SCIENTIFIC PANEL ON ADDITIVES AND PRODUCTS OR SUBSTANCES USED IN ANIMAL FEED (FEEDAP)

185th Plenary Meeting – OPEN to observers

18-20 November 2025

09:00-18:00 / 09:00-18:00 / 09:00-13:00

MINUTES – Agreed on 4 December 2025

Location: EFSA, Parma

Attendees:

- **Panel Members:**

  Giovanna Azimonti, Eleftherios Bonos, Henrik Christensen, Mojca Durjava, Birgit Dusemund, Ronette Gehring, Boet Glandorf, Maryline Kouba, Marta López-Alonso, Francesca Marcon, Carlo Nebbia, Alena Pechová, Miguel Prieto, and Roberto Edoardo Villa (Chair).

- **Hearing Experts[1]:**

  Not applicable.

- **European Commission and/or Member States representatives:**

  DG SANTE: Francesca Moretti, Almudena Rodríguez and Fabien Schneegans.

- **EFSA:**

  FEEDCO Unit: Montserrat Anguita, Rosella Brozzi, Joana Firmino, Jaume Galobart, Yolanda García-Cazorla, Mary Bridget Gilsenan, Eleni Gkimprixi, Davide Guerra, Orsolya Holczknecht, Matteo Lorenzo Innocenti, Paola Manini, Maria Mountricha, Alberto Navarro-Villa, Jordi Ortuño, Elisa Pettenati, Joana Revez, Jordi Tarrés-Call and Piera Valeri.

  FDP Unit: Irene Baratto, Oscar González.

  FIP Unit: Gloria López-Gálvez.

  LA Unit: Federica Bruno, Gunda Kriz.

  RAL Unit: Jorge Jordá Calero, Alessia Amodio.

- **Observers:**

  See Annex III.

- **Others:**

  Not applicable.

1. Welcome and apologies for absence

The Chair welcomed the participants. Apologies were received from Ilen Röhe and Katerina Theodoridou.

The Chair welcomed Annette Bernhard, Petr Letocha, Sofia Sandalli and Tuuli Tauriainen as new members of the FEEDCO Unit.

2. Adoption of agenda

The agenda was adopted without changes.

[1] As defined in Article 34 of the document "Implementing Rule of the Management Board of the European Food Safety Authority laying down the rules on the selection, appointment and operations of the Scientific Committee, Scientific Panels and of their Working Groups": https://www.efsa.europa.eu/sites/default/files/paneloperation.pdf

3. Declarations of interest of 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 Panel members at the beginning of the meeting.

4. Agreement of the minutes of the 184th FEEDAP Panel plenary meeting held on 16-18 September 2025 via teleconference

The minutes of the 184th FEEDAP Plenary meeting were agreed by written procedure on 24 September 2025.[4]

5. Report on written procedures

The Panel adopted the following opinions by written procedure:

- Vitamin C in the form of ascorbic acid (3a300), sodium ascorbyl phosphate (3a311) and sodium calcium ascorbyl phosphate (3a312) as nutritional additives and in the form of ascorbic acid (3a300), sodium ascorbate (1b301), calcium ascorbate (1b302) and ascorbyl palmitate (1b304) as technological additives for all animal species (EFSA-Q-2024-00488). The opinion was originally adopted on 18 September 2025. However, an erratum was identified after adoption. The Panel agreed to withdraw the adoption and adopted an updated opinion on 6 October 2025.

6. Scientific outputs submitted for discussion/adoption

6.1 Sodium nitrite for pigs, poultry, bovines, ovines, goats, rabbits and horses (EFSA-Q-2020-00584)

This question refers to the re-evaluation under Article 10 of Regulation (EC) No 1831/2003 of sodium nitrite as a technological additive for pigs, poultry, bovines, ovines, goats, rabbits and horses.

The Panel discussed the draft scientific opinion, and in particular assessed data regarding product safety. The draft opinion will be presented for possible adoption in a future plenary or by written procedure.

6.2 L-Tryptophan produced with *Corynebacterium glutamicum* KCCM 80346 as nutritional additive for all animal species (EFSA-Q-2022-00882)

This question refers to the authorisation under Article 4 of Regulation (EC) No 1831/2003 of L-tryptophan produced with *Corynebacterium glutamicum* KCCM 80346 as a nutritional additive for all animal species.

The Panel discussed the draft scientific opinion, and in particular assessed data regarding product characterisation, safety and efficacy. The Panel unanimously adopted the opinion.

[2] https://www.efsa.europa.eu/sites/default/files/corporate_publications/files/independence-policy-2024.pdf
[3] https://www.efsa.europa.eu/sites/default/files/corporate_publications/files/decision-ed-on-competing-interest-management-2024.pdf
[4] https://www.efsa.europa.eu/sites/default/files/2025-09/feedap250916-18_m.pdf

6.3 Endo-1,3(4)-beta-glucanase (4a20) produced with *Trichoderma reesei* CBS 126896 as zootechnical additive for all avian species except layers/breeders, piglets (suckling and weaned piglets) and other growing Suidae (EFSA-Q-2023-00251)

This question refers to the authorisation under Article 4 and the renewal of the authorisation under Article 14 of Regulation (EC) No 1831/2003 of endo-1,3(4)-beta-glucanase (4a20) produced with *Trichoderma reesei* CBS 126896 as a zootechnical additive for all avian species except layers/breeders, piglets (suckling and weaned piglets) and other growing Suidae.

The Panel discussed the draft scientific opinion, and in particular assessed data regarding product characterisation, safety and efficacy. The draft opinion will be presented for possible adoption in a future plenary or by written procedure.

6.4 Endo-1,4-beta-xylanase and alpha-galactosidase (4a33) produced with *Trichoderma longibrachiatum* CBS 139997 and *Aspergillus tubingensis* ATCC SD 6740 as zootechnical additive for turkeys (EFSA-Q-2023-00262)

This question refers to the authorisation under Article 4 of Regulation (EC) No 1831/2003 of endo-1,4-beta-xylanase and alpha-galactosidase (4a33) produced with *Trichoderma longibrachiatum* CBS 139997 and *Aspergillus tubingensis* ATCC SD 6740 as a zootechnical additive for turkeys.

The opinion was discussed in a previous plenary meeting. A new draft was presented and the Panel unanimously adopted the opinion.

6.5 *Lactobacillus acidophilus* CNCM I-3231, *Ligilactobacillus salivarius* CNCM I-3233, *Lactiplantibacillus plantarum* CNCM I-3232, *Lacticaseibacillus rhamnosus* CNCM I-4427 and *Bifidobacterium animalis* subsp. *lactis* CNCM I-3993 as zootechnical additive for dogs and other non-food-producing animals (EFSA-Q-2023-00451)

This question refers to the authorisation under Article 4 of Regulation (EC) No 1831/2003 of *Lactobacillus acidophilus* CNCM I-3231, *Ligilactobacillus salivarius* CNCM I-3233, *Lactiplantibacillus plantarum* CNCM I-3232, *Lacticaseibacillus rhamnosus* CNCM I-4427 and *Bifidobacterium animalis* subsp. *lactis* CNCM I-3993 as a zootechnical additive for dogs and other non-food-producing animals.

