SCIENTIFIC COMMITTEE AND EMERGING RISKS UNIT

Scientific Committee

Minutes of the 104th Plenary meeting

Held on 30 June – 1 July 2021, TELE-conference

(Agreed on 22 July 2021)

Participants

- Panel Members

  Simon More (chair), Diane Benford (vice chair), Susanne Hougaard Bennekou (vice chair), Vasileios Bampidis, Claude Bragard, Thorhallur Halldorsson, Antonio Hernandez-Jerez, Kostas Koutsoumanis, Claude Lambré, Kyriaki Machera, Hanspeter Naegeli, Søren Saxmose Nielsen, Josef Schlatter, Dieter Schrenk, Dominique Turck, Maged Younes.

- Hearing Experts[1]:

  Jacqueline Castenmiller (for item 6.1. and 6.2.);

  Claudia Bolognesi (for item 6.3.)

- European Commission and/or Member States representatives:

  Luis Vivas-Alegre, Athanasios Raikos, Alexandra Tuijtelaars (DG SANTE Unit D1, Farm to Fork Strategy)

- EFSA:

  Executive Director: Bernhard Url (1st day until coffee break)

  Executive Directorate: Marta Hugas

  Risk Assessment and Scientific Assistance Department (RASA):

  Juliane Kleiner (until 2nd day lunch time)

  Scientific Evaluation of Regulated Products Department (REPRO): Guilhem De Seze (until 2nd day lunch time)

[1] As defined in Article 15 of the Decision of the Executive Director concerning the selection of members of the Scientific Committee, the Scientific Panels, and the selection of external experts to assist EFSA with its scientific work: http://www.efsa.europa.eu/sites/default/files/corporate_publications/files/expertselection.pdf

Scientific Committee and Emerging Risks Unit (SCER): Tobin Robinson, Daniela Maurici, Maria Chiara Astuto, Maria Bastaki, Bernard Bottex, Irene Cattaneo, Yann Devos, Jean-Lou Dorne, Raquel Garcia Matas, Milen Georgiev, Georges Kass, Christina Kyrkou, Djien Liem, Angelo Maggiore, Caroline Merten, Agnes Rortais, Reinhilde Schoonjans, Rositsa Serafimova, Justyna Slodek-Wahlström, José Tarazona.

Update on Science Studies and Project Identification and Development (SPIDO): Claudia Heppner (for item 8.2.)

Animal and Plant Health (ALPHA) Unit: Andras Szoradi (for item 8.3.)

Global Performance Services Unit (GPS): Ilias Papatryfon (for item 10.1.)

Assessment and Methodological Support Unit (AMU): Olaf Mosbach-Schulz, Didier Verloo (for item 8.1.)

1. Welcome and apologies for absence

The Chair welcomed the participants. No apologies were received.

2. Tour de table Scientific Committee members

The SC members introduced themselves for the benefit of the observers.

3. Adoption of agenda

The agenda was adopted without changes.

4. Declarations of Interest of Scientific Committee/Scientific Panel/Members

In accordance with EFSA's Policy on Independence[2] and the Decision of the Executive Director on Competing Interest Management[3], EFSA screened the Annual Declarations of Interest filled out by the Panel members invited to the present meeting. No Conflicts of Interest related to the issues discussed in this meeting have been identified during the screening process, and no interests were declared orally by the members at the beginning of this meeting.

5. Presentation of the Guidelines for Observers[4]

[2] http://www.efsa.europa.eu/sites/default/files/corporate_publications/files/policy_independence.pdf

[3] http://www.efsa.europa.eu/sites/default/files/corporate_publications/files/competing_interest_management_17.pdf

[4] https://www.efsa.europa.eu/sites/default/files/2021-05/observersguidelines.pdf

The observers were reminded about the code of conduct before, during and after open plenary meetings. The Chair may grant observers the opportunity to ask questions either after they have observed a discussion on a given topic or at the end of the open plenary meeting, on other topics which fall within the remit of the Committee. If members of the Scientific Committee are unable to answer questions from observers during the meeting, they may resubmit their questions to EFSA through the #AskEFSA service on the EFSA website.

6. Scientific outputs submitted for discussion and/or possible adoption

6.1. Draft Guidance on risk assessment of nanomaterials to be applied in the food and feed chain: human and animal health (EFSA-Q-2020-00269)

The SC was provided an overview of the update of the Guidance on Nanomaterials to be applied in the food and feed chain (human and animal health) that was originally published in 2018. The interlinks with the Guidance on Particle Technical Requirements (Agenda point 6.2) were also presented.

The Guidance has been updated considering scientific developments and the experience achieved by the cc-Working Group through the assessment of requests for advice from several Panels and units, which also provided comments during the process for update.

The Nanonetwork was also consulted as well as JRC, ECHA and DG SANTE. While the original focus of the guidance was maintained, the main adaptations were done on the scope supported with the addition of a new chapter on the materials to be assessed.

Additional editorial changes were made to improve the structure and clarity of the document, restructuring the chapter on hazard identification and characterisation for highlighting the need for adapting the study protocols with nano-considerations (also in case of studies conducted under OECD test guidelines), and updating the glossary ensuring harmonisation with ECHA. Figures were added or updated to strengthen linkages between chapters and for different steps of the risk assessment (exposure, hazard assessment and risk characterisation).

The Scientific Committee (SC) adopted the guidance and congratulated the WG for the excellent work done.

6.2. Draft EFSA Guidance on technical requirements for regulated food and feed product applications to establish the presence of small particles including nanoparticles (EFSA-Q-2019-00692)

The SC was provided the background and terms of reference (ToRs) for the guidance on the technical requirements for regulated food and feed product

applications to establish the presence of small particles including nanoparticles.

The public consultation of the draft guidance was held during the summer 2020 and 200 comments were received from 25 contributors. Clarifications were provided on the scope, applicability, thresholds and official nanomaterials definition, the level of details provided (as a cross-cutting guidance it needs to have a broad coverage) and the use of alternatives to animal studies; a glossary was added to clarify the terminology. Detailed responses were provided to the comments made. Several improvements were made to the Guidance following the public consultation and a detailed presentation was made on each of these implementations. All comments received from the different Panels and units were addressed.

The structure of the final Guidance was presented (5 sections and 2 appendices). Practical guidance is provided on the information requirements for demonstrating that a conventional risk assessment is sufficient (for ToR 1: considerations on the material solubility and methodology to determine a dissolution rate; for ToR 2: technical requirements regarding the particle size, including a screening phase; and for ToR 3: details for assessing the coverage of small particles by existing safety studies). If the information confirms that the presence of nanoparticles is not properly covered by the existing safety studies, risk assessment considerations according to the Guidance on risk assessment of nanomaterials (agenda point 6.1) are needed.

The SC adopted the guidance and congratulated the WG for the excellent work done. The technical report presenting the comments received during the public consultation and how they have been addressed was endorsed and will be published together with the guidance hopefully by the end of the July.

6.3. Draft Guidance on aneugenicity assessment

The SC was provided with an overview on the Guidance on aneugenicity assessment which was developed as a self-task activity of the SC (i.e. ToRs, clarification on the relevance and differences between clastogenic or aneugenic effects). The public consultation of the draft guidance was conducted in 2020 and a total of 115 comments were received from 22 contributors from 9 countries and representing various sectors such as private, national authorities, academia and EU institutions. The comments were considered for the revision of the guidance and the clarity was also improved. Two critical issues were addressed as a result of the comments received: on the application of the micronucleus test (MNT) in liver and gastrointestinal tract before OECD test guidelines have been developed and on MNT analysis integrated into routine *in vivo* repeated toxicity studies.

