Scientific Committee

Minutes of the 111th Plenary meeting

Held on 16-17 November 2022

(Agreed on 8 December 2022)

Participants

- Panel Members

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

- Hearing Experts[1]:

  Greg Paoli (for agenda item 4.4)

  Jean-Charles Leblanc (for agenda item 4.2)

- European Commission and/or Member States representatives:

  Luis Vivas Alegre (online DG SANTE Unit D1, Farm to Fork Strategy)

  Athanasios Raikos (online DG SANTE Unit D1, Farm to Fork Strategy)

- EFSA:

  Bernhard Url, EFSA Executive Director (on day 1 until coffee break)

  Risk Assessment Production Department (ASSESS): Guilhem De Seze
  Risk Assessment Services Department (ENABLE): Nick Kriz
  Chief Scientist Office: Carlos Gonçalo das Neves, Georges Kass (for agenda item 4.2)

[1] As defined in Article 15 of the Decision of the Executive Director Fconcerning 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

Methodology and Scientific support Unit (MESE): Claudia Roncancio-Peña, Elisa Aiassa, Maria Chiara Astuto, Maria Bastaki, Fulvio Barizzone, Irene Cattaneo, Daniela Maurici, Alexis Nathanail.

Feed & Contaminants Unit (FEEDCO): Paola Manini (for agenda item 5.2.2)

Communication Unit: Arthur Healy and Barbara Gallani (for agenda item 6.1)

1 Welcome and apologies for absence

The Chair welcomed all participants. Apologies were received from Claude Bragard, chair of the PLH Panel, that was replaced by the vice-chair Francesco Di Serio.

2 Adoption of agenda

The agenda was adopted without changes

3 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.

4 Scientific outputs submitted for discussion and/or possible adoption:

4.1 Draft opinion on Fluoride (EFSA-Q-2021-00358)

A status update on the work performed by the working group was presented for information and discussion. The literature screening of epidemiological studies and studies in experimental animals on fluoride health effects was completed in September 2022. The appraisal of studies for risk of bias (RoB) is currently ongoing according to systematic literature review procedures and is currently focused on neurotoxicity and bone health endpoints. An expert in the area of developmental neurotoxicity and an expert in epidemiology have been added to the WG. Preliminary results of exposure assessment have been obtained using existing occurrence data,

[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

and complete exposure assessment including relative contribution is pending incorporation of exposure estimates from dental health products. The target time for presenting draft sections of the opinion for first reading is February 2023. Outsourcing of data extraction from literature on health effects of fluoride is underway.

4.2 Draft opinion on copper (EFSA-Q-2020-00399)

The draft opinion on copper, including revisions introduced in response to the comments received from public consultation, was presented for discussion and possible adoption. The draft technical report of the public consultation was also provided to the committee for information. The committee reviewed all revisions and comments on the draft opinion that was then unanimously adopted. The opinion will be soon published.

4.3 Draft new Annex on 'Degradation/dissolution rate under acidic conditions'

Following up a request from EFSA's Panels to provide more clear guidance on the "Degradation/dissolution rate under acidic conditions" a document has been drafted by the cross-cutting Working Group on Nanotechnologies (ccWG Nano) to provide further clarifications regarding the application of the Guidance on Particle – Technical Requirements[4] to substances that only meet the dissolution/degradation rate threshold under acidic conditions. After endorsement by the Scientific Committee, the draft document was subjected to a period of internal consultation with EFSA Panels and Units and a second round of external consultation with the Scientific Network of Risk Assessment of Nanotechnologies in Food and Feed (Nano Network). The comments received from the Network were discussed during its 12th meeting, which was held on 24 and 25 October 2022[5]. All input received was considered during the finalisation of the draft Annex, which was presented at this meeting for discussion and possible adoption by the Scientific Committee. After a short discussion, the Annex was adopted unanimously and will be soon published.

