European Food Safety Authority

ADVISORY FORUM AND SCIENTIFIC COOPERATION UNIT

Parma, 14 April 2014
EFSA/AF/M/2014/503/PUB/FINAL

Final Minutes

FIFTY FIRST MEETING OF THE ADVISORY FORUM ATHENS, 5-6 MARCH 2014

MEMBERS OF THE ADVISORY FORUM

Chair: *Juliane Kleiner*, Head Science Strategy and Coordination Department, EFSA

Austria	*Klemens Fuchs*	Italy	*Giancarlo Belluzzi*
Bulgaria	*Boiko Likov*	Latvia	*Aivars Bèrzinš*
Croatia	*Andrea Gross-Boskovic*	Lithuania	*Sniegulė Ščeponavicienė*
Cyprus	*Popi Kanari*	Luxembourg	*Patrick Hau*
Czech Republic	*Jitka Götzová*	Malta	*Ingrid Busuttil*
Denmark	*Anders Permin*	Netherlands	*Antoon Opperhuizen*
Estonia	*Piret Priisalu*	Norway	*Marie Loiuse Wiborg*
Finland	*Matti Aho*	Poland	*Joanna Gajda-Wyrębek*
France	*Rozenn Saunier*	Portugal	*Jorge Reis*
Germany	*Andreas Hensel*	Romania	*Nicursor Ciocanea*
Greece	*Eirini Tsigarida*	Slovak Republic	*Zuzana Bīrošová*
Hungary	*Maria Szeitzné Szabó*	Slovenia	*Urška Blaznik*
Iceland	*Jón Gíslason*	Spain	*Ana Canals Caballero*
Ireland	*Raymond Ellard*	Sweden	*Leif Busk*

OBSERVERS

FYR of Macedonia	*Svetlana Tomeska Mickova*	Serbia	*Vera Katic*
Montenegro	*Nedeljko Latinovic*	European Commission	*Jeannie Vergnettes*
Vice Chair of the AHAW Panel	*Hans-Hermann Thulke*	Turkey	*Irfan Erol*

HEARING EXPERTS

*Anders Glynn**	Swedish National Food Agency
*Gerhard Heinemeyer**	BfR

REPRESENTATIVES OF THE EUROPEAN FOOD SAFETY AUTHORITY

Advisory Forum secretariat: *Jeffrey Moon, Saadia Noorani, Judith Ricketts and Cinzia Percivaldi*

Per Bergman	*Marta Hugas*
Frank Berthe	*Juliane Kleiner*
*Bernard Bottex**	*Djien Liem*
Stef Bronzwaer	*Alberto Spagnolli**
Hubert Deluyker	*Alessia Vecchio*
Mary Gilsenan	

(=by telephone)*

1 WELCOME AND OPENING OF THE MEETING

Juliane Kleiner opened the meeting with apologies from the Chair, Bernhard Url who could not attend the meeting.

Juliane welcomed Maria Louise Wiborg from Norway who attended the Advisory Forum for the first time and noted apologies from Belgium, United Kingdom and Switzerland.

To address the opening of the meeting on behalf of Prof. Athanasios Tsaftaris, the Greek Minister of Rural development and Food who could not attend, Juliane Kleiner gave the floor to Eirini Tsigarida the Greek Advisory Forum member to deliver his speech which outlined areas of common interest in risk assessment and risk communication, citing data collection, networking and sharing work plans as key areas of collaboration between Greece, EFSA and the Member States.

The president of EFET, Mr Ioannis Tsialtas from the Greek Food Safety Agency was in attendance to welcome members to Athens, highlighting key areas of work for EFET and the importance of cooperation in the area of food safety.

2 ADOPTION OF THE AGENDA

Juliane Kleiner noted the Agenda had been circulated on 21st February and added that an additional item on the International Scientific Conference 2015 would be included under Any Other Business (AoB)

Additional items on the Expo 2015 and Paratuberculosis Colloquium (Italy); Upcoming Events in Latvia (Latvia); Change of Organisation Name (Spain) were also accepted for addition under AoB.