For the assessment of risks to humans for a substance exhibiting aneugenicity, three situations were considered (for data-rich substances, for data-poor substances with gaps in toxicological database and for substances where only genotoxicity data available) and addressed

comprehensively and following a step-wise approach. Recommendations focused on the development and validation of the MNT in the gastrointestinal tract and liver with more research to understand and assess aneugenicity (e.g. in vitro 3D models, AOPs, sensitivity of rodents/human somatic and germ cells to aneuploidy). The GD was presented chapter by chapter to show the SC how the comments were addressed, and further clarifications were provided on the new issues raised by the SC.

The SC adopted the guidance subject to minor editorial changes and congratulated the WG for the excellent work done. The technical report presenting the comments received during the pubic consultation and how they have been addressed was endorsed and will be published together with the guidance hopefully by the end of July.

7. Feedback from the Scientific Committee/Scientific Panels, EFSA, the European Commission

7.1. Scientific Panel(s) including their Working Groups

7.1.1. Overview of the work programme of Panel on Food Contact Materials, Enzymes and Processing Aids (CEP)

The Chair of the Panel provided an overview on the activities of the CEP Panel which cover 3 areas: Food Contact Materials (FCMs), Food Enzymes (FEs) and Processing Aids (PAs). The timeline of the progress to be made on the mandate related to phthalates, structurally similar substances and replacement substances from FCMs (EFSA-Q-2020-00725[5]), in particular on the first (to be finalised by Nov. 2022) and second (to be initiated after Nov. 2022) part, was provided. It was highlighted that under the 1st part, the draft opinion on identification and prioritisation of substances as well as the draft protocol on exposure assessment are foreseen to be endorsed for public consultation in October 2021. This preparatory work, involving cooperation between EFSA and ECHA, represents a significant activity of the Panel.

Under the re-evaluation of BPA, the new activities include a Benchmark Dose analysis and selection of a reference point and an uncertainty analysis in the draft opinion to be published for public consultation by the end of 2021.

Regarding applications on recycling, 30 applications were received in 2019, over 35 in 2020 and almost 30 in the first quarter of 2021 showing a significant increase over the last 3 years. Currently, the Panel is dealing with 40 mandates. Most of these mandates deal with PET and more recently with polyolefins and polystyrene and ongoing discussions are made at WG level on EFSA recycling Guidelines.

[5] https://open.efsa.europa.eu/questions/EFSA-Q-2020-00725

Regarding FCM substances, there are several ongoing activities, and these include ongoing work for an opinion on silver as a nano material, the use of chopped carbon fibre as additive in plastics and the re-evaluation of ground sunflower seed hulls which is a new growing interest from industry. Regarding FCM substances, there are ongoing cross cutting and cooperation activities with different EFSA Units as well as upcoming mandates on the follow up of an EFSA opinion on the review and priority setting for substances that are listed without a specific migration limit and on styrene. Regarding FEs, the scientific Guidance for the submission of dossiers for enzymes was under public consultation in May and expected to be adopted in autumn. About 300 dossiers were submitted before the legal deadline, 30 new dossiers were received and 220 are expected to come. The Food Enzymes Intake Model (FEIM) calculators which were produced under this work are open access on Zenodo platform and represent a useful tool.
Two successful workshops and a webinar were organised on the enzyme guidance mentioned above in March and June 2021. Regarding enzyme dossiers, a total of about 420 dossiers is recorded for old and new valid applications and within the new dossiers with legal deadlines, there are still 13 to be adopted.

Regarding Processing Aids (PAs), two areas are progressing and these are on food hygiene (safety and efficacy of lactic acid to reduce microbiological surface contamination on carcasses from wild game and small stock) and extraction solvents (safety of use of 2-methyloxolane as an extraction solvent and its maximum residue limits).

7.1.2. Overview of the work programme of the Panel on Additives and Products or Substances used in Animal Feed (FEEDAP)

The Chair of the Panel provided an overview on the activities of the FEEDAP Panel. The remit of the FEEDAP Panel is on the assessment of the safety and/or efficacy of additives and products/substances used in animal feed (for target species, users, consumers and the environment). The work focuses on re-evaluation, renewal, regular applications, Guidance Documents (GDs) and cooperation with other bodies on the safety assessment of feed additives.

For the re-evaluation of feed additives, most of the work has been adopted in scientific opinions (81% of the 397 mandates received). A total of 185 preparations in the field of botanicals will be finalised by 2026, while the technological additives (antioxidants, clays and gums) are expected to be finalised by mid-2022. For renewals, there is an increasing trend of the number of applications received with an expected increase by 2025 in the nutritional area. Efforts are made on pre-submission advice for renewals.

For regular applications (under Art. 4, 13 and 29 of Reg. 178/2002), a significant increase is experienced due to the entering into force of the Transparency Regulation with 80 dossiers received by May.

Regarding the preparation of GDs, during the last 5 years many Guidance documents were updated, while recently the Panel updated the Guidance on the renewal of the authorization of the feed additives. The Panel has also made preparatory work on user safety; however, the update is currently on hold and is expected to be finalised in 2022. Given the Green Deal context, new updates and renewal of Guidance Documents are expected.

Finally, in relation to cooperation, the FEEDAP Panel interacts with the BIOHAZ Panel on the maximum levels of cross-contamination for 24 antimicrobial active substances in non-target feed. FEEDAP also cooperates with the EC on the Codex Maximum Residue Limits for Halquinol and on the update and development of GDs related to the Green Deal. In conclusion, 1176 (+18 newly received) opinions were delivered between 2003 and 2021 and the trend is on the increase over the years.

7.2. EFSA including its Working Groups

7.2.1. NEW WG Fluoride

The SC was provided with an overview of the EC mandate on "fluoride in food and drinking water" (EFSA-Q-2021-00358) (i.e. background and scientific scope; ToRs; deadline which is set on 30 Sept. 2023; progress with procedures to set up the WG and identify WG expertise). EFSA highlighted that EMA and ECHA will be contacted to see their interest on the subject. Thorhallur Halldorsson, member of the SC, was nominated chair of the working group on "fluoride in food and drinking water" that is in the process of being established.

7.2.2. WG on Benchmark Dose (BMD)

The SC was provided with an update of the SC mandate to update the guidance on the use of the BMD approach in risk assessment, aligning it with the internationally agreed concepts described in chapter 5 of WHO-IPCS EHC 240[6], and to upgrade the related EFSA platform for BMD analysis[7] accordingly. The updated guidance will:

- Help the user decide on a biologically relevant benchmark response (BMR) when dealing with continuous endpoints;
- Provide one single set of models to be fitted to a dataset, independently whether dealing with a quantal or continuous endpoint;
- Implement Bayesian model averaging as the preferred recommended approach;
- Provide further guidance on how to deal with datasets leading to unsuitable BMDLs and/or large BMD confidence intervals.

[6] See Principles and methods for the risk assessment of chemicals in food (who.int)

[7] See R4EU.efsa.europa.eu

The updated guidance is due for public consultation in February 2022, and possible adoption in June 2022. The EFSA platform for BMD analysis is being upgraded in parallel and should be ready when the updated guidance is adopted. A dissemination workshop will be organised in September 2022 to present the new guidance to interested parties and illustrate the new recommended approach, with pesticides data. A number of follow-up activities are being programmed for the period 2022-2025: i) creation of a database of used/set BMRs for different endpoints and species, ii) creation of a repository of informative priors, iii) guidance on the use of the BMD approach with epidemiological data.

