endocrine Disruptors. The aim of the scientific discourse was to discuss the issues amongst the participants and, where possible, to identify ways of resolving the differences of opinion that exist. 23 scientists from Europe, the USA, Japan and four observers of the EC, EFSA and the European Chemicals Agency (ECHA) discussed the basic principles and open questions on the assessment of endocrine disruptors. The outcome is a breakthrough in the scientific discussion of endocrine disruptors, as a consensus was reached on background, definition of an ED, related concepts, sources of uncertainty, scientific principles important for ED identification and research needs. As a next step the consensus is offered as an advice to the EC for decision-making. Germany suggested EFSA and ECHA to start working on harmonised guidance for both biocides and plant protection products.

The Netherlands pointed out that if a common approach is envisaged, a more strategic way in communication actions is needed too. The Chair thanked Germany for the proposal adding that harmonized criteria of EFSA, ECHA, EMA and the MS would be very

helpful. EFSA will try to coordinate the approach and inform the AF. He agreed that this entails a challenge to communication which has to be encountered.

Action Point 15: EFSA to issue proposal on harmonised guidance for endocrine disrupters

12.2 Training on the ImproRisk Model in Cyprus

The Chair gave the floor to Cyprus to provide feedback on the ImproRisk Model Workshop which was held in Cyprus in May involving staff from EFSA. The project was agreed on the visit of the ED to Cyprus and supported with grant funding from EFSA. A report will be prepared and shared with the AF.

Cyprus explained on question from Slovakia, that the model is available directly for those having participated in the workshop, as it has been uploaded to their laptops. Further distribution is possible upon request via the FPs. The Netherlands asked if open access is considered as well and how maintenance is secured. Cyprus explained that users have to be known, open access is not planned. Amendments will be done by Cyprus and alerted to the users. In this context the Netherlands suggested to discuss how to use these models, particularly in the context of open data. Denmark informed that together with France and Germany a repository will be created, which might serve as a pilot. Access will be granted upon financial contribution. Denmark will present the repository in one of the upcoming meetings.

Stef Bronzwaer informed about a meeting with Germany on an IT-tool to align the repository and by the end of the year more technical knowledge will be available on this. The Chair concluded that there will not be one single repository, but a link of repositories and suggested to come back to the issue on the 62nd AF meeting in December.

Action Point 16: Cyprus to share report on ImproRisk Model workshop with AF

Action Point 17: Denmark to present repository to AF

Action Point 18: EFSA to table issue on repository for the 62nd AF meeting

12.3 Presidency priorities and next AF meeting

The Chair gave the floor to Slovakia, who will be holding EU presidency as of July 2016. Slovakia invited the AF to the next meeting in Bratislava on 28-29 September giving an outlook on the meeting and possible priorities under the presidency.

13.AOB

Data Quality

Hans Verhagen gave an update on the proposal to establish a framework partnership agreement with Member States to enhance data quality. In the proposal one of the main aspects is to co-finance data contact points (so-called "data stewards").The proposal will be piloted in in 2017. Following lengthy discussions with FPs who raised a number of issues, a scoping paper is currently been drafted and will be shared with AF members shortly after the meeting. Twelve MSs have expressed interest in participating to the pilot. Five countries will be then selected to participate to the pilot execution. The results of the pilot will be presented to the EFSA management and to the Advisory Forum in 2018 and if a positive result will be achieved a full scale activity may start in 2019.

Spain pointed out that the EC should be made aware of a lack in regulation regarding several data collections causing difficulties for the MS to submit high quality data to EFSA. Denmark agreed, adding that without detailed legal obligations it would be impossible to generate data to meet specific data quality requirements. The EC confirmed awareness of the lack of regulation and informed that discussions are ongoing.

Luxembourg asked to the commission not to adopt a separate data model from Standard Sample Description to manage raw data within RASFF notification system as MS have already made a consistent investment, also supported by EFSA, in implementing EFSA standard. The Chair agreed that use should be made of those models developed over the past 10 years instead of introducing new models. The EC explained that the issue derives from discrepancy with international groups using international models. The Netherland summed up, that the consensus of MSs on using the EFSA model for data transmission should be reflected in promoting it via MSs representatives in the EC and EU

Action Point 19: EFSA to share scoping paper on data quality with MS

Fellowship Programme

Stef Bronzwaer announced that the call for tender to develop, organise and deliver training activities under the Fellowship Programme is published in these days, inviting MS to inform relevant partners. A clear description on the hosting sites with a call for applications will be launched by September. He thanked the Programme Committee consisting of Latvia, Germany, Norway and the UK for the preparatory work done so far.