The Agenda was adopted.

3 MATTERS ARISING

Juliane Kleiner noted that the minutes of the last meeting were approved by written procedure on 7 February and members received a hard copy of the Action list and status from the last meeting.

Stef Bronzwaer reminded members that the deadline for proposals under the Guest Scientist Scheme pilot was the end of March.

4 STRATEGIC DISCUSSION ON EFSA'S WORK WITH MEMBER STATES

4.1 Single Programming Document 2014-2016

Alberto Spagnoli, by telephone, presented EFSA's Single Programming Document (SPD) explaining the development of the document incorporating the Multi-Annual Plan (2014-2016), the Annual Management Plan (2014) and the Staff Policy Plan (2014-2016).

Members welcomed the development of the document, acknowledging the difficulties faced in preparing it. Alberto explained the challenges of bridging the gap between strategic and planning levels, the annual and multi-annual approach and incorporating the Communications Strategy, Science Strategy, Scientific Cooperation and International Cooperation, noting that a complete EFSA strategy would be developed only once a new Executive Director was appointed.

Finland noted that the Management Board had recommended developing EU risk assessment capacity, but this was not provided in detail in the plan. Alberto explained that this would be addressed in the development of the Scientific Cooperation Roadmap.

France and Italy asked for additional information on new areas for risk assessment and details on post market monitoring and environmental risk assessment. Marta Hugas advised that there were ongoing preparatory discussions on post market monitoring in the areas of feed additives, food additives and pesticides and more details will be provided at future AF meetings.

Sweden asked how EFSA is dealing with uncertainty in environmental risk assessment in the area of food additives and when it is considered as mandatory, noting difficulties in this area for Sweden. Per Bergman responded that according to Regulation 257/2010/EC, EFSA is not tasked to perform an environmental risk assessment in the context of re-evaluation of already authorised food additives. He also clarified that according to Article 7 of Regulation 257/2010/EC for re-evaluations of food additives, interested business operators shall inform EFSA and the Commission of any information available in relation to any environmental risk from the production, use or waste of that food additive.

Juliane Kleiner concluded by noting that members can provide additional written comments by mid September, together with comments on the draft annual management plan 2015 to be presented at the June AF meeting.

***Action 1**: Members to provide written comments on the Single Programming Document by mid Sept 2014, together with comments on the Annual Management Plan for 2015 to be presented at the AF meeting in June.*

4.2 Enhancing EU Risk Assessment Community

Advisory Forum Discussion Group on Scientific Cooperation Paper

Stef Bronzwaer introduced this item outlining the background to the development of the paper by the AF Discussion Group, and indicated that the paper will be an important element for developing the Scientific Cooperation Roadmap, along with the external review of EFSA's Grants and Procurement, International Cooperation and the EU risk assessment agenda.

The paper was tabled for comment and agreement.

Denmark questioned why the BTSF training programme conditions were so restrictive. Sweden welcomed the sharing of information and data and involving Focal Points and scientific networks to a greater degree, but noted this was reliant on national arrangements and the organisational structure within each country, which should be acknowledged.

Juliane Kleiner thanked the discussion group for the document and noted that the paper was agreed by the members.

Follow up on Breakout Group Discussion of 50th AF Meeting: EU Risk Assessment Agenda

Juliane Kleiner summarised the activity from the last AF meeting during which a 'brainstorming' session was held to identify priority areas for collaboration with specific examples of activities, which could be worked upon jointly. Stef Bronzwaer provided detail on the structure of the summary document shared, drawing attention to the draft criteria that would be used for prioritising.

France proposed an additional criterion relating to concern for society and stakeholders. Bulgaria noted EU guidance and criteria developed for prioritisation of zoonotic disease which took into consideration speed of spread, potential economic loss etc. and provided a weighting to determine whether the problem would be an EU priority, national priority or with individuals and suggested a similar approach could be taken. This was supported by Sweden. Greece suggested the needs of legislation should be considered.

Germany requested clarification on which MS organisations would be involved in activities proposed, noted the need for the Commission's involvement, and with regard to data collection, stated the need to go further into methodologies and means, involving ECDC and JRC.