The Panel discussed the draft scientific opinion, and in particular assessed data regarding product characterisation, safety and efficacy. The Panel unanimously adopted the opinion.

6.6 L-Valine produced with *Corynebacterium glutamicum* KCCM 80366 as nutritional additive for all animal species (EFSA-Q-2023-00547)

This question refers to the authorisation under Article 4 of Regulation (EC) No 1831/2003 of L-valine produced with *Corynebacterium glutamicum* KCCM 80366 as a nutritional additive for all animal species.

The Panel discussed the draft scientific opinion, and in particular assessed data regarding product characterisation, safety and efficacy. The Panel unanimously adopted the opinion.

6.7 Clinoptilolite of volcanic origin as technological additive for all terrestrial animal species (EFSA-Q-2023-00674)

This question refers to the authorisation under Article 4 of Regulation (EC) No 1831/2003 of clinoptilolite of volcanic origin as a technological additive for all terrestrial animal species.

The Panel discussed the draft scientific opinion, and in particular assessed data regarding product characterisation, safety and efficacy. The Panel unanimously adopted the opinion.

6.8 Perlite as technological additive for all terrestrial animal species (EFSA-Q-2023-00704)

This question refers to the authorisation under Article 4 of Regulation (EC) No 1831/2003 of perlite as a technological additive for all terrestrial animal species.

The Panel discussed the draft scientific opinion, and in particular assessed data regarding product characterisation, safety and efficacy. The Panel unanimously adopted the opinion.

6.9 L-Isoleucine (3c381) produced with *Escherichia coli* FERM ABP-10641 as a nutritional additive for all animal species (EFSA-Q-2024-00033)

This question refers to the modification of the conditions of the authorisation under Article 13 of Regulation (EC) No 1831/2003 of L-isoleucine (3c381) produced with *Escherichia coli* FERM ABP-10641 as a nutritional and sensory additive for all animal species.

The Panel discussed the draft scientific opinion, and in particular assessed data regarding product characterisation, safety and efficacy. The Panel identified the need for additional information from the applicant.

6.10 Guanidinoacetic acid as zootechnical additive for chickens and turkeys for fattening and reared for laying and breeding (EFSA-Q-2024-00287)

This question refers to the authorisation under Article 4 of Regulation (EC) No 1831/2003 of guanidinoacetic acid as a zootechnical additive for chickens and turkeys for fattening and reared for laying and breeding.

The Panel discussed the draft scientific opinion, and in particular assessed data regarding product characterisation, safety and efficacy. The Panel unanimously adopted the opinion.

6.11 Carvacrol, cinnamaldehyde and capsicum oleoresin (4d11) as zootechnical additive for chickens for fattening (EFSA-Q-2024-00573)

This question refers to the renewal of the authorisation under Article 14 of Regulation (EC) No 1831/2003 of carvacrol, cinnamaldehyde and capsicum oleoresin (4d11) as a zootechnical additive for chickens for fattening.

The Panel discussed the draft scientific opinion, and in particular assessed data regarding product characterisation and safety. The Panel unanimously adopted the opinion.

6.12 Menadione sodium bisulphite (3a710) and menadione nicotinamide bisulphite (3a711) as nutritional additives for all animal species (EFSA-Q-2024-00717)

This question refers to the renewal of the authorisation under Article 14 of Regulation (EC) No 1831/2003 of menadione sodium bisulphite (3a710) and menadione nicotinamide bisulphite (3a711) as a nutritional additive for all animal species.

The Panel discussed the draft scientific opinion, and in particular assessed data regarding product characterisation and safety. The Panel unanimously adopted the opinion.

6.13 L-Cysteine hydrochloride monohydrate (2b920) as sensory additive for cats and dogs (EFSA-Q-2025-00008)

This question refers to the renewal of the authorisation under Article 14 of Regulation (EC) No 1831/2003 of L-cysteine hydrochloride monohydrate (2b920) as a sensory additive for cats and dogs.

The Panel discussed the draft scientific opinion, and in particular assessed data regarding product characterisation and safety. The Panel unanimously adopted the opinion.

6.14 L-Arginine produced with *Corynebacterium glutamicum* CCTCC 20232577 as nutritional additive for all animal species (EFSA-Q-2025-00011)

Not discussed due to lack of time.

6.15 KemTRACE chromium (Chromium propionate) for all growing poultry species (EFSA-Q-2025-00199)

EFSA was requested to deliver an opinion on the safety of KemTRACE chromium (Chromium propionate) as a zootechnical additive for all growing poultry species.

The Panel discussed the draft scientific opinion, and in particular assessed data regarding product safety. The Panel endorsed the opinion, which will be adopted once the addendum report from the EURL is received.

6.16 Natrolite-phonolite for all animal species (EFSA-Q-2025-00214)

EFSA was requested to deliver an opinion on the safety of natrolite-phonolite as a technological additive for all animal species.

The Panel discussed the draft scientific opinion, and in particular assessed data regarding product safety. The Panel unanimously adopted the opinion.

6.17 L-Histidine monohydrochloride monohydrate produced with *Escherichia coli* CCTCC M 20241089 as a nutritional additive for all animal species (EFSA-Q-2025-00262)

Not discussed due to lack of time.

6.18 Botanically defined flavourings from Botanical Group 01 - Lamiales for all animal species and categories: thyme oil (EFSA-Q-2025-00403)

This question refers to the authorisation under Article 4 and the re-evaluation under Article 10 of Regulation (EC) No 1831/2003 of thyme oil as a sensory additive for all animal species.

The Panel adopted an opinion on this additive in the 184th Plenary meeting. However, after the adoption an error was identified in the calculation of the safe level for the target species.

The Panel agreed to withdraw the adoption of the opinion and discussed an updated draft in which the error has been corrected. The Panel unanimously adopted the opinion.

6.19 Botanically defined flavourings from Botanical Group 01 - Lamiales for all animal species and categories: spearmint oil (EFSA-Q-2025-00405)

This question refers to the authorisation under Article 4 and the re-evaluation under Article 10 of Regulation (EC) No 1831/2003 of spearmint oil as a sensory additive for all animal species.

The Panel discussed the draft scientific opinion, and in particular assessed data regarding product characterisation, safety and efficacy. The Panel unanimously adopted the opinion.

6.20 Botanically defined flavourings from Botanical Group 01 - Lamiales for all animal species and categories: marjoram oil (EFSA-Q-2025-00407)

This question refers to the authorisation under Article 4 and the re-evaluation under Article 10 of Regulation (EC) No 1831/2003 of marjoram oil as a sensory additive for all animal species.

The Panel discussed the draft scientific opinion, and in particular assessed data regarding product characterisation, safety and efficacy. The Panel unanimously adopted the opinion.