Advice on preliminary reference doses for allergens in foods

The Netherlands presented details on recently issued advice on preliminary reference doses for allergens in food. France informed about having a mandate in the same area, but trying not to duplicate work. On question from Ireland, the Netherlands informed that an English version of the advice will be available the week after the meeting. Ireland proposed to contact France and the Netherlands for possible cooperation on the topic. Juliane Kleiner informed that based on an opinion in November 2014 discussions with the EC took place about EFSA continuing its work in this area and asking the EC, if they intend to send a mandate. The EC will discuss the issue and come back with more information.

Action Point 20: The Netherlands to share advice on allergens in English

Action Point 21: EC to give information on possible mandate on allergens

Red meat chain analysis

The Netherlands informed about the present approach in studies regarding risk assessment of the red meat supply chain. A related brochure was distributed to participants. The Netherlands informed that three new brochures will be issues, on dairy products, eggs and poultry. Red meat will be on the agenda again in 2018.

The report has created debates in parliament and conclusions led to recommendations to the DG. The report is available in different languages and can be shared with the AF.

Action Point 22: The Netherlands to share report on RA regarding the red meat supply chain

Issue with dogs/dogfood

Latvia informed about the potential issue of dogs displaying megaesophagus-polyneuropathy in Latvia. It has been suggested a possible connection with dogfood. Since it is not clear if this is a real (emerging) risk, a dedicated workshop will identify a research programme to find out if there is indeed an issue, and if so to identify next steps.

Action Point 23: Latvia (with EFSA) to have a dedicated workshop to investigate the potential issue of megaesophagus-polyneuropathy

CLOSURE OF THE MEETING

Bernhard Url closed the meeting, thanking participants for their attendance and active contribution, and expressed special thanks to the EFSA colleagues supporting the meeting in Utrecht and in Parma. He particularly thanked the Netherlands for hosting the meeting and accompanying events.

SUMMARY OF ACTION POINTS

Action Number	Action
1	*EFSA to share flash reports of ED visits with AF*
2	*MS to comment on draft Operational Rules of Procedures until end of July*
3	*MS to comment on draft Declaration of Commitment until end of July*
4	*EFSA to circulate template for expressions of interest in leading projects under the EURAA*
5	*AF Members to send expressions of interest to afsecretariat@efsa.europa.eu until September*
6	*MS to share any national activity in the area of AMR*
7	*EFSA to share outcome of workshop on LSD in Brussels*
8	*EFSA to schedule session on Emerging Risks for 62nd AF meeting*
9	*EFSA to schedule presentation from France on biotoxins for 61st AF meeting*
10	*EFSA to schedule AHAW for 61st AF meeting*
11	*EFSA to draft ToR for AFCWG and share it with AF*
12	*AF to collect contacts of national reporting institutions for foodborne outbreaks and send contact details to Spain*
13	*EFSA and Spain to organise meeting with SAMEFOOD coordinator*
14	*EFSA to draft proposal to TAIEX for SAMEFOOD event*
15	*EFSA to issue proposal on harmonised guidance for endocrine disrupters*
16	*Cyprus to share report on ImproRisk Model workshop with AF*
17	*Denmark to present repository to AF*
18	*EFSA to table issue on repository for the 62nd AF meeting*
19	*EFSA to share scoping paper on data quality with MS*
20	*The Netherlands to share advice on allergens in English*
21	*EC to give information on possible mandate on allergens*

22	*The Netherlands to share report on RA regarding the red meat supply chain*
23	*Latvia (with EFSA) to have a dedicated workshop to investigate the potential issue of megaesophagus-polyneuropathy*

Document history	
Document reference	Version 1.3
Prepared by	Julia Finger
Reviewed by	Jeffrey Moon
Last date modified	01 August 2016