7.2.3. WG Read-Across

The SC was provided with an update of the work of the EFSA mandate on the development of a guidance on read-across (EFSA-Q-2020-00413). A general framework is currently under development and is being refined for EFSA's purposes. In addition, a procurement call to determine the application domain of read-across for EFSA's remit using EFSA's database of compounds, including collection of toxicological information from repeated-dose toxicity studies on pesticides and their metabolites was launched successfully. The offers received are currently under evaluation. The next WG meeting will take place on July 9.

7.2.4. WG Non-Monotonic Dose Response (NMDR)

The SC was provided with an update of the work of the WG on non-monotonic dose response. There is an ongoing activity on NMDR since 2012. A mandate (EFSA-Q-2019-00530) on NMDR was received in 2019 and a public consultation was conducted from December 2020 until February 2021. The WG has addressed all comments and is finalising the opinion. The final version should be sent to the SC for discussion and possible adoption in the September SC Plenary.

7.2.5. WG Copper

The SC was reminded of the scope and ToR of the mandate (EFSA-Q-2020-00399), and was informed that the current work of the WG is focusing on exposure assessment analysis to incorporate data on background (natural) copper levels and the drafting of the sections related to exposure assessment, especially in relation to the contribution of copper from background to the overall exposure and the contribution from other dietary sources. Additional work on hazard characterisation and weight of evidence assessment is ongoing. The draft opinion will be presented for first reading at the SC plenary in September.

7.3. EFSA Strategy 2027

The SC was provided an overview of the EFSA Strategy 2027 outcome that was recently adopted by the Management Board. An environmental scan was made between 2019 and 2020 to determine the future challenges that EFSA will have to address in the coming years. A public consultation on the draft 2027 Strategy (i.e. on the strategic foundation, the three strategic

objectives and the next steps) was conducted in April-May 2021 and adopted in June 2021. EFSA mission is based on its founding regulation and the vision is to move towards "safe food and sustainable food systems through transparent, independent and trustworthy scientific advice" by 2027 and beyond.

The EFSA strategic foundation is based on the five values (excellence, independence, openness, accountability, cooperation) that were translated for EFSA staff into actions for the delivery of scientific advice on risk assessment. The challenges were grouped into five cluster topics (from the big picture, evolving dialogue with society, food safety – integral to sustainable food systems, making the most of the food safety ecosystems and harnessing new trends in data technology and science). An overview of the three strategic objectives was provided. The first objective is on delivering trustworthy scientific advice and communication of risks from farm to fork. The second objective is about ensuring preparedness for future risk analysis needs. The third objective is on empowering people and ensuring organisational agility. Finally, the next steps until the end of 2021 were presented and include the launching of the SC consultation on the Strategy implementation plan (July to September), the discussion at the next SC Plenary (September) on the feedback received from the consultation, a discussion with the Management Board on performance framework with the final list of Key Performance Indicators (KPIs) and on new programming document 2022-2025.

The SC raised a series of questions related to the EFSA Strategy 2027. The first question was on the applicability of the risk benefit assessment in EFSA work on risk assessment of regulated products. EFSA noted that a lot of knowledge on risk-benefit could also be needed in the context of the Chemical Strategy for Sustainability. DG SANTE clarified that in the light of the Farm to Fork Strategy, the EC will make a proposal for a legislative framework on sustainable food systems by 2023, with discussions on this framework still ongoing. Another question was related to the monitoring of the success of the outputs related to the three objectives that will be measured by a set of KPIs to determine customers satisfaction and ensure success. To avoid duplications and overlap, partnerships are built with MS to ensure and strengthen risk assessment capacity and excellence in EU. This will also ensure sustainability and resilience of the food and feed safety system.

8. Other scientific topics for information and/or discussion

8.1. Discussion on possible update on the Guidance on Expert Knowledge Elicitation (EKE-2014)

The SC was provided with an overview of the EKE approach which is "a systematic, documented and reviewable process to retrieve expert judgement from a group of experts in the form of a probability distribution". Clarification on what is a formal versus a semi-formal expert elicitation were

given. A summary of the results of the EU survey conducted with EFSA staff and experts in May-June 2021 was provided. Results showed that the interest on EKE seems highest in the area of non-regulated products (e.g. animal health and welfare, plant health etc). With regard to the survey, the question on who should use the guidance indicated that the EKE guidance should be targeted towards EFSA staff and experts who are performing/adopting risk assessments.
In addition, the results indicated that any potential revised guidance should be used mainly to facilitate and support implementation of formal and informal EKEs across EFSA, rather than taking stock of the newest methodological developments. It was highlighted that the provision of training activities on the EKE guidance was as important as external support during an EKE exercise. In case the EKE guidance was to be revised or updated, the suggestion would be to have it in a format of a manual.

With regard to possible recommendations on the revisions of the content of the guidance, special guidance should be provided on different types of EFSA risk assessments, providing the EFSA context. Further survey results indicate the possible use of an interactive guidance that should connect people inside EFSA on EKE related topics.

The results of the survey indicate that further implementation could be facilitated by involving more people (e.g EFSA staff, panel members, experts/ambassadors) giving advice and with additional training material (detailed manual) with more illustrative templates/examples. At the end of the presentation, the SC was asked what could be the best way to implement the guidance. The SC extensively discussed issues relating to implementation (e.g. development of specialised training and use of pre-recorded training for WG members; use of additional ad-hoc experts to support the EKEs; possible use of the uncertainty cross-cutting WG by extending its scope to also support the implementation of the EKE guidance across the Panels with dedicated ambassadors who support EKEs in their respective WGs and report back to their specific Panels; use of outsourced contractors who are trained to steer formal EKE). The conclusion of the discussions was that the cross-cutting WG on uncertainty could be extended to handle additional tasks (for the implementation), respectively external support contracts could be signed, but this would need to be further discussed with a detailed plan (resources needed, projects to be implemented) that EFSA would prepare and present at the next SC Plenary in September.

8.2. Update on Science Studies and Project Identification & Development Office (SPIDO)

The SC was informed on the latest progress made under the Science Studies and Project Identification & Development Office (SPIDO) which is enhancing EFSA's capacity to identify themes and studies/projects

benefitting regulatory processes and science to fill knowledge gaps and ensure preparedness (generating data, advancing methodologies and creating new tools). An overview of the EFSA's SPIDO themes 2020-2021 was provided. For the themes of 2020[8], the aim, objectives, timelines of roadmaps for action were clarified and the organisations that will develop them were introduced. The Plenary was informed that there was a non-award for one roadmap (RACEMIC) as the offer did not pass the quality award thresholds required. EFSA re-launched this call in the form of a negotiated procedure which is possible after a failed open call (para. 11, Annex I Financial Regulation 2018). Finally, an overview of the 2021 themes currently under consultation ([9]on omics and insect pollinators) were briefly introduced. An open call to develop the respective roadmap for actions will be launched in September. The SC members were invited to disseminate the pre-information notice (PIN)[10] for the upcoming call through their professional network.

The SC asked for clarification regarding the lack of suitable tenderers/offers for the RACEMIC call. EFSA clarified that a pre-notification could not be launched for this call given the limited time available, which could be an explanation. Coordination with other activities might enhance application rate and increase competitiveness that is required to attract the best candidates. The SC also asked about the under representation of offers received from the South of Europe and EFSA clarified that some measures are taken to avoid this; one of them being the advertisement of the calls through the Advisory Forum (that enhances collaboration with MS from all over EU).