4.4 Draft guidance on Protocol development (EFSA-Q-2019-00256)

The revisions to the draft guidance document (GD) made by the working group (WG) after the last SC plenary were outlined. The discussion focussed on the revised APRIO paradigm for problem formulation (Agent, Pathway, Receptor, Intervention, Output) and on four hypothetical EFSA mandates where the approach was tested by the WG. The SC acknowledged its

[4] https://doi.org/10.2903/j.efsa.2021.6769

[5] https://www.efsa.europa.eu/en/events/12th-meeting-efsa-scientific-network-risk-assessment-nanotechnologies-food-and-feed

advantages: it aids in the definition of the evidence needs and the methods for the assessment; it overcomes the difficulty of implementing the traditional PICO/PECO approach[6]; it is formal and structured, yet adaptable; it is broadly applicable across EFSA domains and helps harmonise and increase consistency. However, to help put it into each EFSA context, the need for further domain-specific examples of A-P-R-I-O elements was outlined.

The 'Template for protocols' (Annex to the GD - first reading at this plenary) was presented. This document complements the GD by guiding the users step by step through the process of protocol development. It is flexible and must be adapted to the mandate and protocol at hand. In the longer term, it could be converted it into an interactive interface. In the longer term, a 'living repository' of good examples could be created to complement the GD and the Template.

It was explained that the revision of the 'harmonised classification of EFSA questions and sub-questions' developed by the contractor Risk Sciences International (see minutes of 110th SC plenary), not planned in the original mandate for this GD, is on hold.

The overall project timelines are under discussion and the publication of the GD (including the APRIO examples and the Template, not originally planned) will likely be postponed from July 2023 to the end of 2023.

4.5 Draft protocol of the opinion on bromide (EFSA-Q-2022-00329)

The draft protocol for the assessment of health risks to animals from the presence of bromide in feed and to humans from transfer of bromide to food of animal origin and of the safety of the current MRLs for bromide was presented to the committee for discussion and possible endorsement for public consultation. Due to the complexity of the mandate and the agreed deadline, assessments will proceed in parallel in areas of animal health, human health, animal exposure, human exposure, bromide transfer from animals to food of animal origin, and of bromide kinetics. Outsourcing of literature screening related to human health effects of bromide will be done. The protocol was endorsed for public consultation pending possible minor revision by the WG at the next meeting on 28 November. If needed, revisions will be communicated to the Scientific Committee via written procedure.

[6] Population, Intervention/Exposure, Comparator, and Outcome

4.6 Draft technical report to assess reliability and relevance of the Genotoxicity studies

The Technical Report on a 'Harmonised approach to assess relevance and reliability of genotoxicity studies' was presented to the SC for discussion and possible endorsement for publication. This document was previously produced as an internal Working Instruction (WIN) by the cross-cutting WG Genotoxicity upon a request from EFSA. After a further request to make this document publicly available, the content of the WIN document was adapted as a Technical Report and presented to the members of the SC, who unanimously endorsed it for publication on the EFSA website. The Technical Report describes an approach to assess relevance and reliability of genotoxicity studies. It can be consulted by different EFSA Units for the evaluation of genotoxicity studies and can facilitate conduction of weight of evidence in genotoxicity assessments for EFSA opinions. The scope is to ensure harmonisation of the approach for evaluation of evidence on genotoxicity among Units dealing with scientific assessments. Discussion on the refinement and finalisation of the Technical Report is scheduled for the next Genotoxicity WG meeting, which will be held on the 29th November 2022. Publication of the document is foreseen in December 2022.

5 Feedback from the Scientific Committee/Scientific Panels, EFSA, the European Commission Feedback from the panels:

5.1 Feedback from Panels:

5.1.1 Overview of the work programme on Genetically Modified Organisms - GMO Panel

The Chair of the GMO Panel provided an overview of the 2022 workprogramme. So far, the Panel adopted six scientific opinions on GMO applications and 8 for renewal applications. Moreover in 2022, after the entry into force of the Transparency Regulation (Regulation (EU) 2019/1381), the first four applications have been submitted, three of these are under validation and one has been validated. In addition, the Panel finalised the received EC Mandates such as the ones on the post market monitoring of maize MON 810, on Teosinte and oilseed rape MS11. More recently, a new mandate requesting for a scientific opinion on new developments in biotechnology applied to microorganisms has been received and a WG has been established. The Panel also received and finalised two mandates related to biotechnologies, one on criteria for risk assessment of plants produced by targeted mutagenesis and another one on cisgenenic and intragenenic plants. The mandates asked to take into consideration the conclusion already published in previous opinions. It was also announced an upcoming stakeholder Event on 'The safety of plants

derived from New Genomic Techniques: looking into future risk assessment challenges' which follows the publication of the outcome of the two mandates.