7. Other scientific topics for information/discussion

7.1 Assessment of processing aids

The Panel discussed a proposal for the approach to be followed for the assessment of processing aids used in the manufacture of feed additives. Further discussion is needed.

7.2 Genotoxicity testing of clays

The Panel agreed on the new approach for the genotoxicity assessment of insoluble substances (e.g. clays). Analytical data on clays generated in line with the 'Guidance on the identity, characterisation and conditions of use of feed additives'[5] would exclude a series of potentially genotoxic impurities. Other impurities not regularly tested, of organic nature, can be solubilised and the soluble fraction could be chemically analysed to demonstrate the absence of substances of toxicological concern to waive the experimental genotoxicity studies. This approach is in line with the EFSA Statement on 'Genotoxicity assessment of chemical mixtures'.[6]

OPEN SESSION

19 November 2025, 14:00 – 18:00
20 November 2025, 09:00 – 13:00

8. Welcome

The Chair welcomed the participants and the observers.

9. Panel members introduction

The Panel Chair invited the Panel members to introduce themselves.

10. Presentation of EFSA guidelines for observers

A member of the FEEDCO Unit presented the guidelines for observers for open plenary meetings.[7]

11. Update on new mandates since the previous meeting

11.1 New applications under Regulation (EC) 1831/2003

The Commission has forwarded to EFSA the following new applications of feed additives seeking authorisation under Regulation (EC) No 1831/2003 since the last Plenary meeting. These applications were presented to the Panel:

EFSA-Q number	Subject
EFSA-Q-2025-00545	Monosodium L-glutamate produced with *Corynebacterium glutamicum* KCCM 80528 as nutritional and sensory additive for all animal species
EFSA-Q-2025-00558	6-phytase (EC 3.1.3.26) produced with *Trichoderma reesei* CBS 143997 as zootechnical additive for all poultry and all porcine species
EFSA-Q-2025-00574	Ammonium chloride as zootechnical additive for sows
EFSA-Q-2025-00575	*Bacillus velezensis* (DSM 15544) as zootechnical feed additive for pets and other non food-producing animals
EFSA-Q-2025-00576	6-phytase (EC 3.1.3.26) produced with *Trichoderma reesei* (CBS 146250) as zootechnical feed additive for all poultry and all pigs

[5] https://efsa.onlinelibrary.wiley.com/doi/10.2903/j.efsa.2017.5023
[6] https://efsa.onlinelibrary.wiley.com/doi/10.2903/j.efsa.2019.5519
[7] Guidelines for Observers for open plenary meetings

EFSA-Q number	Subject
EFSA-Q-2025-00611	Guanidinoacetic acid as zootechnical additive for chickens reared for laying, piglets (suckling and weaned piglets) and pigs for fattening
EFSA-Q-2025-00613	Montmorillonite-Illite (1g557) as technological additive for all animal species
EFSA-Q-2025-00614	*Bacillus clausii* SNZ 1971 as zootechnical additive for cats and dogs
EFSA-Q-2025-00615	*Bacillus paralicheniformis* DSM 17236 as zootechnical additive for all growing poultry species
EFSA-Q-2025-00617	Cyanocobalamin produced with *Ensifer adhaerens* CGMCC 21299 as nutritional additive for all animal species
EFSA-Q-2025-00628	Sodium benzoate (1k301) as silage additive for all animal species

11.2 Valid applications under Regulation (EC) No 1831/2003

Applications considered valid for the start of the assessment:

EFSA-Q number	Subject	Valid on
EFSA-Q-2024-00669	Ammonium chloride (4d7) as zootechnical additive for sows	29/09/2025
EFSA-Q-2025-00288	Lactic Acid as technological additive for all animal species	29/09/2025
EFSA-Q-2025-00289	Velay Green Clay (1g599) produced with illite, montmorillonite, kaolinite (1g599) as technological additive for dairy cows and other dairy bovines, ovines, caprines, cervids and camelids	27/10/2025
EFSA-Q-2025-00315	*Ligilactobacillus salivarius* PS21603 as zootechnical feed additive for weaned piglets	28/10/2025
EFSA-Q-2025-00353	6-phytase produced with *Komagataella phaffi* DSM 328547 as zootechnical additive for fish	03/10/2025
EFSA-Q-2025-00376	Xylanase (EC 3.2.1.8) and beta-glucanase (EC 3.2.1.6) as zootechnical additive for pigs for fattening	04/11/2025
EFSA-Q-2025-00438	Calcium D-pantothenate produced with a genetically modified strain *Escherichia coli* K-12 (CCTCC M2023146) as a nutritional additive for all animal species	24/09/2025
EFSA-Q-2025-00444	Zinc chelate of amino acids, hydrate (3b606) as nutritional additive for all animal species	16/09/2025
EFSA-Q-2025-00489	Fumonisin esterase (EC 3.1.1.87) produced with *Komagataella phaffii* NCAIM Y001485 as technological additive for all terrestrial species	18/11/2025
EFSA-Q-2025-00495	L-Arginine (EC 200-811-1) produced with a genetically modified strain *Corynebacterium glutamicum* as KCCM 80387 as nutritional and sensory additive for all animal species	04/11/2025
EFSA-Q-2025-00501	*Bacillus subtilis* M5 as zootechnical additive for all aquatic species	20/11/2025
EFSA-Q-2025-00502	*Bacillus velezensis* C8 as zootechnical additive for all aquatic species	20/11/2025

11.3 New questions under Regulation (EC) No 178/2002

EFSA-Q number	Subject
EFSA-Q-2025-00539	Locust bean gum for all animal species
EFSA-Q-2025-00579	Monteban® G100 (narasin) as coccidiostat additive for chickens for fattening

11.4 Valid applications under Regulation (EC) No 1829/2003

Applications considered valid for the start of the assessment:

EFSA-Q number	Subject	Valid on
EFSA-Q-2023-00507	L-Lysine sulphate from genetically modified *Corynebacterium glutamicum* KCCM 80368 in accordance with Regulation (EC) No. 1829/2003 (AP185)	11/09/2025

11.5 New questions under Regulation (EC) No 767/2009

EFSA-Q number	Subject
EFSA-Q-2025-00578	Request for a scientific opinion on an application for the amendment of the list of intended uses of feed for Particular Nutritional Purposes established by Commission Regulation (EU) 2020/354 for the creation of a new entry "Support of Cardiac Muscle and Metabolism in Cats with Subclinical Hypertrophic Cardiomyopathy (sHCM)"
EFSA-Q-2025-00626	Request for a scientific opinion on an application for the amendment of the list of intended uses of feed for Particular Nutritional Purposes established by Commission Regulation (EU) 2020/354 for the amendment of entry #72 "Stabilisation of the physiological digestion"

12. Feedback from Scientific Committee/Scientific Panels/EFSA/European Commission/EURL

12.1 Scientific Committee

The Chair of the Panel provided feedback on the discussions of the last plenary meeting of the Scientific Committee.[8]

