

Streamlining Reporting Table compilation through EFSA Connect: A proposal to reduce MSs workload

PSN 12.05.2026

Proposal by the Swedish Chemicals Agency

The current praxis

Currently, 4 different kinds of documents with **different layouts** are being used for compiling peer review comments:

1. Output from EFSA connect

= excel file with comments from MS and public.

- ✓ 10 columns.

2. Commenting table

= word file with comments from EFSA, respectively Applicant.

- ✓ 4 columns.

3. Reporting table (RT)

= word file compiling comments from all involved parties

- ✓ 1 RT for all sections of the RAR.
- ✓ 5 columns.

3. Evaluation table (ET)

= word file that condenses the most important comments in the RT and follows through the remaining steps of the process.

- ✓ 1 ET per section of the RAR.
- ✓ 5 columns.

Issues with the current praxis



1) Manual data transfer required: Comments must be copied into the RT; formatting inconsistencies (e.g. references, country codes) require manual correction.



2) Formatting issues from source files: Paragraph structures in extracted files prevent direct copying, requiring step-by-step transfer.



3) Inconsistent input formats: Different submission formats (e.g. commenting tables vs RT) require manual merging and editing of content.



4) Cross-referencing challenges: References between documents are not aligned, requiring manual checks and adjustments.





Suggested change

- use the output of the Targeted consultation as a starting point: delete irrelevant columns and add new ones to create a **full template covering all the steps of the process** (i.e., a combination of all the existing documents, where the same comment can be transparently followed from start to end).
- Excel is suggested as the format, in order to facilitate sorting and filtering.



Reporting table										Evaluation table			
Comment no.	Section Title	Specific reference to the RAR	Commentor (MS country code, Applicant, EFSA)	Comments	Applicant's response to comments	RMS' response to comments	Action point(s) proposed by the RMS	Action point(s) agreed by EFSA	Description of action point	Description of Report amendment done by the RMS	Recommendations of the Pesticides Peer Review Meeting and discussion written procedure	Rapporteur Member State homework (reference to addenda where necessary)	EFSA conclusion
1	5.02 Aquatic organisms	Vol 3CP B9, B.9.4, Chronic studies with aquatic organisms	SE	We disagree with the RMS conclusion on Daphnia and consider the study to be unreliable, leading to a data gap.	We disagree with SE comment, see also our discussion below.	We disagree with the opinion of SE.	Expert consultation	Expert consultation	Experts to discuss the reliability of the chronic Daphnia study.	N/A	Experts agreed that the study should be deemed unreliable but this change has no impact on the risk assessment.	Vol 3CP B9, B.9.4 has been revised accordingly to reflect the outcome of the expert discussion.	

Advantages of the suggested change

-  **1) Single standardised template:** Improves efficiency, transparency, and traceability; aligns with [RCOM](#) principles.
-  **2) Reduced manual workload (RMS):** Minimises copy-pasting across documents; only limited initial consolidation needed.
-  **3) Improved usability:** Easier sorting/filtering and navigation; all information in one place reduces time and risk of errors also during RAR revision.
-  **4) Efficiency gains (EFSA):** No need for separate ET file; streamlined tracking of process steps.

Thank you for your attention!



Reflections?



Questions?



Further action?