5.1.2 Overview of the work programme of the Panel on Plant Protection Products and their Residues - PPR Panel

The Chair of the PPR Panel provided an overview on the workprogramme. The PPR Panel mandate is to develop and review guidance documents on the risk assessment of pesticides and to provide advice on the risk assessment of pesticides in support of the Peer Review of pesticide active substances. On an *ad-hoc* basis, the panel can be also involved in applications, to support the risk assessment of pesticide active substances. The ongoing mandates are covering the following items:

- ✓ Development of Adverse Outcome Pathways (AOPs) relevant for the identification of substances having endocrine disruptor properties;
- ✓ Development of an AOP for Voltage Gate Sodium Channel (VGSC) inhibition leading to Developmental Neurotoxicity (DNT) Adverse Outcome (AO);
- ✓ Use and reporting historical control data (HCD) for regulatory studies;
- ✓ Design and conduct of groundwater monitoring studies supporting groundwater exposure assessments of pesticides.

During the update on the HCD mandate, a summary of the outcomes from the outsourced preparatory tasks (GP/EFSA/ENCO/2020/02[7]) was also presented.

In the end, the Chair clarified about the definition for 'endocrine disrupting chemicals', terminology in line with the pesticides regulatory framework.

5.2 Feedback from EFSA

5.2.1 Feedback from WG uncertainty

An update on the current status of the activities of the Uncertainty WG was given. It was highlighted that the plan for this project, originally foreseen until 2022, was extended to June 2023 with a deliverable in the form of an internal technical report expected by March 2023. The technical report should provide the results of a feedback survey on the implementation of the Guidance on Uncertainty Analysis in Scientific Assessments and provide considerations on the methodological priorities for updating the Guidance. It was highlighted that the WG agreed that there is no need to update the

[7] https://efsa.onlinelibrary.wiley.com/doi/abs/10.2903/sp.efsa.2022.EN-7558

Guidance *per se*, rather some considerations on specific issues could be added to the document. To this end, a list of specific issues to be considered for possible update of the Guidance has been drafted and a prioritisation exercise will be performed at WG level. The SC was informed about the forthcoming survey on the application of the Guidance to scientific assessments. The target group for the questionnaire are EFSA SC and Panel Experts and EFSA Scientific Officers. The questionnaire will be administered at individual level. The main characteristics of the questionnaire were presented, and the SC Members were asked to promote awareness of the survey at their respective Panel level.

5.2.2 Follow up discussion on Applicability of the margin of exposure (MOE) in the risk assessment of botanicals and botanical preparation used as feed additives - follow up

After the overview given in the 110th Plenary meeting and the discussion on the applicability of the **margin of exposure** MOE to botanicals which contain substances that are genotoxic and carcinogenic as "characteristic constituents," the relevant EFSA Panels/Units were requested to verify if similar situations have been encountered in their experience and to discuss the possible implications for the respective sectors, if the MOE approach is applied to the risk assessment of botanicals and botanical preparations. The relevant Panels/Units (FAF/FIP and NDA/NIF) reported that don't have specific experience with the application of the MOE to substances present in the products they are evaluating as flavourings or novel foods and have never applied thresholds. It was highlighted that the MOE is always applicable if a suitable reference point can be derived.

It was clarified that the MOE approach is already applied in the risk assessment of botanicals containing p-allylalkoxybenzenes and that the application of the approach is limited to this class of compounds and to the assessment of the safety of the target species (not to human risk assessment). The measures put in place by risk managers to control exposure of animals were presented.

The discussion addressed the applicability of the MOE considering the reasons why the approach was developed in 2005 (EFSA SC, 2005), as an alternative to the ALARA principle, and the rationale for the statement issued in 2012 (EFSA SC, 2012). Overall, the view of the SC was that there are no reasons why the MOE should not be applied and reported to the European Commission to allow a risk management decision. It is important that a reference point (based on a robust database) is available, and exposure can be calculated.