12.2 Scientific Panel including its Working Groups

a) Working Group on Animal Nutrition

The Panel was informed about a meeting held in June 2025, organised by EFSA, to discuss a technical report regarding the efficacy assessment of zootechnical additives submitted within the functional group of "physiological condition stabilisers" (PCS) sent by FEFANA to the EC, and for which input was requested from EFSA. The technical report was discussed in the context of the WG on Animal Nutrition, and some WG representatives were also present at the meeting. EFSA acknowledged that the content and examples included in the technical report were, in most cases, aligned with the position of the WG on the efficacy assessment of PCS. The main points of the discussion regarded (i) clarifications that the assessment for zootechnical additives will focus on the effects claimed, regardless of the functional group of the feed additive; (ii) the minimum duration of the study (short vs long-term) would depend on the effects claimed; (iii) the

[8] https://www.efsa.europa.eu/sites/default/files/2025-10/Minutes%20127th%20SC%20Plenary%20.pdf

possibility and conditions for extrapolating the conclusions between different categories of animals from the same species; and (iv) reinforcing the need to describe the rationale for selecting the stressor(s) and the endpoints monitored, according to the mode of action of the additive, which needs to be scientifically supported (e.g., by literature data). It was noted that most of this information was already included in the updated FEEDAP 'Guidance on the assessment of the efficacy of feed additives'.[9]

b) Working Group on Environmental Risk Assessment

The Panel was updated on the progress done in the general mandate on assessing the safety for the environment of trace elements (EFSA-Q-2024-00482), in particular on the outcome of the call for data and the literature search. The approach to follow in the draft opinion was also described.

The Panel was also informed on framework contract to model predicted environmental concentrations in marine sediment under sea cages. Two deliverables have been published, a third one is on the way, and in January and March two more will be published. Completion of the project is expected by March 2028.

12.3 EFSA

Not discussed.

12.4 European Commission/EURL

a) The European Union Reference Laboratory (EURL) has recently finished an addendum of the EURL evaluation report for beta-carotene for all animal species linked to FAD-2009-0046 (EFSA-Q-2009-00884). The addendum referred to the identification of beta-carotene in premixtures and compound feed. The EURL recommended for official control the EN 17550 method (reversed-phase high performance liquid chromatography (HPLC) coupled to UV detection) for the determination of beta-carotene in premixtures and compound feed. The Panel verified the addendum to the report.

b) The EURL has recently finished an addendum of the evaluation report for neohesperidine dihydrochalcone for piglets, pigs, dogs, calves, ovines, fish linked to FAD-2010-0158 (EFSA-Q-2010-01229). The addendum referred to the determination of neohesperidine dihydrochalcone in the feed additive, premixtures and compound feed. The EURL recommended for official control the European Pharmacopoeia monograph 1547 method (High-Performance Liquid Chromatography coupled with optical detection (HPLCUV)) for the determination of neohesperidine dihydrochalcone in feed additives and the High-Performance Liquid Chromatography coupled with Diode Array (HPLCDAD) for the determination of neohesperidine dihydrochalcone in premixtures and compound feed. The Panel verified the addendum to the report.

c) The EURL has recently finished an addendum of the evaluation report for 6-phytase for all avian species linked to FAD-2021-0066 (EFSA-Q-2021-00417) and for all pigs linked to FAD-2021-0067 (EFSA-Q-2021-00425). The addendum referred to the determination of phytase activity in the feed additive, premixtures and compound feed. The EURL recommended for official control the EN ISO 30024 method (colorimetric method based on the enzymatic reaction of phytase on phytate) for the determination of phytase activity. The Panel verified the addendum to the report.

d) The EURL has recently finished an addendum of the evaluation report for 6-phytase for poultry, pigs and fish linked to FEED-2021-2299 (EFSA-Q-2022-00082). The addendum referred to the determination of phytase activity in the feed additive, premixtures and compound feed. The EURL recommended for official control the EN ISO 30024 method (colorimetric method based on the enzymatic reaction of phytase on phytate) for the determination of phytase activity. The Panel verified the addendum to the report.

[9] https://efsa.onlinelibrary.wiley.com/doi/10.2903/j.efsa.2024.8856

e) The EURL has recently finished an addendum of the evaluation report for vermiculite for all porcine species, all poultry species and ornamental birds, equines, leporids, camelids, pets and other non-food-producing animals linked to FEED-2023-16782 (EFSA-Q-2023-00391). The addendum referred to the determination of its mineralogical composition in the feed additive. The EURL recommended for official control the EN 13925 method (X-ray diffraction (XRD)) for the characterisation of the feed additive. The Panel verified the addendum to the report.

13. FEEDAP Panel - upcoming work, new developments, and working practices

EFSA staff gave a general presentation on the FEEDAP Panel and the FEED Team from FEEDCO Unit. The presentation included information on the way of working, work completed in the last years, work in progress as well as work foreseen for the near future.

14. One Substance One Assessment update

EFSA staff gave an update of the implementation of the One Substance One Assessment (1S1A) in EFSA. An introduction to the 'Chemicals strategy for sustainability (CSS)'[10] was given. Four specific items were presented. The identification of cross-cutting substances across chemical frameworks —a crucial step in the 1S1A approach— has been systematically carried out by EFSA since 2023, including the frameworks outside EFSA's remit. The results of the procurement study on 'Mapping Data Requirements and Risk Assessment Methodologies'[11] were briefly outlined, with examples on the misalignments found, and the likely use of the study for harmonisation purposes. A hint to the EU Library of Food Safety Guidance documents —expected to be finalised by end of February 2026— was given. The Regulations supporting 1S1A, basically the amendment of the Regulation on CLP, the Data Regulation and the Re-attribution of tasks to Agencies (the latter two recently adopted by the European Parliament and the Council), and the tasks impacting EFSA were presented.

The Chair allowed for questions from observers, which are reported below.

Q: Is there in the 1S1A any indications to international organisations, assessment bodies?

A: Yes, the EU-common data platform will allow the uploading of data from international organisations and expects collaboration, where relevant, with them. Also, the Chemicals strategy for sustainability holds the ambition to provide a model to inspire management of chemicals globally.

Q: Regarding the EU-Common data platform on chemicals, how is the confidentiality expected to be handled with dossiers from applicants?

A: Documents uploaded in the platform shall be labelled with the confidential parts. The platform will have different access levels to documents regarding the various type of platform's customers. The legitimate interests of applicants concerning confidentiality and data protection will be fully respected.

15. On-going activities in relation to applications for feed additives

15.1 On-going activities in relation to applications: Updates from FDP Unit

The Panel was informed about the recent updates regarding support to applicants during the preparation of feed additive applications and submissions, highlighting the new services and

[10] https://circabc.europa.eu/ui/group/8ee3c69a-bccb-4f22-89ca-277e35de7c63/library/dd074f3d-0cc9-4df2-b056-dabcacfc99b6/details
[11] https://efsa.onlinelibrary.wiley.com/doi/abs/10.2903/sp.efsa.2023.EN-8540

activities implemented in 2025. It was also informed on the trend of FEED applications and related timelines. Finally, reminders on requirements from EFSA guidance documents were provided.