8.3. Update on the scientific programme of the ONE conference – 21-24 June 2022 https://www.one2022.eu

Marta Hugas introduced the item on the ONE Conference 2022 and explained that, for the first time, EFSA is co-shaping the scientific programme of its next conference in partnership with the ECDC, ECHA, EEA, EMA and the JRC with input from Member States and EFSA's international partners. Inspired by the One Health approach, the conference will bring together experts and professionals from a wide range of expertise from science to policymaking. The aim of the conference is to discuss how food and feed safety should evolve to ensure preparedness,

[8] Building a European Partnership for Next Generation & Systems-based Environmental Risk Assessment (PERA); New Approach Methodologies in Risk Assessment (NAMs); Artificial intelligence for evidence management in risk assessment (AI) and Risk Assessment of Combined Exposure to Multiple Chemicals (RACEMiC)

[9] Application of omics and bioinformatic approaches: next generation risk assessment; Advancing the environmental risk assessment of chemicals to better protect insect pollinators

[10] The pre-information notice (PIN) was published in the Official Journal (TED) on the 13.07.2021. Link to the published PIN available: https://ted.europa.eu/udl?uri=TED:NOTICE:352403-2021:TEXT:EN:HTML

while supporting the ambitions of the EU sustainability framework, and how new ways of engagement and collaboration can help in advancing the One Health approach in food safety and policymaking.

The conference will take place in Brussels and online on 21-24 June 2022. The presentation highlighted also the progress made with the conference project between April and May 2021. Yann Devos, the Chair of the Scientific Programme Committee, presented the narrative and overarching goals of the conference together with the different sessions and thematic tracks of the draft scientific program outline. Andras Szoradi concluded the joint presentation by presenting the role and composition of the Scientific Programme Committee and the two advisory boards, and the overall timelines of the conference project. It was reiterated that the deadline for the submission of poster abstracts is 15 September 2021 and that public registration for physical attendance is expected to be opened at end January 2022.

The SC asked for a more holistic integration of social sciences into the respective thematic sessions. In addition, it was also noted that MS would also need to be on board if the intention is to jointly advance the implementation of the One Health approach in food safety. As part of the discussion, it was clarified that the Scientific Programme Committee is already promoting partnerships, networking and synergies with MS throughout the development of the conference programme.

9. Questions from and answers to Observers (in application of the guidelines for Observers)[11]

10. Any other business

10.1. Draft agenda September SC Plenary

The SC was provided a highlight of the topics to be presented to the next Plenary (105th meeting) scheduled on 22-23 September and which comprises the draft opinion on non-monotonic dose response for adoption, the first reading of the opinion on synthetic biology and of the draft opinion on copper.

10.2. Feedback from GMO Workshop on allergenicity assessment held on 15-16 June 2021

The SC was presented with a short report on the workshop on allergenicity and asked to have the opportunity to have more information on this topic at the next SC Plenary. The outcome and programme of the meeting is

[11] Refer to footnote 4

available on the EFSA website. The topics were on allergenicity assessments and tools. The participants represented a wide range of sectors (Academia, NGOs, MS representatives, FAO, EU, EFSA). One important part of this workshop was a discussion with the stakeholders to co-act on issues to be solved and where research is still needed (12 distinct questions were listed). The new view was to determine what would be the detected level and acceptable threshold if allergenicity was demonstrated.

10.3. General matter arising

The Scientific Committee was provided with a document summarising relevant activities that took place since the last plenary meeting with focus on the activities of the EFSA Advisory Forum (AF), interagency and international scientific cooperation and EFSA Stakeholders Meetings.

Questions from observers submitted at the time of the registration to the meeting and answers from EFSA

Q1. Are there plans to further study and publish guidance concerning PFAS in Food Contact Materials? And how the Danish regulations can be further refined?

Q2. Will it be possible to share the framework you are considering to address emerging chemical risks?

A1. Currently, there are no ongoing risk assessment activities regarding perfluoroalkyl substances used to manufacture plastics, so falling within the scope of the Regulation (EC) 10/2011 and which assessment follows the EFSA Note for Guidance. Please contact directly the Danish competent authorities in relation to Danish regulations or the European Commission in relation to risk management measures at the level of the European Union.

A2. The European Food Safety Authority's (EFSA) Founding Regulation (EC) No 178/2002 (Article 34), requires EFSA to establish monitoring procedures for systematically searching for, collecting, collating and analysing information and data with a view to the identification of emerging risks in the fields within its mission. An 'emerging risk' is understood to be a risk resulting from (a) a newly identified hazard to which significant exposure may occur or (b) an unexpected new or increased significant exposure or susceptibility to a known hazard.

Emerging chemical risks may arise from intentional or unintentional contamination of the food chain either by anthropogenic or "natural" chemicals. A systematic framework for the identification of emerging chemical risks in the food chain using data generated under the REACH regulation was published in 2014 on the EFSA website. The methodology proposed was further developed and tested on 100 substances registered under REACH (REACH 1[12]). The tested screening procedure was then applied to the 15021 substances registered in REACH (REACH 2[13]). Substances were assessed and scored for environmental release (tonnage and use information from REACH registration dossiers), biodegradation (predictions from BIOWIN models 3, 5 and 6 evaluated in a battery approach), bioaccumulation in food/feed (ACC-HUMAN steady modelling) and chronic human health hazards (classification according to the CLP Regulation for carcinogenicity, mutagenicity, reproductive toxicity and repeated dose toxicity as well as IARC classification for carcinogenicity). Prioritisation based on the scores assigned and additional data curation steps identified 212 substances that were considered "potential emerging risks" in the food chain.

A follow-up project has started in March 2021 to analyse food samples for occurrence of substances in the priority list[14]. The overall objective of the new project is to analyse food and feed for the presence of chemicals that are potential emerging risks using the 212 substances identified in previous work as a suspect list and using non-target analysis, and for a subset of identified substances to quantify levels and assess risks.

Q3. Concerning the Implementation plan of EFSA strategy 2027. Premise: I am aware that there has been a public consultation. I have not been able to submit my comments, for lack of free time for this. I take, therefore, this opportunity to ask 2 questions. Question 1: The Strategy sets 3 main objectives, to be achieved by an Implementation plan. A number of implementation actions consist in implementing the Transparency regulation (TR), i.e. a procedure (or, the means towards the ends). Do you think that monitoring the implementation of the TR will automatically lead EFSA to achieving its goals?

A3. Monitoring the implementation of key actions / deliverables will be one means of checking progress in achieving the strategic goals; in addition, we are currently working on the review of EFSA 's performance framework, i.e. set of corporate/strategic key performance indicators (KPIs)

[12] https://www.efsa.europa.eu/en/supporting/pub/en-1050

[13] https://www.efsa.europa.eu/en/supporting/pub/en-1597

[14] Reference: OC/EFSA/SCER/2020/02 Subject: Screening for emerging chemical risks in the food chain Procurement procedure: Open call (Article 164(1) (a) of the Financial Regulation)

that will also measure the end results (such as timeliness of our scientific advice, satisfaction of customers/stakeholders, use of scientific advice by customers/stakeholders, etc.). See also reply to Q4. below.

Q4. Concerning Objective 1 of the Strategy, how will you monitor the increased quality of scientific advice with respect to the past?

