European Food Safety Authority

ADVISORY FORUM AND SCIENTIFIC COOPERATION UNIT

Parma, 09 September 2014
EFSA/AF/M/2014/513/PUB/FINAL

Final Minutes

FIFTY SECOND MEETING OF THE ADVISORY FORUM OSLO, 18-19 JUNE 2014

Chair: Bernhard Url, Executive Director, EFSA

MEMBERS OF THE ADVISORY FORUM

Austria	*Klemens Fuchs*	Latvia	*Aivars Bèrzinš*
Belgium	*Benoît Horion*	Luxembourg	*Patrick Hau*
Bulgaria	*Boiko Likov*	Malta	*Ingrid Busuttil*
Croatia	*Andrea Gross-Boskovic*	Netherlands	*Antoon Opperhuizen*
Cyprus	*Popi Kanari*	Norway	*Lars Hanssen*
Czech Republic	*Petr Beneš*	Poland	*Jacek Postupolski*
Denmark	*Jørgen Schlundt**	Portugal	*Pedro Gaspar*
Estonia	*Martin Minjajev*	Romania	*Nicursor Ciocanea*
Finland	*Matti Aho*	Slovak Republic	*Zuzana Bīrošová*
France	*Rozenn Saunier*	Slovenia	*Urška Blaznik*
Germany	*Andreas Hensel*	Spain	*Ana Canals Caballero*
Hungary	*Maria Szeitzné Szabó*	Sweden	*Leif Busk*
Ireland	*Raymond Ellard**	United Kingdom	*Alisdair Wotherspoon*
Italy	*Giancarlo Belluzzi*		

*Attended 18th June only

OBSERVERS

European Commission	*Jeannie Vergnettes*	Serbia	*Vera Katic*
FYR of Macedonia	*Svetlana Tomeska Mickova*	Switzerland	*Vincent Dudler*
Montenegro	*Nedeljko Latinovic*	Turkey	*Irfan Erol*

GUEST SPEAKERS

Norwegian Scientific Committee for Food Safety	*Marie Louise Wiborg*
Chair of EFSA's Management Broad	*Sue Davis*
Vice Chair of EFSA's Management Broad	*Piergiuseppe Facelli*

REPRESENTATIVES OF THE EUROPEAN FOOD SAFETY AUTHORITY

Advisory Forum Secretariat: *Jeffrey Moon, Saadia Noorani, Piera Pozzatti and Cinzia Percivaldi*

Per Bergman	*Mary Gilsenan**
*Bernard Bottex**	*Marta Hugas*
Valeriu Curtui	*Juliane Kleiner*
Stef Bronzwaer	*Alessia Vecchio*
Hubert Deluyker	*Christiane Vleminckx (Vice-Chair of the Acrylamide Working Group**
Peter Fürst (Chair of the Acrylamide Working Group) *	

* by telephone

1. WELCOME AND OPENING OF THE MEETING

Bernhard Url, Chair of the meeting, welcomed members, observers and external attendees to the 52nd Advisory Forum Meeting.

Bernhard Url welcomed Pedro Gaspar from Portugal and Vincent Dudler from Switzerland who were attending their first meeting of the AF. The Chair also extended his welcome to the Chair and Vice Chair of the EFSA Management Broad, Sue Davis and Piergiuseppe Facelli who would be addressing the Forum under the agenda item on strategic discussion with EFSA and Member States. Apologies were received from Iceland, Greece and Lithuania.

Bernhard Url reminded members to update and submit their Annual Declaration of Interests.

Address from Norwegian State Secretary for Health and Care Services

Cecile Brein-Karlsen, The Norwegian State Secretary for Health and Care Services welcomed members, observers and representatives to Oslo and passed on the best wishes of the Minister.

The Chair thanked Norway for their support to the EU project.

2. ADOPTION OF THE AGENDA

Bernhard Url noted the Agenda had been circulated to members on 6th June.
Members were invited to propose any additional items under Any Other Business.

The following items were raised:

- Sweden – Information on red meat and cancer opinion.
- Romania – 10th anniversary

The Agenda was adopted with the above inclusions.

3. MATTERS ARISING

Members received a list of action points from the last Advisory Forum meeting and the Executive Director's Management Board Progress Report.

No matters were raised by members.

4. STRATEGIC DISCUSSION ON EFSA'S WORK WITH MEMBER STATES

4.1. Address by Chair of EFSA's Management Board

Bernhard Url invited Sue Davies, Chair of the Management Board (MB) and Piergiuseppe Facelli, Vice Chair of the Management Board to address the Forum.

Sue Davies informed members that the Board would be discussing scientific and international cooperation at its forthcoming meeting. The discussions today would be important to feedback to the Management Board.

Sue Davies noted the importance of Members States input in helping EFSA to produce its opinions especially within the current financial challenges facing the whole of Europe. With the current pressure on scientific funding she emphasised the importance of partnership working, in particular to access the best expertise without compromising independency and sharing data.

Members were reminded that the Management Board had proposed a list of recommendations following the external review of EFSA in 2012. These recommendations were being taken forward in EFSA's Annual Management Plan 2015, presented later in the meeting. It was noted that more work is done with less resources and the importance of avoiding duplication. Sue Davies emphasised the importance of working together in partnership to enhance food safety highlighting the importance of using experts resourcefully and to have an open exchange, allowing the difference of views.

Sue Davies raised a number of questions for the Forum to consider relating to increasing collaboration, how to develop a EU risk assessment agenda, international cooperation and the future use of MS experts.

Pierguiseppe Facelli, highlighted the importance for better cooperation between EFSA and Member States, the EU RA Agenda as a crucial means in using public money in the best way and strengthening the role of national Focal Points (FP). In addition he highlighted that the role of experts from Article 36 organisations should be optimised.

