European Food Safety Authority

Brussels, 6 October 2014

EFSA/SHP/

Record of the views expressed at the

2ND MEETING OF THE EFSA STAKEHOLDER CONSULTATIVE PLATFORM DISCUSSION GROUP ON FOOD CHEMICAL OCCURRENCE DATA BRUSSELS (BELGIUM) 6 OCTOBER 2014

MEMBERS OF THE DISCUSSION GROUP

Chair: *Fanny Heraud*

AESGP – Association of the European Self-Medication Industry	*Kinga Adamaszwili*	Independent consultant	*David Tennant*
CEFIC – European Chemical Industry Council	*Miguel Prieto Arranz*	FoodDrinkEurope	*Angeliki Vlachou*
CEFIC – European Chemical Industry Council	*Cedric Delveaux*	ICGA - International Chewing Gum Association	*Christophe Leprêtre*
ELC – Federation of European Speciality Food Ingredients Industries	*Joy Hardinge*	NATCOL – The Natural Food Colours Association	*Valerie Rayner*
ELC – Federation of European Speciality Food Ingredients Industries	*Petr Menšik*	SNE - Specialised Nutrition Europe	*Aaron O'Sullivan*
ESA – European Snacks Association	*Ylenia Maitino*	EFSA Stakeholder Consultative Platform Chair	*Andreas Varlamos*
FEDIMA – Federation of the EU Manufacturers and Suppliers of Ingredients to the Bakery, Confectionery and Patisserie Industries	*Jean Christophe Kremer*	UNESDA	*Chris Bruyninckx*
PFP – Primary Food Processors	*Julie Roïz*		

APOLOGIES

BEUC – The European Consumer Organisation – *Gemma Trigueros*

CAOBISCO – Assoc Chocolate, Biscuits & Confectionery of Europe – *Alice Costa*

FoodDrinkEurope – *Beate Kettlitz*

Food Supplements Europe – *Patrick Coppens*

SpiritsEurope – *Bettina Breuer*

UNESDA – Union of European Soft Drinks Association – *Helen Benson*

European Dairy Association – Euromilk – *Helen Smonin*

FoodDrinkEurope (for contaminants) – *Sue O'Hagan*

OBSERVERS

Wim Debeuckelaere – DG Health and Consumers (SANCO), Unit E3 (Chemicals, Contaminants and Pesticides)

Frans Verstraete – DG Health and Consumers (SANCO), Unit E3 (Chemicals, Contaminants and Pesticides)

REPRESENTATIVES OF THE EUROPEAN FOOD SAFETY AUTHORITY

Fanny Heraud	*Doreen Dolores Russell*
Alexandra Tard	*Marco Binaglia (by teleconference)*
Eniko Varga (by teleconference)	*Petra Gergelova (by teleconference)*

1 WELCOME AND ROUND TABLE PRESENTATIONS

The Chair Fanny Heraud (EFSA DATA Unit) welcomed all the participants and the Commission representatives to the 2nd meeting of the Discussion Group on Food Chemical Occurrence Data. The programme for the day was outlined together with an overview of the main topics to be discussed. A 'tour de table' commenced to enable the participants to introduce themselves. Fanny asked the participants for any comments or amendments to the agenda or if the group would like to suggest further items for consideration.

Jean-Christophe Kremer (FEDIMA) requested a clarification concerning the presence of contaminants topics in the agenda given that the main profile of the discussion group is additives. Aaron O'Sullivan (SNE) added that he could not provide answers on contaminant food safety issues and would need to go back to his group to elicit information. Fanny replied that EFSA would like to extend some discussions within the group to include food contaminants, in order to encourage data submissions on contaminants such as MCPDs.

2 CONTAMINANTS

2.1 Update on expected opinions related to contaminants for end 2014/beginning 2015

Marco Binaglia (EFSA CONTAM Unit) provided an update on the activities of the EFSA CONTAM Panel including opinions adopted/expected to be adopted in 2014 as well as the future work programme that included an update on the timetable for adopting the acrylamide opinion. The discussion group was advised that EFSA was looking for data on MCPDs and Chlorates.

Frans Verstraete (DG SANCO) provided a clarification on the coverage of the Erucic acid mandate (feed and food) and as little data are available in the EFSA database, stakeholders' data would greatly support the risk assessment.