The questions received during the registration phase were answered, and the Chair allowed for further questions from observers, which are reported below.

Q: What data should be included in Public Summary?

A: The information required and its structure are indicated in Annex I of Regulation (EC) No 429/2008 and in the Administrative guidance for the preparation of applications on additives for use in animal nutrition. No confidential information shall be included in the Public Summary.

Q: When will the EU Submission platform be connected to the account in connect EFSA?

A: We understand the importance of having this feature available to applicants, which could be useful for the notification of studies (NoS) for example. We are exploring ways to create this connection, although at the moment it is not yet possible.

Q: If the feed additive is composed of 2 bacteria strains - we should register the name of bacteria or the brand name of the product e.g. *Lactobacillus* strain X, *Bififobacterium* strain Y or brand name [omissis]?

A: The inclusion of the trade name during the preparation of applications mainly depends on the additive being holder specific or not. Regulation (EC) No 429/2008 describes in detail how dossiers should be prepared and presented.

Q: An applicant has submitted certificates of analysis with parts sanitized upfront in their dossier. They have been deemed not relevant for the risk assessment and not accepted during the intake phase. What was the reason for this?

A: Original files (i.e. containing confidential information) cannot be blackened. Not complying with this indication will lead to requests to the applicant to provide the original non-blackened versions of files and delays during the completeness check.

Q: Wasn't it clarified that certificates of analysis are not subject to notification of studies obligations?

A: It depends on the type of studies. For instance, certificates of analysis describing stability tests fall under the notification of studies obligations, while certificates of analysis regarding the composition and the purity of a feed additive do not. More information can be retrieved on the Q&A of the EFSA website or applicants can ask for pre submission advice to have a better idea of the notification of studies.

15.2 Update from the Legal Affairs Services Unit

The Panel was informed that a positive trend in relation to the submission of confidentiality requests and reaction times has been observed which is resulting in faster processing times. Recent and ongoing activities to improve the applicants' experience were listed, including the simplification of communication templates, the improvement of the IT tools and the preparation of sector specific guidance to assist applicants with the confidentiality assessment process. The Panel was briefed that work on the comprehensive guidance is ongoing and that Panel members will be informed once the work has been completed and where the guidance can be found. General guidance relevant for all feed applications regarding the confidentiality requests submitted in the context of qualitative and quantitative composition, the manufacturing process and methods of analysis was provided.

The Chair allowed for questions from observers, which are reported below.

Q: During the presentation it was mentioned that ISO methods will not be considered confidential. However, one needs to order and pay for the methods.

Don't think ISO will appreciate if it is published. Do I understand the correction correctly?

A: It was clarified that only the name and type of the ISO method, which are publicly available, will be rejected as confidential whereas the details of the ISO method will be accepted as confidential.

15.3 Update from the Risk Assessment Logistics (RAL) Unit

EFSA staff from the RAL Unit presented an overview on the risk assessment and publication process and tools, focusing on the interaction with applicants between the validation and the publication of the scientific output. Information was provided on the upcoming changes impacting the publication workflow and the approach to requests for additional data. It was shown how the risk assessment documents, events and timelines are displayed to the applicant through the e-submission tool and to the public through the OpenEFSA platform.

The Chair allowed for questions from observers, which are reported below.

Q: In the previous presentation, FDP asked that during the completeness check stage the original documents be replaced when revisions are made. Did I understand correctly that during the risk assessment phase, you would prefer that we do not delete the original documents (e.g. a dossier section), but rather reply in the form of an additional annex?

A: Correct. During the risk assessment phase, unless specifically agreed with EFSA, applicants should refrain from deleting documents. Revisions should be provided through an additional annex with clear reference to the changes to be considered and the sections impacted. This avoids the need for applicants to resubmit the same confidentiality claims and helps EFSA focus on the assessment of new data and related requests for confidentiality.

Q: In cases where the deadline for the risk assessment is exceeded (e.g. after submission of additional information), the applicant would greatly appreciate if the FEEDAP Panel provided us with feedback indicating the reason for the delay and an estimated new timeframe. Is there a chance that such a notification to the applicant is implemented in the future?

A: To address this need and increase transparency towards the applicant and the public in general, EFSA is planning to display in OpenEFSA an "Expected Completion Date" in cases in which the risk assessment deadline has expired and cannot be extended. This date would be estimated by EFSA considering pending data submissions (clock-stop periods), the meeting plan, prioritisation, etc. Where relevant, a public comment clarifying the circumstances linked to the proposed date may be displayed.

Q: Regarding the technical hearing, would it be possible to have it in working group and/or Panel meetings?

A: Yes, technical hearings can be held in the context of working group and Panel meetings.

16. Update on the assessment of microorganisms

16.1 New guidance on microorganisms

EFSA staff and two Panel members updated the Panel and stakeholders on the adoption of the 'Guidance on the characterisation of microorganisms in support of the risk assessment of products used in the food chain'[12] and described the novelties introduced compared to the current data requirements described in the FEEDAP 'Guidance on the characterisation of microorganisms used as feed additives or as production organisms'[13].

EFSA clarified that the new EFSA guidance will repeal the provisions of the current FEEDAP guidance, except for section 4 (i.e., In vivo studies) which will remain applicable, and

[12] https://efsa.onlinelibrary.wiley.com/doi/full/10.2903/j.efsa.2025.9705
[13] https://efsa.onlinelibrary.wiley.com/doi/10.2903/j.efsa.2018.5206

informed stakeholders that applicants are expected to submit applications in full compliance with the new EFSA guidance provisions as from 6 months from the date of adoption of such guidance (i.e., 1 April 2026). However, EFSA encouraged applicants to produce all new datasets in compliance with the new EFSA guidance, especially those to be submitted upon additional data requests. EFSA also communicated the intention to update the citation/reference of the current FEEDAP guidance document with the new EFSA guidance in other existing FEEDAP guidance documents.

The Chair allowed for questions from observers, which are reported below.

Q: Regarding the antimicrobial production analysis, the whole-genome sequence (WGS) data for the strain should be interrogated for the presence of genes or gene clusters involved in the biosynthesis of antimicrobials. How should this be handled for microalgae? Considering that microalgae and other protists typically rely on combined morphological and marker-gene sequencing for taxonomic identification—and WGS data are often not available—what would be the appropriate approach for their characterisation? Would the phenotypic test (antimicrobial production test) be required for fermentation products from microalgae?

A: Analysis for the presence of antimicrobial activity are required for fermentation products derived from microorganisms that (i) are not included in the list of Qualified Presumption of Safety (QPS) microorganisms; (ii) are included in the list but have a qualification for antimicrobial production; (iii) are known to produce antimicrobials. Microalgae are not expected to produce therapeutic antimicrobials and therefore this section of the guidance, in principle, does not apply for microalgae.