A4. See also reply to Q3. above; we are currently working on the review of EFSA's corporate/strategic KPIs to accompany the EFSA strategy 2027; the final set of strategic KPIs (and targets) will become part of EFSA's Single Programming Document 2022-2025, to be adopted by the EFSA Management Board in December of 2021. The quality of scientific advice will be monitored by indicators that measure to what extent we meet customers and stakeholders' expectations, such as the timeliness of our scientific advice, etc.

Q5. With the new EFSA Register of Questions (RofQ) on the OpenEFSA website it seems to be more difficult to find specific search items, since the 'Filter' is very limited and double keywords seem not to work. It could also be helpful, if the Register would have a function, that the list of found entries could be easily extracted in Excel or other format, as was the case with the EFSA RofQ previously.

Will EFSA intend to still widen the features of the RofQ and by when? And once it would be updated, could it maybe an idea to run a webinar explaining best practice for the search of specific items and/or public consultation asking about the features stakeholders are missing and the problems they are facing, to improve it further? Thank you!

A5. Thanks for the feedback. The new OPEN EFSA Portal (https://open.efsa.europa.eu/) has not yet all the functionalities for which it has been designed. We hope to be up to speed soon. Overall, the trainings available for the implementation of the transparency regulation are available at this link: https://www.efsa.europa.eu/en/stakeholders/transparency-regulation-implementation-training-programme

Q6. How well is known the effect of GMO foods in humans and the later effect it causes?

A6. The SC cannot explain an assessment about GM foods in general. However, a rigorous risk assessment by the GMO Panel at EFSA guarantees that the GM foods authorized so far in the EU are as safe as the corresponding conventional foods. Consequently, GM foods authorized in the EU are expected to have the same short- and long-term nutritional effects as the corresponding conventional foods. In the EU, the safety of GM plants used for food and feed purposes is ensured by an extensive and detailed pre-market evaluation that examines all possible new hazards arising from the engineered plants in comparison to non-GM comparators. This comparative approach considers effects intended by the genetic modification as well as unintended effects. The consequences of any lack of equivalence between the engineered food and its comparators will be assessed to ensure that GM products are as safe and nutritious as conventional food. In particular, this safety assessment includes:

– Information on the recipient and donor organisms and molecular analyses of the effects of the genetic modification.

– Information on the transformation process, the introduced DNA sequences, the potential for horizontal gene transfer, the biological function and activity of newly expressed proteins and, if applicable, an evaluation of RNA interference.

– A comparative analysis of phenotypic characteristics and agronomic performance of GM plants as well as a detailed evaluation of the nutrient, antinutrient and toxin content of raw commodities and their products.

– A weight-of-evidence approach evaluating the safety of newly expressed proteins and the potential allergenicity of the GM food and feed.

This thorough pre-market assessment provides assurance that the GM food and feed is as safe and nutritious as non-GM counterparts. The observer is referred to the relevant EFSA guidance documents and to Commission Regulation 503/2013 for a comprehensive description of the above safety assessment process.

Q7. What is the status of the EFSA work on the ~40 plasticisers identified for further review? It is understood that EFSA will work jointly with ECHA on this topic - how will that be organized. How can industry support the scientific risk assessment of these substances?

A7. In July 2020, EFSA received from the European Commission the first part of a 2-part mandate on the re-evaluation of the risks to public health related to the presence of phthalates, structurally similar substances and replacement substances from food contact materials (FCMs). The aim of this first part of the mandate is to carry out preparatory work on following three topics: 1) prioritisation of substances; 2) development of protocols for exposure and hazard assessment; 3) preparation of a call for data and literature search for the exposure assessment. The outcome of these preparatory tasks will support the eventual risk assessment of the substances, which will be the scope of part 2 of the mandate.

As specified in the Terms of Reference, EFSA and ECHA are closely collaborating in addressing the currently on-going work on prioritisation of substances, but also beyond, e.g. on the recently kicked-off work on development of a protocol for exposure assessment (incl. the preparation of a call for data). In practice, this collaboration is implemented by active participation and involvement of ECHA staff in the meetings of EFSA's WG (operating under the remit of the CEP Panel). This allows sharing of expertise and knowledge among the agencies and supports the achievement of a relevant outcome on substances of common interest for EFSA's and ECHA's regulatory framework.

As is the case also for other areas of EFSA's work, industry and other interested stakeholders will have the opportunity to contribute to the work by participating in engagement activities (i.e. public consultations) on the planned outputs related to this mandate. It is currently foreseen for October 2021 to endorse for public consultation both the draft opinion on prioritisation of substances as well as the draft protocol for exposure assessment (at a later stage, also the draft protocol for hazard assessment will be undergoing public consultation). Furthermore, it is envisaged for 2022 to launch calls for data in support of the exposure assessment. Via these calls, industry and other interested stakeholders will be invited to submit to EFSA relevant data on the prioritised substances, e.g. occurrence in food or migration from food contact materials.

Q8. I want to engage on country wide tour to sensitize farmers on the best practice of applying aflasafe and its importance if I succeed in getting the funds I want. Best approaches of sensitization and what could be best cost effective way forward.

A8. Apologies but we can't answer this question as it is not clear and not under the remit of activities of the EFSA Scientific Committee.

Q9. What the tools to developed a standardized food classification and description system to my country?

A9. EFSA has developed FoodEx2, a standardised food classification and description system with the aim of covering the need to describe in the most detail possible food in data collections across different food safety domains.
FoodEx2 consists of descriptions of a large number of individual food items aggregated into food groups and broader food categories in a hierarchical parent-child relationship structure. The description of individual foods can be complemented by additional information through the use of facets. You can find more guidance and trainings on its use by accessing the EFSA website through this *link.* To support the use of the FoodEx2, EFSA also developed a browsing tool, the *EFSA Catalogue browser* through which users are able to navigate easily through the FoodEx2 catalogue and perform the coding of their food items and the *Interpreting and checking tool* through which they can interpret and analyse FoodEx2 codes generated by the catalogue browser.
FoodEx2 is already used by Member States when exchanging data with EFSA. In addition, it boasts an international reach with the Food and Agriculture Organization and the World Health Organization using FoodEx2 to facilitate the collection of food consumption and food composition data on a global level. FoodEx2 is freely available for download and use.

Q10. How Scientific Committee identifies EFSA's long-term scope (To-Do)? Is that come up from internal specialist meetings or external research programs?

A10. The work programme of the Scientific Committee is built considering the EFSA strategic documents that are developed (e.g. the EFSA strategy 2027 with its implementation plan), and the

priorities set by the European Commission and in particular by DG SANTE. For what concerns development of methodologies, identification of data needs and guidance documents to be developed, priorities are discussed and agreed with EFSA's Units, Scientific Panels. In these considerations, needs in the area of harmonisation of risk assessment approaches at European and International level are also taken on board.

Questions submitted during the meeting and answers from EFSA

Agenda 6.1 Draft Guidance on risk assessment of nanomaterials to be applied in the food and feed chain: human and animal health

Q. How much nanomaterials (in agriculture) are accepted in Europe?

A. EFSA has not conducted an assessment of nano pesticides so far; assessments have been conducted in other areas, e.g. nano-silver as Food Contact Materials, and also risk assessments for conventional materials containing a fraction of nanoparticles, e.g. TiO2 as food and feed additives. Regulation (EU) 2019/1009, among others, sets out procedures for conformity assessment of fertiliser products, the role of manufacturers and the role of Conformity Assessment Bodies in EU Member States.
As an example, this Guidance on risk assessment of nanomaterials applied as feed additives, together with the EU legislation and specific Guidance document developed by the FEEDAP panel that are already in place, will enable EFSA to apply updated methods for assessing new applications in this field.