Specific reasoning related to the applicability of the MOE to feed additives would be addressed by the FEEDAP panel.

5.2.3 Draft framework for guidance on read across

An overview of the read-across guidance framework (under development) and its key steps were provided to the members of the SC. Background information and the rationale behind the need for a cross-cutting read across guidance for EFSA were also highlighted. In addition to more specific information on the 7 steps of the framework, the progress made on data matrix and uncertainty templates was discussed together with brief examples. Lastly, the presentation touched upon the role of New Approach Methodologies (NAM) data to support analogue selection and read across justification, as well as filling of data gaps. The public consultation of the guidance is scheduled for Q4 2024, with its publication foreseen for the first half of 2025. The members of the SC expressed their support towards the status of the proposed framework and their feedback revolved around alignment with existing read across approaches developed by EU sister agencies and interaction with other relevant guidance protocols of EFSA.

6 Other topics for information and discussion

6.1 Review of Plain Language Summary programme and future direction. Introduction to Food Risk Assess Europe

The SC was informed about the project to produce clear, jargon-free summaries of EFSA's risk assessments tailored for non-technical audiences. This is beneficial for layman non-specialists on risk assessment, it facilitates cross-disciplinary engagement, it is more inclusive as addressing a wider audience, it facilitates non-mother tongue English speakers and it promotes accurate media reporting. The project has been piloted starting in 2021 and EFSA is now analysing the lesson learnt. Some examples were presented and discussed. More discussion will take place internally before deciding the way forward.

The SC was also informed that the EFSA website is now available in 24 EU languages. Many pages on the website have been translated using automatic translation. All reasonable efforts have been made to provide an accurate translation. The reference text is anyway the English version.

7 Any other business

7.1 Update on Draft technical report on a common approach on exposure assessment methodologies to residues from veterinary medicinal products, feed additives and pesticides residues in food of animal origin

The SC was presented with a short update on the status of the art of the technical report.

The EC mandate to EFSA and EMA called for the development of a common approach on exposure assessment methodologies to residues from veterinary medicinal products, feed additives and pesticides residues in food of animal origin.

In particular, the EC requested to:

- assess currently available dietary exposure models and discuss their possible alignment
- assess the possible integration the approach developed by JECFA and JMPR
- recommend common approach for future use by EMA and EFSA in routine assessment

The report will be adopted by the EMA Committee on Veterinary Medicines at the CVMP meeting of 6-8 December and it is proposed that the SC endorses this document by written procured by the beginning of December the report will be then published as a joint effort.

The SC asked how previous comments made by the SC have been addressed, and overall acknowledged the effort done in this joint work.

The Technical report will be published at the beginning of January 2023.

7.2 Highlights of draft agenda of next SC Plenary

The SC was provided with a highlight of the topics to be presented to the next Plenary (112th SC Plenary) scheduled on 15 and 16 February 2023. A presentation on the work-programme of the BIOHAZ and CONTAM Panels will be done at the next SC Plenary meeting that will be held as web meeting.

7.3 Publication of the draft report on thematic workshop biomarkers of effects

The SC was informed that the event report summarizing the thematic workshop held on 22-23 September 2022 on the possible use of the biomarkers of effects in scientific assessments will be published as annex of the minutes of this meeting.

End of the meeting

METHODOLOGY AND SCIENTIFIC SUPPORT UNIT

Annex to the minutes of the 111th Scientific Committee plenary

Workshop Report

Thematic Workshop: Biomarkers of effect

Parma (Italy), 22-23 September 2022

Background

In chemical risk assessment, establishing a Health Based Guidance Value (HBGV) is based on the identification of a suitable reference point (RP) and the application of uncertainty factors (UFs). The traditional RP is a Benchmark Dose Lower confidence limit (BMDL) or a No Observed Adverse Effect Level (NOAEL) based on the observation of adversity.