Q: Microalgae are often produced in the presence of mandatory symbiotic bacteria. In such cases, metagenomic data are typically used to identify the microorganisms present within this type of ecosystem; however, this technique is not mentioned in the guidance, and no methodology is provided for this scenario. What would be EFSA's requirements for establishing the genetic identity of an ingredient composed of multiple microorganisms, including both bacterial species and eukaryotic cells (such as microalgae)?

A: This aspect has not been included in the guidance because this document is intended for applications involving single strains or a limited number of strains produced independently. In case applications in which scenarios like these are received in the future, it is being considered that metagenomic strategies could help to identify and characterise these mixed microbial compositions. The guidance aims to be a functional document for applications that are normally received/assessed. It aims to reflect the information necessary for EFSA Panels to complete their risk assessment. However, at this point in time, it is difficult to define specific requirements and provide clear guidance for these type of applications without having previous experience.

Q: Is there a plan to re-check already registered bacterial strains for virulence genes and antibiotic resistance transfer? Probiotics need to be characterised to not contain plasmids or antimicrobial genes. According to new guidance, bacteria that qualifies for QPS there is no need to provide this information. If we have bacterial strains that are expected to be probiotic products, we need to do WGS and do all these screenings. There are some publications that say that some bacteria, like *Streptococcus*, do not have plasmids, but could have antimicrobial producing activity, so I am wondering if there are bacteria that are already on QPS, if you are planning on re-checking them. Because previously, if bacteria were on the QPS, they did not need sequencing.

A: The assessment is based on the data submitted, the applicant should provide data not older than two years from the dossier submission to EFSA. The QPS list is reviewed regularly by the BIOHAZ Panel, with updates every six months. During these revisions, taxonomic groups that no longer comply with the QPS criteria may be removed, and new ones may be added. It is also noted that the QPS is reviewed at species level, whereas the risk assessment

for applications of regulated products is performed at strain level. Therefore, even when an application concerns a strain belonging to a species included in the QPS list, it is still required to carry out a proper characterization of the strain.

Q: Regarding the detection of viable cells and DNA of the production strain in the final product: must these analyses be performed on the same test batch, or is it acceptable to use different batches for each analysis? Furthermore, does the requirement to use the same test batch also apply to other compositional analyses, or can those be conducted on different batches as well?

A: The guidance specifies that for fermentation products three independent batches should be tested for the presence of viable cells and DNA of the production strain. The applicant may choose to use the same batches for both analysis or different ones, provided that they are independent, produced within the indicated timeframes based on the type of application (5 years for Art. 4; 1 year for Art. 14), and representative of the final product. Regarding the number of batches, five should be used for the composition analysis, and three for the impurities. These batches should also be independent, and the applicant can choose whether to analyse the same or different batches, provided they comply with the requirements.

16.2 Microorganisms pipelines service (MoPS)

EFSA staff provided a general presentation on recent updates on the Microorganisms pipelines service (MoPS). In particular, they introduced the "MoPS2 project", which aims to develop an enhanced version of the MoPS portal that will be accessible to applicants for the analysis of their whole genome sequence (WGS) data for the risk assessment. This new version of the portal will allow applicants to upload their WGS data directly to the portal, and the system will generate a report that can be included in the technical dossier, eliminating the need to submit WGS data within the dossier itself. MoPS ensures a confidential environment and input files submitted to the portal (i.e., WGS raw data) will be automatically deleted once the analysis begins.

The Panel and stakeholders gained further insights on the expected timeline of the project and its main deliverables, particularly the reports summarising the results generated by MoPS.

The Chair allowed for questions from observers, which are reported below.

Q: Regarding the submission of the WGS, you mentioned that the MoPS tool will be finalised within the first two months of 2026, when also the new Guidance will be implemented. Will everything be submitted through the MoPS portal or will we need to use the portal and upload the FASTA file separately in ESFC?

A: The definitive deadline is not yet confirmed, but it is expected within the first half of 2026. The sequence data will be submitted directly through the portal. Once the analysis is initiated, the system will automatically delete the uploaded WGS to avoid storage. Detailed results will be accessible in the portal for visualisation, with downloadable files available for a period of 24 h. The portal will generate a summary report that is expected to be included in the technical dossier, avoiding the need to include also sequence data within the submitted dossier.

16.3 Fermentation products

EFSA staff updated the Panel and stakeholders on a new mandate that was received in June 2025 from the European Commission according to Article 31 of Regulation (EC) No 178/2002 (EFSA-Q-2025-00411). EFSA was requested to provide scientific and technical assistance on existing processes to remove recombinant DNA from fermentation products produced with genetically modified microorganisms. A technical report was prepared by EFSA to address the terms of reference of the mandate and the main conclusions of the work were presented to the Panel and stakeholders. The technical report was approved in October 2025 and is expected to be published in the EFSA website soon.

17. Update on guidance documents

17.1 Frequently asked questions from EFSA to applicants

EFSA staff presented the results of an internal exercise on the questions most frequently asked to applicants during the risk assessment of feed additives. The exercise focused on questions raised after the implementation of the Transparency Regulation, related to identity and characterisation, excluding microorganisms, and on the safety for target species. The analysis highlighted that most clarification requests concern elements already described in the Guidance documents. The findings of this analysis will support the revision of both administrative and scientific guidance documents and help the applicants building higher quality applications.

17.2 Update on the Guidance on target animal safety

The FEEDAP 'Guidance on the safety of feed additives for the target species' was issued in 2017.[14] The Panel was given an overview of the status of this guidance document and to envisage if there is a need for an update. The presentation focused on the experience gained over the last years in assessing dossiers and on the Panel's ambition to move forward with the 3R approach. The Panel was also updated on the discussion held with the stakeholders on this topic in a recent ad hoc event in Brussels, within the context of the WG Animal Nutrition meeting. The Panel unanimously voted in favour of updating the guidance.

The Chair allowed for questions from observers, which are reported below.

Q: Good to hear about reconsideration of 10x and 100x dosage. Could this also mean that the dosage at which endpoint exemptions apply will be brought down? Especially at a high recommended dosage, 10x and 100x may be unrealistic which means that the whole battery of endpoints have to be executed, leading to more invasive/welfare affecting techniques.

A: The logic followed in the current guidance and, likely in the new one, is that the higher the overdose used in the tolerance study, fewer endpoints would be required. This means that if the overdose levels tested are lower, more endpoints would be needed to demonstrate the safety for the target animals. At this point in time, EFSA is not in the position to say how these requirements will change. A potential reduction in the number of trials could be also a future possibility (requesting more analysis for less trials).

Q: Safety presumed approach urgently needed especially in a lot of technological additives for different species in order to not lose more of them - when will it be implemented - which additive categories with priority?

A: The update of the guidance is expected to start next year, after the Panel has been tasked to do so. In principle, no distinction depending on the additive category is foreseen, since the safety depends on the nature of the additive (case-by-case) instead of its category of functional group.

17.3 Update on the Guidance on Characterisation

The FEEDAP Guidance on Characterisation was issued in 2017.[15] A presentation was given in order to have an overview on the status of this guidance document and to envisage if there is need for an update. The presentation focused on the experience gained based on the input of the FAQ exercise, the work of the FEEDAP WG on Characterisation and horizontal issues, such as the nano characterisation and harmonisation with other projects. The Panel unanimously voted in favour of updating the guidance in subject.