Q. What about the use of nanomaterials as feed additives? Ad-hoc residue studies?

A. Please see this document: Microsoft Word - ECHA-EFSA Silver compounds biocides_FCM.docx (europa.eu)

Q. Which Panel is taking care of fertilizers?

A. Fertilizers are out of EFSA's remit. EFSA was asked in the past to assess specific substances (e.g. nitrates/nitrites) but not of fertilizers and nano pesticides. EFSA-ECHA assesses risks from nano-silver as food contact material and TiO2 as food and feed additives (see Microsoft Word - ECHA-EFSA Silver compounds biocides_FCM.docx (europa.eu)). Additionally, Regulation (EU) 2019/1009, among others, sets out procedures for conformity assessment of fertiliser products, the role of manufacturers and the role of Conformity Assessment Bodies in EU Member States.

Q. While characterization, do testing strategies consider complexes formed between nano and non-nano materials in food and feed matrices please. Also, weightage for bioavailability of nanomaterials is taken care of during risk assessment

A. The test design presented in the Guidance is suited to address such interactions. Some properties can change in food, affecting their availability. Toxicokinetic information is needed to understand their availability during the absorption and also the systemic distribution in the different body parts to know how much is absorbed and excreted. The Guidance suggest the incorporation of the toxicokinetic assessment in the design of the repeated dose toxicity studies, and highlights the need for adapting the study designs, also for studies conducted under OECD guidelines, including confirmation of particle internalisation by cells and tissues.

Q. What about the fate of unabsorbed nano material (NM)? Does it alter or interact with microbiome?

A. Potential antimicrobial properties of a nano-material (eg silver particles) is considered as a specific section of the Guidance. In addition, local effects in the gasto-intestinal tract should be investigated and properly reported.

Q. How the ongoing revision of the nano material definition in the EC recommendation and potentially the one in the novel food will impact the current version of the guidance?

A. Ongoing revisions of the nano material recommendation will not affect this guidance, as the scope is broader, covering also conventional nanomaterials containing a fraction of small particles and materials with nanoscale properties relevant for the risk assessment.

Q. You mentioned that the OECD methods may not be appropriate to test NM. I wonder who is deciding which adaptations of the protocols are included when testing NM?

A. There is a specific OECD working group, to which EFSA participates, assessing the safety of NM and the specific considerations relevant for the risk assessment. Adaptations of OECD test guidelines for covering the specific considerations for nanomaterials are on-going but will take time until all relevant guidelines could be covered. To address this need, the EFSA Scientific Committee Guidance, includes specific recommendations for adapting "in vitro" & "in vivo" methods including OECD guidelines for assessing NM.

Q. Do reference materials developed by different methods show different properties?

A. Yes as there are several reference materials, such as those developed by the JRC of the EC. In addition to the chemical composition, other properties (different sizes, shapes) may lead to different behaviors under different conditions. There are on-going research projects mapping such differences.

Q. Do NM produce free radicals or are inert?

A. It depends on the general property of the NM. It has to be assessed on a case-by-case basis, a specific consideration is needed regarding the capacity of NM to cross the cellular membranes and produce these radicals at locations of specific concern within the cell.

Agenda 6.2. Draft EFSA Guidance on technical requirements for regulated food and feed product applications to establish the presence of small particles including nanoparticles

Q. How the threshold < 500 nm has been selected? Where is coming from?

A. The selection is justified in the guidance and has been improved with specific details following the public consultation. The basis is the current scientific knowledge that indicates that particles up to 250nm may be internalized by the cells. An uncertainty factor of 2 has been added to account for the uncertainty of screening methods. There are also technical considerations.

Q. Any guidance on distribution of particle size? Should it be normally distributed. Is there a need for assessing half-life of nano material? Guidance on handling of nano particles.

A. The guidance focuses on conventional materials, and particularly the fraction of small particles focusing on the "nano tail" and we cannot assume a normal distribution. The worst-case conditions are considered for setting the thresholds. Regarding the half-life of NM, it is a relevant parameter for deciding if the NM dissolves in the gastrointestinal tract of if particles will reach the small intestine. This is covered in the Guidance by a dissolution rate protocol; a half-life of 10 min or less under these conditions can be used to demonstrate that a conventional risk assessment is sufficient.

Q. Nano-particle Titanium dioxide in food chain needs life cycle analysis.

A. The role of EFSA is to conduct the risk assessment, and it is covered by the EFSA FAF Panel in a recent opinion.

Q. Does the solubility limit of 33g/l only apply to solubility at pH 7 or can pH3 be applied as well, as in the case of the of solubilisation rate? if not, why?

A. This solubility threshold applies only at pH 7. For materials that are only soluble under acidic conditions, time considerations are needed for ensuring full dissolution in the stomach. As a consequence, for pH 3 the Guidance indicates the need for measuring the dissolution rate at this pH level, adapting the timing for accounting that the dissolution process is restricted to the gastric conditions.

Agenda 8.1 Discussion on possible update on the Guidance on Expert Knowledge Elicitation (EKE-2014)

Q. The EKE Guidance transformation into a manual might compromise creativity of EKE performance?

A. No, it does not compromise creativity, it provides more transparency and openness. Three standard protocols were proposed 3 years ago. The questionnaire was saying that this implementation seems more difficult and needs more support. Seven years since the guidance was produced is a long time and new development need to be included. Implementation is more important at the moment rather than revision which could come later (so new protocols would bring more confusion than clarification).

Q. How do you select experts for EKE?. How do you eliminate psychological bias (CoI)?. How do you keep the confidence level of an expert and how to consider in uncertainty EKE?

A. There is a selection procedure (with criteria and with a long list to be checked) and a formal process. When for example you take an expert from industry, you also take a counterpart, i.e. an expert from an authority controlling industry. There is a feature to improve or reduce biases in the discussions. Confidentiality is the most difficult part. A distribution of a range of answers is provided, i.e. experts are asked to provide not a single answer but a range of answers (with probability).

Q. **There are different levels of knowledge across the participants which have an impact of the outcome of the EKE.**

A. There are also some advantages of having such a group with different depths in already known topics.

Q. **Food Safety assurance demand world food trade to end up of the exporting countries to endure huge wastage of food due to non-acceptance by the importer country. That food wastage connotes the huge environmental issue of wasting so much of natural resources and man-made agri-input resources without any purpose.**

A. This is not a question related to the agenda and it is a Risk Management issue therefore outside EFSA's remit of activities. The Green Deal and Farm to Fork strategy are reflecting on this issue and should come up with a way forward by 2023.

Agenda 7.2 EFSA including its Working Groups

Q. **Is Fluoride covered by REACH?**

A. In REACH it is a registered substance >1000 tonnes/year (as NaF)

Q. Was Fluoride considered by SCCS (consumer products, like tooth paste)?

A. The SCIENTIFIC COMMITTEE ON CONSUMER PRODUCTS delivered an opinion on the safety of fluorine in 2005: (https://ec.europa.eu/health/ph_risk/committees/04_sccp/docs/sccp_o_024.pdf)

Q. **I have a question concerning the WG on the read across. Have you considered the read across assessment framework that was developed by ECHA? Do you consider that experiences from ECHA assessment are relevant for the work under EFSA?**

A. The RAAF and the experience gained from it will be taken into consideration together with other existing frameworks in the development of the EFSA Guidance.