Ylenia Maitino (ESA) advised the meeting of information provided by its members who asked for more guidance on recommended methods as well as the laboratories that are available to perform the analyses. EFSA took note of the concerns and said that when possible EFSA tries to give more guidance regarding analytical requirements for data collection. However, this is not always easy, especially for the new substances. Frans acknowledged the concerns, which were not new to him, and advised on the methods available while encouraging the members to generate data with accredited laboratories. He also pointed out that industry should not use the freedom of information requests as an excuse to avoid providing data. He said that one way to address the issue is to strongly encouraging companies to respond through their trade asso-

ciations (so that their data are anonimised) and/or when specifying the country could lead to an identification of the company, they can indicate "EU".

Kinga Adamaszwili (AESGP) asked for further information about the requests for data from the EC and for EFSA. Though there may have been some ambiguity in the past, for contaminants in feed and food, it is clarified that EFSA is now in charge of collecting occurrence data, for both risk assessment and risk management purposes. The data collection is open on a continuous basis. Depending on the needs of the risk assessment (EFSA) or risk management (EC), additional or specific calls can be issued when the data available in the EFSA database are insufficient.

Chris Bruyninckx (UNESDA) asked for more information on the Chlorates mandate, especially regarding Chlorates in drinking water. Frans replied that water is to be taken into account in the exposure assessment. Member States' competent authorities will provide data to EFSA, but as food producers use potable water in food processing it may be that they also have data on water quality/wholesomeness.

2.2 Open data collection of MCPDs and glycidyl esters

Fanny provided a presentation on the new request for MCPDs and glycidyl esters data, the main foods of interest and the specific EFSA needs. Minimum analytical requirement were presented as well as the specific requirements relating to these contaminants.

Though predominately involved with Additives, Angeliki Vlachou (FoodDrinkEurope) informed EFSA that it will notify its members of the call and suggested that future invitations should be extended to stakeholders with an interest in chemical contaminants. Frans reinforced points concerning the information needed and the requested food groups. He also indicated that the official methods mentioned by EFSA have been validated on oils and fats matrices only. There is currently a project underway – supported by EFSA – at the Joint Research Centre (JRC) to adapt these methods on other food matrices. The JRC can be contacted on this topic. The deadline for the call is the end of 2014, but if informed of pending submissions after this deadline EFSA has some scope for flexibility in accepting the data. Ylenia advised that as a sector ESA is currently discussing a data collection activity, but this seems unlikely to be in place before the end of the year. ESA would still like to work with EFSA on this, but stressed that it might not be able to supply any meaningful data within the time frame

2.3 Feedback regarding the organisation of the ad-hoc call for Acrylamide data, roundtable

Fanny opened a learning from experience discussion based on the ad-hoc call for acrylamide data launched in 2013 with the objective of identifying the strengths, weaknesses and improvements to be made on the organisation of EFSA calls for stakeholders data. A 'tour de table' approach was used to gather information.

Ylenia advised that acrylamide was a serious concern for their sector and that ESA have had proper, positive dialogue with EFSA and the European Commission. As a sector, ESA would have liked to have been able to submit more data, but it was unfortunately out of scope, especially regarding the timeframe (data collected from 2010 onwards).

Angeliki indicated that FoodDrinkEurope has developed an acrylamide toolbox and has provided data from their members. Jean-Christophe said the call was clear but didn't receive feedback from the FEDIMA members.

Andreas Varlamos (EFSA Stakeholder Consultative Platform Chair) commented that many independent food testing laboratories have data but that the results of their analyses do not belong to them.

Jean-Christophe suggested that EFSA makes more effort on the communication around the data calls, in order to convince stakeholders of the importance of contributing to the calls for data. Frans indicated that it is important to have in mind that data collated by EFSA are also considered for risk management purposes.

3 ADDITIVES

3.1 Use of usage/monitoring data in exposure assessment to food additives: concrete examples

Alexandra Tard (EFSA FIP Unit) in collaboration with Petra Gergelova (EFSA DATA Unit) presented the new exposure approach and scenarios for refined exposure assessments. Concrete examples of how the

data are received by EFSA were presented. Challenges in interpreting the usage data were also highlighted. Discussions took place on how to reduce mistakes and misunderstanding while providing data.

Wim Debeuckelaere (DG SANCO) asked whether such data gaps and challenges wouldn't be solved by having more interactions/exchanges between EFSA and data providers during the assessment process. Aaron also suggested that data gaps could be addressed during such an exchange, providing an opportunity to look at the data with the appropriate data provider. Organisation of one/two technical hearings per year was suggested.