The questions received during the registration phase were answered, and the Chair allowed for further questions from observers, which are reported below.

---

[14] https://efsa.onlinelibrary.wiley.com/doi/10.2903/j.efsa.2017.5021
[15] https://efsa.onlinelibrary.wiley.com/doi/10.2903/j.efsa.2017.5023

Q: When is the new guidance expected?

Q: When can we expect having EFSA Guidance on nanoparticles analysis?

Q: I would like to know the status of the risk assessment guidance re small particles at nanoscale for farm and companion animals. I understand that this is in making.

Q: I would like to know where FEEDAP is with the guidance on small particles at nanoscale risk assessment guidance

A: The update of the Guidance on characterisation is expected to start next year, after the Panel has been tasked to do so. It might take 2 years for its update and adoption. With regards the guidance on nanoparticles related to feed additives, the work on the update has started, but a guidance is not expected before 2029.

Q: I find that in the last years applicants are over-guided. I did a tolerance trial in piglets with results same for all the test groups. EFSA replied that the piglets didn't grow according with the default values. This is affecting small and medium-sized enterprises in the EU and favouring external competitors. I don't understand why the Panel enter in specificities that are not safety related.

A: There are different views from different stakeholders on the need for guidance. In any case, it should not be confused the requirements with the quality of the data that is provided in the technical dossiers. The scope of the guidance is to make sure that the requirements are clear, to allow applicants to conduct and report the studies in a proper way.

Q: Regarding the detection of viable cells and production-strain DNA in the final product: must these analyses be performed on the same test batch, or is it acceptable to use different batches for each analysis? Furthermore, does the requirement to use the same test batch also apply to other compositional analyses, or can those be conducted on different batches as well?

A: The Guidance requires three independent batches for the detection of viable cells and DNA. The Guidance also requires five independent batches for batch-to-batch variation and three independent batches for impurities analysis. The samples must be representative of the final product that will be marketed.

Q: Is the panel not worried that the bureaucracy will suffocate scientific creativity in the EU, whereas we leave the door open to ex-EU countries with less stringent regulations?

A: Guidance documents are not supposed to add bureaucracy but to provide guidance to applicants to fulfil the requirements for a proper assessment according to the legislation in place.

Q: Regarding the nano-properties: Wouldn't it be useful to reference the annex to the 175th FEEDAP Plenary meeting minutes on the EFSA website, specifically in the section where the scientific guidance for feed additives is listed? It could help make these criteria more transparent.

A: Thank you for the suggestion.

Q: When processing aids are under critical review: does this mean that only authorized substances (for feed?) will be allowed in future?

A: We would like to get all the relevant data about the product and its compounds. Depending on the different cases, further data on the processing aids may be required.

18. Update on PARNUTS

The staff and a Panel member updated the Panel and stakeholders on the advancements of the preparation of the draft Guidance on the information needed to support the evaluation of the applications for feed intended for particular nutritional purposes (PARNUTs) as

provided for in Regulation (EC) No 767/2009 (EFSA-Q-2025-00425). The main differences identified so far by the experts in assessing PARNUTs, compared to the assessment of feed additives, were presented, as well as the agreements reached on the methodologies to be applied in the assessment of their efficacy and safety. The requirements for the characterisation of PARNUTs were also presented.

The Chair allowed for questions from observers, which are reported below.

Q: Would you consider accepting studies under field conditions to demonstrate efficacy?

A: Any supporting information that could link the mode of action of the PARNUT to the condition of the animals could be used to support that it has an effect in the animals. As an example field studies, where the animals are followed up and their conditions are properly defined, can be accepted. In other cases, specific studies could even not be necessary.

Q: Will all particular nutritional purpose dossiers be assessed by EFSA from now on, or can dossiers also be assessed by Member State research institutes like in the past?

Q: So far applications for PARNUTS have been handed to EC and the Member States, and only in special cases EFSA had to do an assessment. After the guidance adoption, will EFSA be the responsible for these applications or only special cases?

A: According to Regulation (EC) No 767/2009, the applications are dealt by the EC; when the EC considers that the use of the specific feed may not fulfil the particular nutritional purpose or may not be safe, then the application is sent to the EFSA for assessment.

Q: How long (approximately) is the process of validation of a PARNUT from submission of the dossier to publication in the Regulation?

A: The validation phase is quite fast since there is only a light check of the information (it is a matter of days and then the process starts). Until the adoption it will depend on the quality of the data/dossier. The deadline to deliver the opinion is of 6 months.

Q: It was mentioned that "non healthy animals" could be used in efficacy studies. How would the limit be established with clinical studies that could be seen as "veterinary like"?

A: PARNUT should be used to fulfil a particular nutritional purpose/need and that should be the "limit" in terms of health. A PARNUT should not substitute veterinary treatments, but they should be used to give support to the animals with metabolism impairments and support them at specific moments with the particular nutritional purpose feed. As an example, some PARNUT could support animals having chronic renal insufficiency and indeed veterinary treatments could cure them, but in the same time they need a specific diet, which is PARNUT. Therefore, PARNUTS should be considered as special diets to be used in support to other treatments.

Q: Is the submission to be made via ESFC?

A: For the time being Portalino is the system of submission since ESFC is not ready for this kind of applications.

Q: Since the application is submitted via Portalino, do the same rules regarding confidentiality apply?, Or what will be published in Open.EFSA portal?

A: Yes, there is the need to submit both confidential and non confidential version, but EFSA will publish the non-confidential version after confidentiality check. There is no need for Public Consultation like in the other applications.

Q: So probiotic products used during diarrhea should be PARNUT or feed additive?

A: Probiotics are feed additives and should be authorised as such first. In the Annex (Part B) of the Commission Regulation (EU) 2020/354, there is a specific entry for the use of some

probiotics as PARNUT. So in case they can meet a particular nutritional purpose which can be demonstrated it can be considered as PARNUT.

Q: Is there any difference in assessing PARNUTS according to intended target species? I mean animals for food purposes or not. The risk profiles are fundamentally different depending on whether the animal is part of the food chain or not, correct? This should be reflected in assessments.

A: PARNUTS can be used either for food producing animals or pet animals, but most of the entries in the Regulation are for pets. As discussed in the Working Group, the assessment depends on the specific nutritional purpose that needs to be addressed, and not on whether the target animal is a food-producing animal or not. This applies to the safety for the target species. Regarding consumer safety, this aspect has not been considered so far, as it is regarded as a minor part of the overall assessment. In cases where food-producing animals are involved, consumer safety should indeed be taken into account. However, if the PARNUT is mainly composed of feed materials that are already included in the Catalogue or the Register of feed materials, or of substances authorised as feed additives, the relevant assessment has already been performed. Therefore, up to the maximum authorised levels, no consumer safety issues are expected. For this reason, there is not a difference in the approach between food-producing and non-food-producing animals.