Finland expressed concerns on the limitations of the tools to elaborate risk assessment activities and questioned whether a list of topics and projects was helpful in increasing RA capacity. Denmark noted the need for a pragmatic, dynamic list of activities and suggested a quicker timeframe.

Juliane Kleiner requested that members provide more detail on the areas identified at the last meeting so that specific actions can be proposed.

Juliane Kleiner advised members that modalities and timelines for developing an EU risk assessment agenda will be explained further in the Scientific Cooperation Roadmap, which will be discussed at the next meeting in June, where also the establishment of a discussion group could be discussed. Members were asked to provide any additional comments on the document by April 15.

Action 2*: Members were requested to provide comments on the Follow up of Break out-group document to AF secretariat by 15th April 2014.*

Work Planning 2014

Jeffrey Moon introduced the discussion on the sharing of risk assessment activities of Member States as a follow up to the last AF meeting, indicating that only a small number of countries had shared information, which had been incorporated into a spreadsheet. Members were asked if the exercise was valuable and whether additional countries could provide information on their activities.

The Netherlands, Norway, Sweden and Cyprus welcomed the initiative and agreed to provide information. France suggested that a publications calendar of completed risk assessments could also be kept.

Hubert Deluyker asked whether the overview table could be made public. After discussion, the members agreed that as the information in the table related to proposed and ongoing work, it should remain confidential.

Members asked to add column filters and few additional columns to the spreadsheet. Stef Bronzwaer explained that this spreadsheet will replace the 'table on planned activities' that had been filled out by Focal Points in the past.

Juliane Kleiner noted the comments and the agreement that the information would be updated and shared ahead of the next meeting.

Action 3*: MS to provided details by end of May on planned activities to allow table to be updated by June meeting.*

Early means to identify and possibly prevent diverging opinions

Stef Bronzwaer presented a brief summary of past cases where divergent opinions occurred between EFSA and member states, listing a number of remedial actions.

France noted the importance of specific meetings on specific questions in order to resolve and clarify differences of approach. Germany highlighted the importance of harmonisation on the risk assessment process.

4.3 Evidence Management – Data Collection and Data Access

Mary Gilsenan introduced the breakout session providing an overview of EFSA's current activities on data collection and the development of a draft data roadmap.

The plenary session closed to allow members to participate in small discussion groups to consider issues relating to data access and data quality.

Each group reported back to the session on the main points of their discussion. A summary of the feedback is provided in Annex A.

Juliane Kleiner opened the discussions on the issue of open data access.

Denmark commented that it was important for industry to follow public bodies in opening access to their data and stated the importance of including industry data in conducting risk assessments. Finland raised uncertainty about opening access to data, suggesting a step wise approach, first opening data to Member States then NGOs. Based on the experience gained it was suggested the data could be opened to the public. Spain supported this view. Italy was in favour of opening access to data however noted that the decision needs to be taken at a political level and not by the Forum. Italy commented that data from private laboratories should also be considered in addition to data owned by industry.

The Commission highlighted that there are European Commission guidelines supporting open data and that a lot of data was open access. However it was recognised that it is important to have a debate where there are problems with access to data.

In relation to data quality, Mary Gilsenan informed the Forum that it was envisaged to carry out a similar exercise with the Scientific Network on Chemical Occurrence.

Finland welcomed the idea of carrying out a similar breakout session with the Scientific Network on Chemical Occurrence and suggested an exercise should also be carried out with the Scientific Network on Zoonoses. Both groups suggested taking advantage of changes to EU Regulation 882/2004 to improve data collection for risk assessment.

Spain suggested that efforts should be made to progressively change official data collection to meet the needs for risk assessment.

Juliane Kleiner concluded noting that EFSA would reflect on the outcomes of the group discussion and comments raised. Members were informed that EFSA intends to draft an implementation plan for the Data Roadmap after consultations with other stakeholders during this year and would provide a further update to the Forum in due course.