Angeliki asked for information on additives/food categories for which data was not received. Aaron also indicated that information on the data received would by very useful as they are not representing the whole of their particular sector. For instance, to let them know which food categories are covered and for which other food categories data are missing could help them to encourage their members in submitting data.

Andreas asked if matters concerning transparency are relevant for discussion group and asked for other views about this. Kinga suggested the use of technical hearing, as presented on the EFSA website - http://www.efsa.europa.eu/en/press/news/140710.htm - as a means of strengthening support for applicants and other stakeholders and as a transparent way for collecting and sharing information; an idea which was also supported by Joy Hardinge (ELC). Fanny indicated that EFSA will look into the feasibility of this suggestion.

Joy commented that data on usage levels is provided as consolidated data as it enables reporting data more efficiently. Angeliki made the point that differences in analytical data can be due to the sampling strategy.

For ease of reference all matters concerning comments on the current template for reporting additive usage data are included as Annex I to this report.

3.2 Update on tentative work programme 2014-2016

Alexandra Tard advised the discussion group that the new ANS Panel has been created and new working groups established. The tentative work programme was outlined. The new call for additive usage might involve 2 steps (call for expressions of interest and call for data).

Christophe Leprêtre (ICGA) asked about the timeframe for the call (Batch 4) for data, indicating that a call in the summer period presents some difficulties. Alexandra advised that Batch 4 should be launched during the 2nd quarter 2015. It could be divided in two sub-batches, e.g. one with a 6 month deadline, the other with a 9 month deadline. Aaron responded positively to this information as can start preparing for the call now.

3.3 Template for food additives: proposed revisions

Doreen Russell (EFSA's DATA Unit) in collaboration with Eniko Varga (EFSA DATA Unit) provided an overview of the elements of the EFSA template for reporting additive usage data for which comments and clarifications requests were made by the discussion group following the previous meeting. The details of the discussion are presented in the Appendix 1 of this report.

The way to report information on the representativeness of the usage data was discussed in depth. Alexandra and Fanny insisted on the fact such information is of primary importance for the selection of the input data to be used in the exposure assessment and to describe the uncertainties. Fanny mentioned the example of acrylamide, for which an indication of the percentage of the food products available on the EU market covered by the dataset was given by the data provider. Such information had been very appreciated by the experts. Petr Menšik (ELC), supported by other participants, indicated that such information was extremely sensitive. He suggested to have a look at the outcome of a European Commission project on guidelines for monitoring the presence of food additives, which should bring ideas on the way to move forward on this topic. Chris proposed to consider the information contained in the GNDP database. Fanny proposed the discussion group work further on this topic.

The participants were informed that EFSA is still taking comments on the template by end 2014. Based on the discussions, a revised template will be designed in order to be use for the Batch 4 call mid-2015. It was suggested the next Discussion Group meeting to take place first semester 2015 in order to endorse the revised template and organise ad-hoc training(s) before the call.

4. ANY OTHER BUSINESS

Chris asked for a feedback on the calls for scientific data. Alexandra indicated that the call for batch 3 was just closed and EFSA was not yet able to provide a feedback. Though already raised during the meeting while he was not present.

5. TRAINING SESSION

Doreen Russell presented EFSA's Standard Sample Description and the Simplified Generic Reporting format for reporting. Time constraints prevented the completion of the self-guided exercise on MCPDs data.

Appendix 1

Data element/Group of data elements	Summary of the discussions/suggestions of the DG
Macros	Some data providers are satisfied by the macros, others not. EFSA suggested the possibility to create two templates: one with macros, one without macros. But the DG (discussion group) was not in favour of this option which might create confusion for the data providers Proposals: - Retrieve the macros from the template (the ones linked to SSD)
All	Proposal: Highlight with different colours the status of data elements (mandatory/optional)
Country of reporting	It was clarified that the exposure assessor expects to have an indication of the countries where the products concerned are available for consumption. The current disadvantage of the template is that this variable doesn't allow to report intermediate situations between one country and entire EU Proposals: - As for the first batch, give the possibility to report several countries, separating them by a $ - It could be envisaged to transform this variable in order to report the population size, expressed in number (or range) of inhabitants which have access to the product
Food description (efsaprodcode, authorised additives and conditions of use, product full text description)	It was clarified that the exposure assessor first considers the food additives classification and use the other information for cross-checking purposes. As such, it was suggested to delete the Efsaprodcode. Some DG members indicated that the Efsaprodcode was useful to provide more precise descriptions when the food additives classification is too generic Proposals: - Change the order of the data elements in the template in order to put the most important (food additives classification) in first position and then the others - Consider the Efsaprodcode as optional. It could be recommended to use it only when it allows to provide more details than the food additives classification - Consider the prodtext as a mandatory information indicating precisely which food it is/ the description of the food
Efsaprodcode	Some data providers reported difficulties related to the macro used to se-

