

# PSN IUCLID SUB-GROUP SATISFACTION SURVEY

Giovanni BERNASCONI




# SURVEY RESULTS

- Feedback received by 13 organisations including both MSs and IND representative
- Good overall satisfaction with the IUCLID PSN meetings (duration, items for discussion, level of interactions, balance between participation of Industry and Authorities)
- Several comments were raised. EFSA will address them during the different presentations of today's and future IUCLID PSN meetings




# OVERALL SATISFACTION WITH THE MEETING

How satisfied were you with the overall meeting?



How satisfied were you in relation to duration of the meeting?




Overall a good satisfaction with the meeting and its duration




# LEVEL OF INTERACTIONS AND PARTICIPATION BALANCE

How satisfied were you in relation to level of interaction and time allocated to discussion?



How satisfied were you in relation to the balance between participation of Industry and Authorities?




Overall a good satisfaction with time allocated to discussion and IND/Authorities balance




# AGENDA ITEMS AND TOOLS/COMMUNICATION CHANNELS

How satisfied were you in relation to the items included on the Agenda?



How satisfied were you with the tools and communication channels used in the meeting?



Overall a good satisfaction with the agenda items;  
On communication channel some lower level of satisfaction (is this related to use of M-teams?) - considering the overall feedback and established channel we do not propose to modify it



# COMMENTS REGARDING THE TOPICS ON THE AGENDA

1. The items in the agenda have been important and relevant
2. Consider including a session on **MSs experiences** in the general session; Consider reporting to EFSA **most common problems encountered by MSs/IND**
  - *This could be increased from next PSN, expanding the feedback from IUCLID PSN members/AM to both MSs and IND, while maintaining a closed session for authorities/PM*
3. Consider encouraging active **participation by risk managers of Commission**
  - *Regular agenda item by EC to be introduced in the feedback from IUCLID PSN members/AM?*
4. Consider giving more assistance on **problems and case studies with the MSs' received dossiers** (difficulties on the admissibility step, NoS and Confidentiality checks, balance between general vs specific answers)
  - *please notes EFSA virtual tour of MSs to facilitate this discussion bilaterally and strongly encouraged TC pre-admissibility check between EFSA FDP Unit and MSs*



# TOPICS TO DISCUSS IN FUTURE MEETINGS / 1

- 1. General Roadmap for IUCLID for Pesticides** - Consequences and handling of IUCLID format changes for submitted dossiers
  - *This item will be discussed today – IUCLID 6.7 release ppt/AM session*
- 2. How could **admissibility check** become more user-friendly** ensuring right balance between scientific and regulatory needs
  - *This will be addressed by Feedback from EFSA ppt/PM session*
- 3. Confidentiality requests** - how to manage in a better way
  - *This item will be discussed today – Latest updates on Confidentiality ppt/AM session*
- 4. Report Generator:** MSs are willing to use the report generator when the automatic report will be sufficiently detailed and adapted to be acceptable by EFSA.
  - *This item will be discussed today – Validation Assistant Report Generator ppt/AM session*
- 5. Use of **comparison tool**:** request for recording of a live demo
  - *This item will be discussed today (live demo included on slides) - Feedback from EFSA ppt/PM*



## TOPICS TO DISCUSS IN FUTURE MEETINGS / 2

6. **IUCLID updates:** how to handle them and re-work needed - possibility to ask for one unique IUCLID update at the end of the assessment, so that RMS has only one final NoS check and conf check to do at the end of the assessment, and not at each time that a new study is added to the dossier
  - *Proposed for discussion during the Risk Assessor's session/PM*
7. **Use of Ask a Question:** it is not clear when, in case of a specific dossier, and when we already have a EFSA contact point / coordinator, should we still use Ask a question, or can we exchange with the EFSA coordinator?
  - *This will be addressed by IUCLID latest news and update ppt/AM session*
8. **Annotation fields:** can it be used in communicating with the applicant and can the annotations be seen also in the updated IUCLID dossier?
9. **OHT's:** Are they up to date? the format seems to be outdated these days. Can we discuss them and maybe forward a suggestion to OECD?
10. **Microorganisms**
  - *Points 8-10 for future IUCLID PSN (regarding OHTs regular updates ongoing with OECD)*





# STAY CONNECTED

## SUBSCRIBE TO

[efsa.europa.eu/en/news/newsletters](https://efsa.europa.eu/en/news/newsletters)  
[efsa.europa.eu/en/rss](https://efsa.europa.eu/en/rss)  
[Careers.efsa.europa.eu](https://careers.efsa.europa.eu) – job alerts



## LISTEN TO OUR PODCAST

Science on the Menu – Spotify, Apple Podcast and YouTube



## FOLLOW US ON TWITTER

[@efsa\\_eu](https://twitter.com/efsa_eu)                      [@methods\\_efsa](https://twitter.com/methods_efsa)  
[@plants\\_efsa](https://twitter.com/plants_efsa)                [@animals\\_efsa](https://twitter.com/animals_efsa)



## FOLLOW US ON LINKEDIN

[Linkedin.com/company/efsa](https://linkedin.com/company/efsa)



## FOLLOW US ON INSTAGRAM

[@one\\_healthenv\\_eu](https://instagram.com/one_healthenv_eu)



## CONTACT US

[efsa.europe.eu/en/contact/askefsa](https://efsa.europe.eu/en/contact/askefsa)