5. Benefits and challenges from the implementation of electronic transmission of chemical occurrence data to EFSA in Greece

Greece presented information on Greece's experience with electronic data transmission, outlining some of the difficulties with the food description and classification codes and translation between English and Greek.

Sweden asked Greece whether they participated in the EU menu initiative and who was responsible for the SSD coding. Greece confirmed participation in EU Menu and indicated that the scientists handling the samples did the coding. Bulgaria and Hungary also noted their participation in the electronic transmission group, noting that the SSD codes were not the same as used in EU legislation. Luxembourg also noted the difficulty in training those taking samples on the methodology and encoding.

6. FORWARD PLANNING

6.1 Food Safety Research and Industry – Making bold decisions while recognizing that perception is reality.

Denmark presented a national perspective of how conflicts of interest are managed relating to industry funding of research, detailing the different options used where there is potential conflict of interest on collaborative projects.

Germany stated that the particular issues for food and health sectors are not the same as other sectors where there is a great reliance on industry funded research. France noted that with public/private partnerships there was a need for detailed declarations of interest.

Finland stated the necessity of earning trust of industry and while accepting that research developed through the Commission services can be considered publicly funded, the difficulty is how to avoid conflicts of interest in scientists with links to industry.

Italy stated that NGOs should be challenged on their assertions and be more transparent in their processes as constant criticism is leading to loss of scientific expertise.

6.2 Nutrivigilance – Terms of Reference for a proposed pilot

France presented proposals to establish a pilot group to further consider how to collectively work on nutrivigilance surveillance of recording adverse reactions to some regulated products such as novel foods and food supplements and tabled a draft Terms of Reference for the group.

Germany noted that national poisoning centres may be dealing with adverse effects relating to such products, but these are not being referred on or captured in any way.

Juliane Kleiner noted that the European Medicines Agency (EMA) should be invited to the meetings as an observer. The Netherlands, Sweden, Finland, Germany, Ireland, Denmark, Luxembourg, Italy, Croatia, Greece and Cyprus agreed to meet with France to discuss the issue further.

Juliane Kleiner concluded with the agreement that EFSA would support a meeting in Paris on 12 June for the matter to be discussed further.

Action 4*: Nutrivigilance Pilot meeting to be arranged for June 12, Paris.*

6.3 International Scientific Cooperation

Djien Liem introduced the draft Multi-Annual Programme on International Cooperation highlighting the priorities for bi-lateral and multilateral relations in 2014 and beyond.

Members were asked for their views on the proposed actions.

Italy supported the programme and highlighted that it should take into account the outcome of the trans-atlantic trade agreement negotiations between the EU and US. France supported the Italian view and requested the Commission to share the geographic areas of priorities.

The Commission confirmed that work was currently ongoing on developing priorities and would keep EFSA informed of developments.

The Netherlands asked what the differences in actions would be for 2016 and noted there was no action proposed for harmonisation. Djien Liem noted that further discussions were needed in EFSA on specific actions in the next period, as well as on the proposed action on harmonisation.

Germany highlighted the importance of representing the EU in third countries and suggested that when EFSA is invited to third countries, consideration should be given to inviting other Member States.

Sweden asked about the possibilities to participate in meetings of the Joint FAO/WHO Expert Committees (JECFA, JMPR, JEMRA) meetings. Djien Liem explained that EFSA does not receive standing invitations to the meetings. It was noted that a roster of experts was used by the committee to prepare documents for each meeting and that some experts on the roster may be invited to participate in EFSA meeting.

7.0 PRESENTATION FROM A SCIENTIFIC PANEL

7.1 AHAW Panel and Scientific Network on Risk Assessment in Animal Health and Welfare

The Chair welcomed Hans-Hermann Thulke, Vice Chair of the AHAW Panel and Franck Berthe, Head of the Animal and Plant Health unit to the table to present the activities of the AHAW Panel and scientific network.

Hans-Hermann Thulke provided an update on the activities of the AHAW Panel. Since 2004, the panel has produced on average 10-12 opinions each year.

