



Group 1 Information Access

**Stakeholder Conference
Transparency in Risk Assessment**

▪ Based on what information are already available, what additional information could be made available:

- ✓ for what purpose?
- ✓ in what format?
- ✓ at what time in the process?

Public data: for citizens to gain their trust and for scientific community (replicable research, usable, editable). Without undermining EFSA or industries work obviously. But citizens are worried about these risks.

VS.

Industries do not submit to EFSA for this purpose for benefits of other businesses and several re-assessments. Check the data is ok but want to undermine the risk of commercial misuse. Should not undermine the work of EFSA in assessing these data. **Fundamental difference among stakeholders.**

Aarhus convention, case law and regulations have to apply to EFSA work in general EU.

Identify data gaps and need to be transparent for others to determine if they are data gaps.

Possible further initiatives to increase transparency?

EFSA decisions, minutes of meetings: need to get them quicker, at least one summary with the key points?

Open Panel Meetings to stakeholder scrutiny –observers-?
15 Panel Meetings have been opened this year. Still project under development.

How is the risk assessment made? Need to understand better and have transparency over the exact process before the decision.

Making public not only the industry application as well dialogue/exchanges between EFSA and companies on this matter. For instance the additional information requested.

Reading room concept proposed by industry. Paper or PDF on computer
VS.

Would be a progress. Then discussion possible. But not enough for the scientific community to work on the tests that have been carried out.

Declaration of interests of EFSA's main employees should be proactively published and kept online for 5 years.

Where is the right balance? Cost versus benefits of possible initiatives.

All the data available, usable, editable
Scientific data that reveals the methodology are crucial. Elements of characterization that could give information to competitors could be kept confidential.

VS.

Industries believe it is not necessarily good for consumer protection that third parties can do the re-assessment and huge variation in conclusions is not necessarily positive.

Data provided for Risk Assessment should not be confidential at all.

VS.

Industries need to provide these kind of information but it is essential that they stay indeed confidential