A difficulty arises when there is no clear evidence of adversity or overt toxicity, as represented by a disease, histopathology or traditional clinical chemistry markers indicative of organ toxicity. This is often the case when the assessment is based on human data, and here the risk assessor may need to consider other types of evidence. These may consist of molecular biomarkers of effect that indicate an early biological response as a result of exposure to a chemical but not necessarily representing adversity, such as an increase in serum total cholesterol (which increases coronary heart disease risk), or may be used as a predictor for the development of a disease, such as elevated levels of urinary beta-2-microglobulin above the reference interval (indicative of decreased activity of renal tubule to reabsorb this protein). Such biomarkers of effect have indeed been used by EFSA's Scientific Panels to derive RPs.

Recently, the Scientific Committee (SC) has adopted a Statement for establishing HBGVs[1] where the need for early markers of biological changes that precede cellular and tissue architectural and functional damage in the absence of overt toxicity was emphasised. While this Statement was focusing on regulated products that are also nutrients, a need to consider sensitive biomarkers of effect in risk assessment more widely across the different sectors

[1] EFSA Scientific Committee, More S, Bampidis V, Benford D, Bragard C, Halldorsson T, Hougaard Bennekou S, Koutsoumanis K, Machera K, Naegeli H, Nielsen S, Schlatter J, Schrenk D, Silano V, Turck D, Younes M, Aggett P, Castenmiller J, Giarola A, de Sesmaisons-Lecarre A, Tarazona J, Verhagen H and Hernandez-Jerez A, 2021. Statement on the derivation of Health-Based Guidance Values (HBGVs) for regulated products that are also nutrients. EFSA Journal 2021;19 (3):6479, 39 pp. https://doi.org/10.2903/j.efsa.2021.6479

within the remit of EFSA was identified, together with a need to harmonise their use across EFSA's Scientific Panels.

Objective of the workshop

EFSA aims to prepare guidance documents to support the panels and units when establishing a HBGV in the absence of clear evidence of adversity or overt toxicity of a chemical. For this reason, a dialogue should be established with scientists in and outside the EU, with International Organisations and with other scientific advisory bodies, to learn from existing experiences, to gather information on the approaches taken so far, to collect views and recommendations on possible ways and to help EFSA to shape its future work in this area.

EFSA's Scientific Committee will start a self-task mandate in 2023 to prepare a guidance document on the regulatory use of biomarkers of effect. It is expected that this work will take approximately 24 months, including public consultation of the draft guidance.

Discussion

In the first day of the workshop a plenary session was organised, in which a general discussion took place setting the scene and presenting examples of EFSA's Opinions in which the biomarkers of effect were used in setting reference points, Bisphenol A (Henk van Loveren), Copper (Georges Kass) and Cadmium and Polyfluoroalkyl substances (Dieter Schrenk).

Antony Williams from the US-EPA provided information on the use of databases. In particular, CompTox Chemicals Dashboard (https://www.epa.gov/chemical-research/comptox-chemicals-dashboard) was acknowledged for being useful tool for the identification of relevant biomarkers of effects. It represents an opportunity of collaboration between EFSA and US-EPA for investigating how to validate the biomarkers based on the information available in the database and for exploring to what extent this tool could help making functional correlations and predictions.

Following EFSA's request, Member States appointed experts to contribute to the discussion joining the workshop. Three presentations were made on ongoing work related to the "Risk assessment based on biomarkers of effect for toxic metals inducing nephrotoxicity (Marcel Mengelers, National Institute for Public Health and the Environment, The Netherlands), "NMR-based metabolomics for discovery of biomarkers of dietary intake" (Francesco Capozzi, University of Bologna, Italy), and "Biological systems connectivity framework for identification of effect biomarkers for endocrine disruptors, using cross-omics data and systems biology modelling (Dimosthenis Sarigiannis, Aristotle University of Thessaloniki, Greece).

On the second day of the workshop, the participants were divided in three break-out groups, each one addressing one specific question, as summarised below:

1. What are the scientific criteria to differentiate biomarkers of effect that reflect homeostasis, perturbation of homeostasis, adaptation and cellular/architectural/functional damage? Which ones and how can they be used to identify a RP and to establish HBGVs?

- Initial considerations were made related to the definitions and the differences between: Homeostasis *vs* adaptation *vs* adverse outcome pathway (AOP). A distinction should be made between biomarkers of exposure and biomarkers of effect.

- The interpretation of the quantification of a biomarker of effect differs if the biomarker is upstream or downstream in the AOP, i.e. whether it is far away or closer to the apical adverse endpoint.