Hans-Hermann Thulke highlighted the recent activities of the panel which included updating the 2010 opinion on African swine fever, assessing the risk posed by sheep and goat pox, developing a conceptual model on bovine tuberculosis, developing a risk assessment model on tail biting in pigs and assessing the risk to sheep welfare in different production systems.

Franck Berthe presented the key areas of the AHAW network. Members were informed that the Terms of Reference for the network had recently been renewed with an additional activity aiming to improve collaboration at animal human interface on non-foodborne zoonatic and potential zoonatic issues.

Finland welcomed the active work undertaken by the AHAW Panel and network and commented that an important point was to understand the resilience or robustness of the production systems in face of animal diseases. The Vice Chair replied that the suggestion would be communicated to the Panel. Franck Berthe responded that it was an important point and mentioned that the system approach was being discussed in the Panel.

Germany queried what connections the panel or network had with the World Organisation for Animal Health (OIE). Franck Berthe responded that EFSA has close relations with the OIE, EC and the Standing Committee on the Food Chain and Animal

Health (SCFCAH). Members were informed that EFSA regularly participates in SCFCAH meetings to discuss mandates and present opinions of the Panel. In addition representatives of the OIE attend EFSA AHAW panel meetings.

Italy welcomed the work of the Panel and believed the work was important in changing the vision of risk managers in improving animal welfare. It was noted that there were issues that overlapped with CODEX and that EFSA provided support to the EC in these areas.

7.2 Scientific Network on Harmonisation of Risk Assessment Methodologies

Bernhard Bottex provided an update on the work of the Scientific Network on Harmonisation of Risk Assessment Methodologies, which last met on 23th October 2013. The recommendations identified by the network from their last meeting were presented.

Juliane Kleiner informed members that the network has had difficulty in completing its remit. At their first meeting, network members had decided to focus on chemical occurrence however later some members felt the remit of the network should cover more broader areas. Members were informed that the TOR of the network were due to expiry at the end of 2014 and were asked for their views on its renewal.

Spain commented that due to the broad area of the network it would be difficult to find suitable experts and suggested that the network should focus on chemical occurrence risk assessment. Germany supported the view of Spain and suggested that a two level approach should be taken, a strategic level with a roadmap and a secondary level of working groups on the concepts.

Finland commented that the remit of the network is very broad and as such it has run into difficulties. Finland suggested that sub groups should be created on different topics, however, at the same time the network was not best placed to deal with risk assessment policy.

Sweden supported the idea of having one network and a range of subgroups or a discussion group suggesting that the focus of the network should be on areas which are not covered by other networks e.g. risk-benefit.

Juliane Kleiner summarised that the majority of comments by members favoured to have one network and additional subgroups. The Chair clarified that it would not be possible to create subgroups or sub-networks from a network however alternate representatives could attend meetings depending on the topic of discussion.

Germany questioned whether the network is the best forum to deal with the harmonisation of risk assessment methodologies and suggested for the network to be changed to a discussion group of the Advisory Forum. The Commission agreed that it was difficult for the network to deal with strategic aspects and that it would be useful to re-consider the status of the network.

Spain, supported by The Netherlands, commented that a network should be useful for EFSA and suggested that EFSA provides a proposal to the AF for discussion.

Juliane Kleiner agreed for EFSA to consider how best to proceed and would take into consideration the comments by Members.

***Action 5**: EFSA to consider future way forward on network on Harmonisation of RA methodology for further discussion at June meeting.*

8. OTHER MATTERS RAISED BY EFSA AND MEMBER STATES

8.1. Quantitative Risk Assessment on Nitrate and Nitrite in Finland

Finland provided a presentation on a quantitative risk assessment carried out by Evira on nitrate and nitrite using national Finnish data and probabilistic methods. The assessment helped inform new dietary recommendations on processed meat consumption.

Risk and benefit assessment of decreased nitrate and salt content of processed meat

Anders Glynn from the Swedish National Food Agency informed members of a risk-benefit assessment of nitrite and salt in processed meat conduced by the Swedish National Food Agency. They concluded that a reduction of nitrate and salt in processed meat had limited public health effects.