19. Questions from and answers to Observers (in application of the guidelines for Observers)

Questions from observers not addressed in the specific sections above.

Q: About physiological condition stabilisers, do you foresee an additional guidance or update to cover those in more detail (e.g., study design, more specific endpoints…)? Will EFSA accept the use of NAM (new approach methodologies) safety methods in feed additive applications to reduce animal testing?

Q: Could you please provide an update on feed additive evaluations of the group "Physiological Condition Stabilisers"?

A: The Panel considers that the current guidance on efficacy already contains sufficient guidance and allows enough flexibility. Regarding the use of NAMs in the safety assessment, the Panel will consider whether there are any validated NAMs that could be considered in the new guidance.

Q: If a dossier to renew a feed additive is not submitted due to lack of industry support, what is the applicable transition period for its phase-out?

A: This question should be addressed to the EC, as it regards legislative aspects.

Q: Draghi's report indicates that EU industry is suffering from lack of competitiveness. The current Commission has indicated that it will therefore introduce simplifications to (among others) regulated product procedures. This will hopefully result in certain simplifications in the applicable regulations. Will EFSA also contribute to this target by assessing their own internal rules and procedures for feed additive authorisations, and if so, can you indicate in what areas you see possibilities to reduce red tape and bureaucracy?

A: EFSA continuously tries to improve processes and tools in order to lean its procedures. On the scientific side, this is reflected by the periodic update of guidance documents. It should be noted however that some mandatory steps cannot be deleted or skipped.

Q: Could EFSA's FEEDAP Panel envision a framework to promote structured technical cooperation or twinning projects between EU-designated control laboratories and those in Mercosur or Africa, especially for risk-based residue surveillance?

A: This question is out of the remit of EFSA.

20. Any other business

Not discussed

21. Next meeting

The next meeting will be held on 27-29 January 2026 via teleconference.

22. Closure

The Chair closed the session by thanking all the participants.

Annex I List of Observers

Online:

A total of 74 observers attended the meeting (out of 119 registered observers)

Observer	Affiliation
Amaduzzi, Angelica	Not available
Arnaud, Ludovic	lallemand
Bailly, Rose-Aimée	Eurolysine
Balázs, Zoltán	Leveret GmbH
Ballin, Patrick	Martin Bauer GmbH & Co. KG
Bouxin, Arnaud	FEFAC
Bremmers, Ruud	Regal BV
Brownen, Aideen	Department of Agriculture, Food and the Marine
Buyens, Goedele	AVEVE Biochem
Capodieci, Giuseppe Luca	FEFANA
Colombo, Valentina	Federchimica AISA
Conboy-Schmidt, Lisa	Nestlé Purina
Correns, Annkatrin	CoGreen Consulting
Costerousse, Benjamin	CoGreen consulting
De Keyser, Kirsten	Huvepharma
Debiais, Julian	ALL4FEED
Derrien, Christophe	Derr Innov EU
Di Giovanni, Francesca	Elanco
Diaz, Sabina	Novus Spain SA
Dickinson, Michael	Exponent International
Dohms, Juliane	Phytobiotics Futterzusatzstoffe GmbH
Drago, Matteo	Prosol S.r.l.
Durán Tenreiro, Nuria	Border Control Post of Algeciras
Dyck, Carol	Neova Technologies Inc
Elewa, Esraa	Nutreco
Eskola, Mari	Medfiles
Gonzalez Sanchez, Antonio Luis	Paleo
Grothaus, Katrin	Biochem Zusatzstoffe Handels- und Produktionsgesellschaft mbH
Hannoun, Marie Julie	Eurolysine
Herrera Garcia, Maria	FEFANA asbl
Herrero-Rollett, Alexandra	dsm-firmenich
Juraskova, Lucie	BeneMeat Technologies a.s.
Karalis, Thanasis	IMERYS INDUSTRIAL MINERALS S.A.
Kiehne, Verena	IFF
Koskinen, Elina	Orion Corporation
Kuterna, Leni	Arvesta
Lanckriet, Anouk	Huvepharma NV
Langhi, Cédric	FoodChain ID
Le Bloch, Jérôme	FoodchainID
Legendre, Héloïse	Phileo by Lesaffre (S.I. Lesaffre)

Observer	Affiliation
Lepont, Alexia	Botanical ID SAS
Llamas Moya, Sara	Kerry
Maigret, Olivier	Puratos NV
Martin, Sarah	Nutrex
Matczuk, Ewa	National Institute of Public Health
Meisel, Sandra	IVH e.V.
Morisset, Typhaine	MIXSCIENCE
Muñoz, Daniel	Zinpro Animal Nutrition
Niederberger, Katherine	Leveret West Ltd
Nikodinoska, Ivana	Alltech
Perez De Nanclares, Marta	Kemin Europa NV
Perrot, Tifenn	ALL4FEED
Pippig, Susanne	LANXESS Deutschland GmbH
Piskorikova, Mirka	Artemis Regulatory Consulting
Podgórska, Aleksandra	Owlie S.A.
Popiołek, Michał	dsm-firmenich
Rachel, Serafin	Azelis
Riedel-Caspari, Gerd	almapharm GmbH
Robles, Lilette	Symrise Pet Food
Rodriguez Manzano, Diego	Corteva Agriscience
Roet, Ron	Stakeholder
Santigosa, Ester	dsm firmenich switzerland
Schoenmann, Susan	taro services GmbH
Schöndorfer, Karin	dsm-firmenich
Setzer, Ariela	Elanco
Storder, Julie	Food Law Science
Taylor, James	Kerry
Ukkonen, Anne	Biosafe Ltd
Van Dam, Hans	Nutreco
Van Eerden, Ellen	Schothorst Feed Research
Varona Sanchez, Elisa	Kemin Europa N.V.
Wall, Sian	Greencoat Ltd
Zeugin, Fabienne	perpende GmbH
Zhu, Hua	Baseclear

Onsite:

A total of 17 observers attended the meeting (out of 20 registered observers)

Observer	Affiliation
Alexopoulou, Katerina	FEFANA asbl
Bertin, Gerard	ERAWAN CONSULTING SARL
Bortoletto, Jacopo	Università degli Studi di Parma
Ciobotaru, Ruxandra	Right First Time
Goñi García-Falces, Mikel	Royal Canin
Herzog, Michaela	Feed and Additives GmbH

Observer	Affiliation
Huibers, Ruud	Elanco Deutschland GmbH
Longares, Mónica	Lucta, S.A.
Mårtensson Dashti, Caroline	Agteria Biotech
Nuyens, Filip	Kemin Europa NV
Pagés Plaza, Daniel	Argenta Global
Pardo, Alicia	Lucta, S.A.
Ravidat, Valerie	ERAWAN CONSULTING SARL
Raynaud, Emilie	ROYAL CANIN
Ribó Arboledas, Oriol	Novonesis Animal Biosolutions AG
Suarez, Robert	Royal Canin
Tedó, Gemma	Lucta, S.A.