- How directly is the biomarker linked to adversity? Not always there is a direct link between an intermediate endpoint and the apical outcome. There could be cross-talks between several key intermediate biomarkers, acting together in the toxicological pathway leading to an adverse apical outcome. The probability that this intermediate biomarker leads to the adverse apical endpoint is often not known.

- In the absence of a causal correlation between an intermediate and an apical endpoint, it is not possible to use intermediate endpoints as biomarkers of effect for establishing an HBGV.

- The human relevance of a biomarker must be considered in first instance, as biomarkers for adversity in animals do not necessarily reflect their relevance in humans.

- For the biomarkers of effect, validation of methods for their measurement and their predictivity ability is needed (to account for specificity, sensitivity, human and animal variability).

2. What are the scientific criteria i) to assess human relevance of biomarkers of effect including relevance for establishing HBGVs? ii) to select (size) of the uncertainty factor(s)?

- A structured, stepwise approach is needed to evaluate the prediction of biomarkers for human adverse effect: 1) Establish human relevance; 2) Identify indication of adverse outcome, 3) Identify information on the mode of action (is this adverse outcome automatically triggered or only under certain conditions? –where is it in the AOP? - Do we have an idea of the mode of action?).

- Good experimental data quantifying the relationship between biomarkers and adverse effect in human are needed.

- Consideration should be given to an additional extrapolation factor. The frequency with which the biomarker leads to an adverse outcome and the level of certainty in the totality of the evidence available needs to be considered.

- Using the Margin of Exposure approach could be an alternative to establishing a HBGV, when the biomarker of effect is not in a well-known toxicity pathway or is far upstream in the AOP.

3. How can New Approach Methodologies (NAMs) be used to integrate biomarkers of effect i.e. molecular initiating event, key events, intermediate effects or adverse outcome?

- The increasing use of NAMs in risk assessment can be leveraged to integrate data on the biomarkers of effect

- NAMs could have a role in validating biomarkers of effects by understanding what the variability of a biomarker in the healthy population is, what its sensitivity and specificity are.

- NAMs could integrate the knowledge for the qualification and quantification of biomarkers of effect, possibly through Adverse Outcome Networks (AONs) and computational tools.

- It was suggested that the new guidance to be developed should be re-named to introduce the concept of intermediate effects, considering it more relevant in relation to the adverse outcome (human effects, animal effects, NAMs) instead of biomarkers of effect alone.

Conclusions and way forward

Following the discussion, it has been concluded that a guidance on biomarkers of effect needs to be developed. The title should be more comprehensive, and it is proposed the following one: "Guidance for the use of biomarkers of effects which are intermediate events in the toxicological pathway leading to apical adverse effects".

Several commonalities between the different sessions were also identified including:

Needs to continue the scientific discussion and to perform preparatory work in specific sub-areas that will support the preparation of the guidance document.

EFSA will be inviting MSs to nominate experts to participate in preparatory work or join the Working Group that will be established.

Opportunities for Collaboration with other agencies and international organisations.

EFSA will be inviting international organisations to nominate experts to participate in preparatory work or join the WG.

Challenges in the development of a guidance document: integration of this methodology in ongoing risk assessments and the implementation of the One-Substance-One-Assessment approach.

EFSA will be inviting MS at the next Advisory Forum taking place in October 2022, to express interest on the willingness to prepare jointly the new guidance document.

Participants

Representatives from Member States, US-FDA, US-EPA, Health Canada, EC, EFSA's Scientific Committee, Scientific Panels and EFSA staff.

Chair: Josef Schlatter (EFSA Scientific Committee)
Co-chairs: Susanne Hougaard Bennekou and Antonio Hernandez Jerez (EFSA Scientific Committee members)

Scientific support:
Jean Lou Dorne, Djien Liem, Daniela Maurici, Claudia Roncancio Peña (Methodology and Scientific Support - MESE Unit)
Georges Kass (Chief scientist office - CSO)
Zainab Al Harraq, Cristina Croera, Chantra Eskes, Sandra Rainieri, Valeriu Curtui (Food Ingredients and Packaging - FIP Unit)