Juliane Kleiner commented that the Finnish approach was based on exposure assessment where as the Swedish assessment used a weighing approach of risk and benefit.

Latvia queried if they had received any feedback from the meat industry in response to their assessments and whether they looked at the growth of pathogens at different temperatures. Sweden confirmed that there were on-going discussions in Sweden with industry on the reduction of sodium but not on nitrite. Finland also confirmed that there were discussions with the Finnish food industry on lowering nitrates in food.

8.2. Are consumers aware of their caffeine intake or not ?

Cyprus provided a presentation on the survey of the amount of caffeine contained in energy drinks.

Juliane Kleiner reminded members that EFSA has been mandated to conduct a risk assessment on caffeine. The opinion is planned to go out for public consultation in April 2014.

Sweden queried if Cyprus was planning to take any follow up actions as a result of the survey. Cyprus confirmed there were no immediate plans for follow up action.

8.3. Update on Guidance for Scientific Network Representatives

Jeffrey Moon introduced the paper on draft guidance for scientific network representatives, produced by a focal point discussion group. Members were reminded that the self-review of EFSA's scientific networks recommended that the role of the focal points in facilitating the exchange of information between scientific networks should be further considered. Members were informed that the guidance was drafted with the flexibility for it to adapted based on the national situation of the Member State.

Finland commented on the complexity of the draft guidance and suggested that focal points should develop a information flow with Article 36 organisations.

Greece welcomed the guidance and suggested that focal points should be copied in when information is sent by EFSA to networks, as it can be difficult to receive information from network representatives. Estonia supported this view.

Spain also welcomed the document asking for some time to consider the document, and reiterated their request for focal points to be given access to the network extranet pages. Jeffrey Moon acknowledged that it had been agreed for focal points to be given access to the scientific network extranet pages and the secretariat was in the process of implementing this request.

Members were informed that the scientific network coordinators would be consulted on the document.

Action 6*: Proposal for Focal Points to be copied in to draft agenda to all scientific network meetings.*

8.4. Research Results: Energy Drinks

Gerhard Heinemeyer from the BfR presented the results of a survey conducted in Germany on high consumers of energy drinks.

Luxembourg commented that caffeine intake is present in food supplements and slimming products and that these products should be evaluated including the synergetic effects of these products in the diet.

9. ANY OTHER BUSINESS

9.1. Country briefing on participation in grant and procurement projects

Stef Bronzwaer announced that the secretariat would be sending out a country briefing on the national participants of organisations in the grants and procurement programme to all members.

9.2. Upcoming BfR events

Germany announced a calendar of events concerning consumer health protection to be held throughout 2014. Members were invited to the stakeholders conference on Food Safety and Globalisation- Pitfalls Challenges and Chances to be held on 2-3 June 2014.

9.3. International Scientific Conference 2015

Hubert Deluyker announced that EFSA was planning to organise a conference in October 2015 in conjunction with EXPO 2015. Further details will be communicated to the AF at a later stage.

9.4. EXPO 2015

Italy announced details of EXPO 2015 which will be held in Milan between 1st May and 31st October and the 12th International Colloquium on Paratuberculosis to be held on 22-26 June 2014.

The Chair announced that the secretariat was considering to hold an AF meeting during the EXPO 2015 event. Members were requested to inform the secretariat of any planned meetings between Member States during EXPO 2015 and to register their interest in organising any joint meetings.

Action 7: Members to provide the secretariat with details of any planned meetings during EXPO 2015 and/or express interest of hosting a joint meeting.

9.5. Change of Organisation name

Spain informed members that there had been a change of name for the national agency following the merger between the Spanish Food Safety and Nutrition Agency (AESAN) and the National Institute for Consumer Affairs (INC), which will now be called the Spanish Agency for Consumer Affairs, Food Safety and Nutrition (AECOSAN).

9.6. The Second International Meeting on Food Control Research

Latvia announced the second international meeting on Food Control Research organised by the Institute of Food Safety, Animal Health and Environment (BIOR) to be held on 9-11 April 2014 in Riga.