Q. **Question to WG Copper: Does the hazard characterization include deficiency (full assessment of AROI)? Should we expect the ADI to change significantly?**

A. Copper deficiency is outside the remit of the copper mandate as it has already been addressed by the NDA Panel in 2015 (EFSA Journal 2015;13(10):4253). Once endorsed by the Scientific Committee, the draft scientific opinion developed by the WG Copper will be made available for public consultation.

Q. **Does EFSA has any plan that involves plant-based food (i.e. meat & cheese analogues, plant milk) safety / regulations program: guidelines to assess the safety of "novel foods" such as plant-based proteins and cultured or lab-grown meat, amid growing demand for meat substitutes.**

A. In EFSA's EMRISK activities towards different sources for food/feed is being monitored through our systems (concomitant introduction of new risks). Provided that there are no regulatory issues, both the information requested on these products and the scientific approach described in the EFSA Guidance on the preparation and submission of an application for authorisation of a novel food in the context of Regulation (EU) 2015/2283 (updated in 2021) should allow a sound and adequate risk assessment of the above-mentioned substances.

DG SANTE provided additional information that are shared here *a posteriori*:
According to the novel food Regulation, food business operators shall verify whether or not the food which they intend to place on the market within the Union falls within the scope of this Regulation. Where they are unsure whether or not a food which they intend to place on the market within the Union falls within the scope of this Regulation, food business operators shall consult the Member State where they first intend to place the novel food. In doing so, the Commission adopted Implementing Regulation (EU) 2018/456 which lays down the information requirements that need to be included in the consultation request, including provisions on the confidentiality of the request, and the procedural steps business operators must follow for the consultation process.

Plant-based products and cultured meat may fall within the scope of the novel food regulation. However, as indicated above, prior to considering as novel foods, the applicant should identify if the technique used e.g. for cultured meat falls under the scope of Regulation (EC) No 1829/2003 on genetically modified food and feed or if for plant-based products other EU regulations (e.g. food additives or flavouring regulation) apply as these regulations prevail over the novel food regulation.

If plant-based products and cultured meat are considered as falling within the scope of the novel food regulation these products may fall within the following two novel food categories:

1) food consisting of, isolated from or produced from plants or their parts, except when the food has a history of safe food use within the Union and is consisting of, isolated from or produced from a plant or a variety of the same species obtained by:
- traditional propagating practices which have been used for food production within the Union before 15 May 1997; or
- non-traditional propagating practices which have not been used for food production within the Union before 15 May 1997, where those practices do not give rise to significant changes in the composition or structure of the food affecting its nutritional value, metabolism or level of undesirable substances;

2) food consisting of, isolated from or produced from cell culture or tissue culture derived from animals, plants, micro-organisms, fungi or algae" to address new foods such as cultured meat.

The applications should be addressed directly to the Commission and the risk assessment is carried out by EFSA.

Q. **Mineral oil hydrocarbons and phthalates in food risk assessment, regulation, and standard analytical method (update on EFSA activities).**

A. Work is ongoing in relation to the development of a draft opinion on identification and prioritisation of substances, as well as of a draft protocol for exposure assessments. Both documents are foreseen to be endorsed for public consultation by the CEP Panel in October 2021.

Agenda 7.1 Overview of the work programme of Panel on Food Contact Materials, Enzymes and Processing Aids (CEP) and Panel on Additives and Products or Substances used in Animal Feed (FEEDAP)

Q. EFSA puts emphasis on risk assessment - the chemical sustainability strategy puts greater emphasis on hazard - will this potential divergence be addressed in the conference?

A. EFSA works on the risk of a hazard to occur: it is about risk and not hazard (it is in EFSA's founding regulation).

Q. **The EU Climate Law has major implications for agriculture and food production - how will EFSA take this into account into their strategy/work?**

A. We have an interest on how these developments will impact EFSA (regulation, food production). It comes from our strategy to develop more sensitive antenna to detect how these changes will affect our risk assessment.

End of the meeting

List of observers attending via web-conference				
Title	**Name**	**Country**	**Organisation**	**Affiliation**
Ms	Alharthi Reem	Saudi Arabia	SFDA	University/public research institute
Mr	Alnughaymishi Hamoud	Saudi Arabia	Saudi Food and Drug Authority	National authority
Mr	Alodhaibi Ibrahim	Saudi Arabia	Saudi Food and Drug Authority	National authority
Ms	Andrei Madalina	Romania	National Agency for Environment Protection	National authority
Ms	Araujo Ana Claudia	Brazil	Brazilian Health Regulatory Agency (Anvisa)	National authority
Ms	Arecchi Alessandra	Switzerland	Givaudan International	Private sector
Mr	Aubanel Michel	France	Kerry	Private sector
Ms	Baldi Alessandra	Italy	Inter university consortium TEFARCO INNOVA	University/public research institute
Mr	Banjara Santosh Kumar	India	Santosh Kumar Banjara	Other - ICMR-National institute of Nutrition
Ms	Beglaryan Meline	Armenia	Center for Ecological-Noosphere Studies (CENS) NAS RA	National authority
Ms	Brozic Diana	Croatia	Veterinary Faculty University of Zagreb	University/public research institute
Ms	Cederberg Ulla	Finland	TErveystuotetukut	Other - lobbying union
Ms	Chakravarty Indira	India	Self	National authority
Mr	Chalias Thanos	Italy	UNIVERSITY OF PERUGIA	Other - eu-froa fellowship programm
Ms	Cheng Wanyun	United States	UPL	Private sector
Mr	Chiba Shuichi	Japan	San-Ei Gen F.F.I., Inc.	Private sector
Mr	Corvaro Marco	Italy	Corteva Agriscience	Private sector
Mr	D'ambrosio Gianni Jan	Italy	Università degli studi di Parma	University/public research institute
Mr	Decan Matthew	Canada	Health Canada	National authority
Mr	Demyttenaere Jan	Belgium	EFFA/IOFI (European / International Flavour Association)	International organisation
Ms	Dermiki Maria	Ireland	Institute of Technology, Sligo	University/public research institute
Mr	Desai Suseelendra	India	Indian Council of Agricultural Research	University/public research institute
Ms	Díaz Pohl Cecilia	Sweden	Swedish Chemicals Agency	National authority
Ms	Druet Céline	France	Anses	Other - Agency for Food, Environmental and Occupational Health & Safety
Ms	Fernandez Rebeca	Belgium	FoodDrinkEurope	Private sector
Mr	Fletcher Nick	Australia	Food Standards Australia New Zealand	National authority
Mr	Frunzareanu Bogdan	Romania	Institute for Control of Biological Products and Veterinary Medicines	National authority
Mr	Frydl Josef	Czech Republic	Forestry and Game Management Research Institute	University/public research institute