	lect the Efsaprodcode Proposals: - Drop the macro or include in the template - Add in the file a table with the full list of Efsaprodcodes, so that the data provider could simply go to the list to find the right code and make a copy/paste.
Product treatment	These variables are not considered by the exposure assessor and EFSA proposed to drop them
Market share	The DG said that this variable is too sensitive and sometimes not even known by people filling the template; there it is almost never completed and EFSA proposed to drop it. Instead, the DG proposed to have another field i.e. occurrence variable to provide information on the number of products which contain the additive at the levels described in the usage variables. EFSA replied that any information that could help in the refinement is welcome
Year of reporting	Although this variable doesn't seem of great interest when submitting the data, EFSA explained that it could be useful in future when analysing data reported at different years.
Parameter description	The DG group would appreciate to have both the name and the E number of the food additive included in the template.
Usage minimum, Usage level typical, Usage level maximum	It was clarified that the usage data should refer to the active principle of the food additive and not its formulation It was clarified by some data providers that when a 0 is indicated, (the cells cannot be left empty), this means that there is a usage but it is not quantified/specified for confidentiality reasons. On the other side, EFSA already received data with 0 levels for the 3 fields with the comment that it meant that the food additive is not used in this food category EFSA was also asked the meaning of a 0 for minimum levels and/or typical levels when a value is indicated for the max level. David Tennant answered that it probably means that the additive is used in some cases/products but not in all. Some data providers mentioned they faced certain difficulties when reporting usage levels above the cut-off value used in the business rules to prevent outliers. Proposal: - Increase the cut-off value
Information on the maximum permitted level	Some data providers suggested having this value appearing automatically once the food and food additive are selected. EFSA replied that such functionality would require some macros calling an external file (database) which would create the same difficulties as the Efsaprodcode variable. In addition, this variable is used only for checking the consistency of the information, and wouldn't represent any interest if filled automatically
Function of the additives	It was clarified that this variable is mainly used for checking the consistency of the information. EFSA reminded the DG that in the framework of this call, it expects to receive data reflecting only the food additive usages. Any other usage of the substance (for nutrient fortification purposes for example) is not expected to be reported. When assessing risk, the other

	sources of exposure are taken into account and are obtained from elsewhere
Expression of the results	EFSA reminded the DG that it is important to report usage levels consistently with the food description provided. EFSA gave the example of sugar coating on a brioche: if the food selected is sugar coating, then it is expected to get data on the usage of additive in the sugar coating. If the food is described as a brioche, then it is expected to get the usage of additive in the sugar coating expressed on the full brioche equivalent. EFSA also reminded the DG about how the exposure assessor would interpret potential discrepancies between food description and unit of reporting. Giving the example of a beverage described as powder to be diluted: if the usage level is reported on a whole weight basis, the exposure assessor understands that the usage refers to the beverage as ready-to-drink; if the usage is reported in a dry weight basis, then the usage refers to the powder.
Conversion factor	Following suggestions received by some members of the DG, EFSA proposed to add in the next revision of the template a data element "Conversion factor" which could contain the conversion factor to apply when a usage level is not reported on a whole weight basis: i.e. the dilution factor from powder to product ready for consumption or the fat percentage to convert a result expressed in fat to products ready for consumption. The DG indicated that there could be a wide range of values and it would be more accurate to use the information contained in the food consumption database. EFSA replied that the food consumption database had also some limitations regarding the macronutrient content (fat) of the food and it could be worthwhile to cross-check the different sources of information.
Application	Some members suggested enabling the possibility to report, when the usage refers to an ingredient, the application rate of the ingredient in some final products. EFSA proposed to add this data element as an option
Other information	Some members suggested adding other kinds of important information such as the loss between the application of the additive and the consumption of the products, etc. The DG concluded that such information concerns very few food additives and would be better managed separately from the standard template (such as when the call for data is issued).