9.7. Miscellaneous

Ireland requested a list of participants with contact details after each Advisory Forum meeting. It was agreed for the secretariat to circulate details after each meeting.

Spain requested that the topic "Sharing Protocols, Experiences and Knowledge on Management and Communication during Food Crisis" be included on the agenda for the next meeting, which they would present.

Norway announced details of a scientific conference to be held on 17th June 2014. It was agreed to circulate the details of the event to members via the secretariat.

Action 8*: Secretariat to provide members with a list of participants and contact details after each meeting.*

Action 9*: Report on "Sharing Protocols, Experiences and Knowledge on Management and Communication during Food Crisis" to be shared and presented by Spain at next AF meeting.*

Action 10*: Norway to provide details of conference programme to be held immediately before the next AF meeting in Oslo*.

10. CLOSURE OF THE MEETING

The Chair closed the meeting and thanked members, observers and external attendees for their contributions.

The next meeting will be held on 18-19 June 2014 in Oslo.

51ST ADVISORY FORUM MEETING

SUMMARY OF ACTION POINTS

Action Number	Agenda Item	Issue/Topic	Action
1	4.1	Single Programming Document 2014-2016	Members to provide written comments on the Single Programming Document by mid Sept 2014. Annual Management Plan for 2015 to be presented at June AF meeting.
2	4.2b	Follow up of breakout groups discussions of 50th AF meeting: EU risk assessment agenda	Members were requested to provide comments on the Follow up of Break out-group document to AF secretariat by 15th April 2014. Possible establishment of AFWG to follow discussion planned for June AF meeting.
3	4.2c	Work Planning 2014	Agreed to add an option of "other" under the subject area and column filters to be added to allow sorting by country and topic. MS to provided details by end of May on planned activities to allow table to be updated by June meeting.
4	6.2	Network on Nutrivigilance	Nutrivigilance Pilot meeting to be arranged for June 12, Paris.
5	7.2	Scientific Network on Harmonisation of Risk Assessment Methodologies	EFSA to consider future way forward on network on Harmonisation of RA methodology for further discussion at June meeting.
6	8.3	Guidance for Scientific Network Representatives	Proposal for Focal Points to be copied in to draft agenda/initiations to all scientific network meetings.
7	AOB	EXPO 2015	Members to provide the secretariat with details of any planned meetings during EXPO 2015 and/or express interest of hosting a joint meeting.
8	AOB	List of participants	Agreed to provide members with a list of participants and contact details after each meeting.
9	AOB	Miscellaneous	Report on "Sharing Protocols, Experiences and Knowledge on Management and Communication during Food Crisis" to be shared and presented by Spain at next AF meeting.
10	AOB	Miscellaneous	Norway to provide details of conference programme to be held immediately before the next AF meeting in Oslo.

Annex A

Feedback from the Advisory Forum Breakout Groups on Draft Data Roadmap

Following the plenary presentation by Mary Gilsenan, Head of the Evidence Management unit, members participated in one of four breakout sessions focusing on data quality or open data.

Members were asked to address the following specific questions with two groups focused on open data and two on data quality.

Data Quality
1. What measures could EFSA and Member States take to improve the quality of data used in EFSA risk assessments?
2. Presently, data in the EFSA chemical occurrence database mainly includes data generated within the framework of national plans to a large extent focused on compliance with legal limits. Would members envisage a specific European sampling plan for exposure assessment to be implemented co-operatively? If so, what measures could be taken to initiate this process?

Open Data
EFSA receives an increasing number of requests from a wide range of stakeholders to access the raw data used in our scientific opinions.
1. What are the main obstacles to opening up EU risk assessment data?
2. What steps could EFSA take to open up EU risk assessment data to increase transparency in our risk assessments.

The rapporteur of each breakout group reported back to plenary on the main points discussed. The summaries of their remarks are provided below.

Group 1 – Data Quality
Facilitator: Marta Hugas, EFSA
Rapporteur: Ana Canals, AF member for Spain

Members noted that a large amount of data was collected in Europe but was not used for a specific purpose. Members highlighted the importance of identifying data needs for risk assessment earlier in the process and to be more creative in the use of data being collected. Members discussed the need for the EC, Member States and EFSA to agree on a format for data submission to help ensure information was submitted in a harmonised way.