Ms	Garzelli Antonella	United Kingdom	FAIR TRADE	EFSA Panel/WG/Network
Ms	Geiser Stefanie	Belgium	EAS Strategies	Private sector
Mr	Gomez Pablo	Spain	Pablo Gómez Serrano	Other - Graduated in biochemistry
Ms	Hajizada Jamila	Azerbaijan	Azerbaijan Food Safety Institute	Other - public legal entity
Ms	Idowu Caroline	Spain	Pen & Tec Consulting S.L.U	Other - Consultancy
Mr	Iordache Gabriel Dorin	Romania	Sanitary Veterinary and Food Safety Departament Prahova	National authority
Mr	Iziomon Moses	Canada	Agriculture and Agri-food Canada	National authority
Mr	Jallow Cherno Assan	Gambia, The	Food Safety and Quality Authority	National authority
Ms	Jensen Henriette	Denmark	The Danish Veterinary and Food Administration	National authority
Mr	Jongpiputvanich Sungkom	Thailand	Chulalongkorn university	University/public research institute
Ms	Kalantzi Ioanna	Greece	HELLENIC CENTRE OF MARINE RESEARCH	University/public research institute
Ms	Kapur Suman	India	Birla Institute of Technology and Science,	National authority
Ms	Kern Magdalena	Germany	Evonik Operations GmbH	Other - Industry
Ms	Khalifa Samia	Sudan	Ministry of Agriculture	National authority
Mr	Kojiro YOKONUMA	Japan	Food Safety Commission Secretariat Cabinet Office, Government of Japan	National authority
Mr	Kotetishvili Mamuka	Georgia	The Scientific-Research Center of Agriculture (SRCA)	University/public research institute
Mr	Koutelidakis Antonios	Greece	UNIVERSITY OF THE AEGEAN	University/public research institute
Ms	Koyanagi Mihoko	Japan	San-Ei Gen F.F.I., Inc.	Private sector
Mr	Krishna Pillay Madhavan Nair	India	Food safety Standards Authority of India	National authority
Mr	Kumar Pradeep	Hungary	Hungarian University of Agriculture and Life Sciences	University/public research institute
Mr	Lang Gunnar	Germany	Evonik Operations GmbH	Other - Toxicologist
Mr	Lazaro Mojica Jonas	Belgium	FoodDrinkEurope	Private sector
Ms	Long Eleanor	United Kingdom	Battelle UK Ltd	Private sector
Mr	Ludeña Iván	Spain	1	Private sector
Ms	Malkiewicz Katarzyna	Sweden	Swedish Chemicals Agency	National authority
Mr	Mantovani Alberto	Italy	Istituto Superiore di Sanità	EFSA Panel/WG/Network
Ms	Martelli Giuliana	Italy	Nathura	EFSA Panel/WG/Network
Ms	Martin Jimenez Cristina	Spain	Pen & Tec Consulting	Private sector
Ms	Mcelhatton ANNA	Malta	University of Malta	University/public research institute
Mr	Modi Bhavesh	India	Government of Gujarat, INDIA	International organisation
Mr	Momcilovic Dragan	United States	Food and Drug Administration	National authority

Mr	Nassar Atef	Egypt	Damanhour University	University/public research institute
Ms	Neumann Birgit	Germany	BAYER AG	Private sector
Ms	Passamonti Sabina	Italy	University of Trieste, Italy	EFSA Panel/WG/Network
Ms	Pereira Marina	Belgium	Humane Society International/Europe	NGO
Ms	Preniqi Sara	Kosovo	Naser Krasniqi	EFSA staff
Ms	Reinik Mari	Estonia	Veterinary and Food Laboratory	National authority
Ms	Roerbo Kristina	Denmark	Danish Veterinary and Food Administration	National authority
Ms	Roila Rossana	Italy	University of Perugia	University/public research institute
Ms	Romeo Agathe	France	Animine	Private sector
Mr	Rossi Luca	Italy	Luca Rossi	Private sector
Mr	Sakaridis Ioannis	Greece	ELGO DEMETER	University/public research institute
Ms	Saparin Norliza	Malaysia	Sime Darby Plantation	Other - Industry
Mr	Sarginson Nigel	Belgium	ExxonMobil Chemical Europe Inc	Private sector
Mr	Schmit Travis	United States	PepsiCo	Private sector
Ms	Schreiner Ligia	Brazil	Brazilian Health Regulatory Agency-ANVISA	National authority
Ms	Schriro María Victoria	Argentina	Administración Nacional de Medicamentos, Alimentos y Tecnología Médica (ANMAT)	National authority
Mr	Schulte Stefan	Germany	BASF SE, Ludwigshafen, Germany	Other - industry
Ms	Sfugier Tollik Kamila	Spain	Bioazul	Private sector
Mr	Shetty Halady Prathap Kumar	India	Pondicherry University, Pondicherry, India	University/public research institute
Ms	Shipp Elizabeth	United Kingdom	Corteva AgriScience	Private sector
Ms	Silva Rebeca	Brazil	Brazilian Health Regulatory Agency (ANVISA)	National authority
Ms	Smith Catherine	Canada	Health Canada	Other - International - Government
Ms	Sokolovic Marijana	Croatia	Croatian veterinary institute	University/public research institute
Ms	Soviero Giovanna	Italy	Dr.ssa Giovanna SOVIERO	Private sector
Mr	Stamenitis Stamatios	Germany	Mars Inc	Private sector
Mr	Stavroulakis Georgios	Cyprus	State General Laboratory (SGL), Ministry of Health	National authority
Mr	Taylor Sean	United States	International Organization of the Flavor Industry (IOFI)	Private sector
Mr	Teste Bruno	France	ANSES	Other - French safety agency
Ms	Tokar Stephanie	Canada	UPL	Other - Industry
Mr	Torres Gregorio	France	World Organisation for Animal Health	International organisation
Mr	Tp Rajendran	India	FOOD SAFETY STANDARDS AUTHORITY OF INDIA	National authority
Mr	Van Den Berg Gijs	Netherlands	Netherlands Minister of Health	National authority

Mr	Vazirani Rakesh	Hong Kong	TUV Rheinland	Private sector
Ms	Vida Patrizia	Italy	Manica SpA	Private sector
Mr	Wang Si	United Kingdom	PepsiCo	Private sector
Mr	Wang Zhongwen	Canada	Health Canada	National authority
Mr	Weidenauer Matthias	Switzerland	Battelle	Private sector
Mr	Wyser Yves	Switzerland	Société des Produits Nestlé	Private sector
Mr	Yang Tony	United States	FDA	International organisation
Ms	Ziabasharhagh Khadejeh	Canada	Health Canada	Other - Department of Health

List of acronyms

AF	Advisory Forum
AHAW	Panel on Animal Health and Welfare
AI	Adequate Intake
ASF	African Swine Fever
BIOCONTAM	Biological Hazards and Contaminants Unit
ccWG	cross-cutting Working Group
CEP	Panel on Food Contact Material, Enzymes and Processing Aids
COM	Communication Unit
COMCO	Communication, Engagement and Cooperation Department
CONTAM	Panel on Contaminants in the Food Chain
DATA	Evidence Management Unit
DG SANTE	Directorate General for Health and Food Safety
EC	European Commission
ECDC	European Centre for Disease Prevention and Control
ENCO	Engagement and Cooperation Unit
ENVI	European Parliament Committee on Environment, Public Health and Food Safety
EURL	European Union Reference Laboratory
FAF	Panel on Food Additives and Flavourings
FCM	Food Contact Materials
FIP	Food Ingredients and Packaging Unit
GMO	Panel on Genetically Modified Organisms
HBGV	health-based guidance values
JRC	Joint Research Centre
MS	Member States
NDA	Panel on Nutrition, Novel Foods and Food Allergens
NMDR	Non-Monotonic Dose Response
NUTRI	Nutrition Unit
OECD	Organisation for Economic Co-operation and Development
PPR	Panel on Plant Protection Products and their Residues
PRES	Pesticide Residues Unit
PREV	Pesticide Peer Review Unit
RASA	Risk Assessment & Scientific Assistance Department
REPRO	Scientific Evaluation of Regulated Products Department
SC	Scientific Committee
SCER	Scientific Committee and Emerging Risks Unit
SPIDO	Science Studies and Project Identification and Development
ULs	Upper Levels
WG	Working Group