1. **What measures could EFSA and Member States take to improve the quality of data used in EFSA risk assessments?**
   - Currently there is a vast amount of data collected that is not used. It is important to identify the data needs and acquire data of better quality. Apply intelligence to data collection starting with the needs as early as possible.
   - Improved coordination between risk assessors and risk management.
   - Map data collection on who is collecting data and why it is being collected. Could help to influence quality.

2. **Would members envisage a specific European sampling plan for exposure assessment to be implemented co-operatively? If so, what measures could be taken to initiate this process?**
   - Suggest to progressively change the national sampling plans to address the need for risk assessments.
   - Involve risk assessment experts when designing risk control plans.

- Take advantage of the current review taking place on regulation "control reg 882" to improve data collection.

Group 2 – Open Data
Facilitator: Hubert Deluyker, EFSA
Rapporteur: Ingrid Busuttil, AF member for Malta

1. What are the main obstacles to opening up EU risk assessment data?

- Commercial data owned by industry
- Possibility of the data collector being identified
- Not always possible to compare data
- Can Member States be asked on individual basis to open data for a particular use.
- Bad quality data should not be opened
- Openness of data could lead to mis-use by other countries to gain trade advantages

2. What steps could EFSA take to open up EU risk assessment data to increase transparency in our risk assessments?

- List of conditions should apply to opening access to data
- Need to get risk managers on board to open data
- Could face reluctance to open data from MS who are not used to opening access to data
- Ownership of data should be clarified

Group 3 – Data Quality
Facilitator: Mary Gilsenan EFSA
Rapporteur: Raymond Ellard, AF member for Ireland

The group recognized that data quality has improved since 2010 especially with the implementation of SSD. However one of the difficulties in using data from control plans is that the current sampling plans are based on control and not targeted for exposure assessment. The group highlighted that the first principles to consider is the question that needs to be answered and then understand what are the data needs and requirements. The importance of specifying the criteria and standardisation were highlighted.

1. What measures could EFSA and Member States take to improve the quality of data used in EFSA risk assessments?

- Data should be standardized and the methods harmonized for data to be comparable. It was noted that the chemical occurrence monitoring data was not ideal for exposure assessment and in some areas there is limited data available for different population groups.
- Laboratory accreditation – although the importance of proficiency testing by labs was recognized, the use of data from non-accreditation labs should not be excluded due to limited availability of data. The importance of validation of methods rather than accreditation was highlighted.
- Large amounts of data are collected by industry. The question is always who owns the data and if industry would be willing to share and open access to data.

2. Would members envisage a specific European sampling plan for exposure assessment to be implemented co-operatively? If so, what measures could be taken to initiate this process?

- A call for training and guidance is needed to help people create targeted sampling plans for exposure assessment.
- The resource implications to implement such a plan were raised
- Need a change in law if improvements are to be seen in plans and methodology.

Group 4 – Open data
Facilitator: Per Bergman, EFSA
Rapporteur: Eirini Tsigarida, AF member for Greece
---

1. What are the main obstacles to opening up EU risk assessment data?

- In general, there are no issues to share data with EFSA or international organizations, however agreement is needed with third countries.
- Ownership of data is not always clear
- Institutional structure of countries (local, regional level). Tiered datasets.
- Difficulty in comparing datasets from different sampling: monitoring (official control) and targeted sampling.
- Risk of misinterpretation of raw data.
- Economical and political consequences (e.g. influence trade)
- Moral ownership of data. If researchers collected data they need to publish their data first before sharing with others.

2. What steps could EFSA take to open up EU risk assessment data to increase transparency in our risk assessments?

- This question cannot be decided by the forum, as it needs to be addressed to the owners of the data.
- Time limit approach- could open access to data after a number of years but need to balance usefulness of data for others.
- Be clear at the start of collection that data will be open.
- Benchmark based on approach used by other countries (e.g. US)