Bernhard Url opened the floor to the AF members to provide comments and questions to the Chair and Vice Chair of the MB.

Norway expressed concern about the independence of EFSA in particular regarding its relationship with industry. It was understood that connections with industry are needed however he asked if EFSA could provide any guidance on this issue. Norway asked what process is followed on the selection of members to the Board. Sue Davies explained that the MB has a code of conduct, which requires members to declare an interest at the start of each meeting.

Sweden noted that Member States have an obligation to work with EFSA as stated in the Founding Regulation, recognising that the EU risk assessment agenda was a new way to agree on common priorities which would help to highlight priorities to politicians who are responsible for setting national agendas and priorities.

Italy noted that experience had been gained by both EFSA and Member States following food incidents such as recent outbreaks of *E. coli* and Hepatitis A affecting a number of Member States and highlighted the importance of Member States providing continuous support in terms of experience and expertise in addressing the ongoing challenges in risk assessment.

Finland suggested that scientific opinions produced by Panels should consider an external peer review process and that risk communications should be targeted to the general public. Finland also highlighted the importance of dialogue between risk assessors and risk managers.

Cyprus appreciated the joint benefits of collaborating with EFSA but raised concerns on the impact on resources if the role of Focal Points were to be expanded, in particular for smaller countries. Cyprus requested more transparency on the use of data supplied to EFSA by Member States. Sue Davies responded that independence was fundamental to EFSA's credibility and some areas were under more scrutiny than others. Members were informed about discussions on independence at a recent stakeholder meeting, and on the fact that the independence rules are currently under review and will be discussed by the Board at its next meeting.

Denmark stated that the rules of EFSA are very bureaucratic and that there are differences between EFSA and Member States on what they consider to be a conflict of interest.

Germany questioned whether the Panel system is adequate to deal with the current workload since there is an overload of questions to the Panels. Germany commented that data collection quality and the system of providing data to EFSA should be improved. It was suggested that there should be a mechanism in place to update scientific opinions and a mechanism developed to accept risk assessments from other agencies and bodies.

France commented that independence is the key element for acceptance. It was suggested that the option for Member States to send requests/mandate to EFSA could be used more frequently.

Sue Davies noted that some Member States felt that there is not enough value in EFSA's work for the Member States, however she reminded members that EFSA's work for the Commission is also indirectly for the Member States. With regards to data collection, it was noted that a balance was required with sufficient scrutiny of industry data.

Bernhard Url reminded members that the legislator has set up the Panel system which allows EFSA to draw on the best expertise, routinely renewed via the Panel renewals. It was noted that support from national governments was needed to prioritise the European RA project and that the role of the Focal Points could possibly be expanded.

4.2. Scientific Cooperation Roadmap

Stef Bronzwaer introduced the Scientific Cooperation Roadmap paper presenting the vision and objectives of the Roadmap. Members were invited to comment on the Scientific Roadmap.

Finland welcomed the paper and highlighted that risk assessment capacity is needed at the EU and at national level. With regards to the framework agreements, it was suggested to involve scientists in the same area to provide a comprehensive perspective.

Spain requested further clarification on the details of the framework partnership agreements and thematic grants and expressed concern on the implications of these new tools. Also Hungary requested further clarification on the framework partnership agreements.

Italy highlighted the importance of strengthening national networking and suggested that there could be a role to play for Focal Points in this area. Italy enquired how a consortium could be formed under the framework partnership agreement.

The Commission suggested that the paper should explain how EFSA uses contributions from Member States, for example how data collection feeds into the scientific opinions. The Commission also highlighted that EFSA provides services to Member States such as training.

France requested further details on the resources allocated to international cooperation and if the framework partnership agreements related to the concept of centres of excellence.

The UK commented that the document was a good starting point. It was not easy to see how the partnerships agreements would work in practice and it was suggested to provide examples.

Sweden asked if there would be less resources for data collection in the future and suggested to have a funding mechanism similar to the Focal Point agreements to support data collection at the national level. It was noted that smaller Member States need stable resources for carrying out tasks on data collection. Sweden also suggested to include information on inter-cooperation between Member States in the paper, and asked for caution when talking of 'duplication of work' to be precise on what is meant.

Germany commented that there continues to be duplication of effort and potential divergence between Member States and EFSA, 'redoing' work already done. Germany suggested that the Forum should consider how to share its resources highlighting the importance of having mechanisms in place to implement collaborative activities.

Norway supported the view of Germany of having mechanisms in place to accept risk assessment done by others and commented that Member States should not start risk assessments that are being carried out by EFSA, thereby freeing up resources for other activities.

Germany commented that EFSA was not the only platform for international collaboration and collaborations between Member States should continue to be used. It was suggested to consider developing a mentoring system to provide support for smaller Member States.

Denmark commented that there is a focus on sustainability in Horizon 2020, which should also be taken into consideration for risk assessments.

Latvia stated that the Horizon 2020 programme encourages collaboration with industry, which could have an impact on Article 36 organisations. It was suggested that EFSA should provide guidance to Article 36 organisations on this issue.

Ireland stressed the importance of avoiding situations of diverging opinions.

Stef Bronzwaer explained that the framework partnership agreements would be an important tool for the EU risk assessment agenda to operate joint projects. The agreements would allow developing consortia over a longer period of time. The grant agreements are limited to Article 36 organisations and the scheme would start with a limited budget that could increase over time. He welcomed the proposal from Sweden on having specific support in the area of data collection at national level.

Spain expressed concern that the framework partnership agreements can not involve parties from the private sector for example in the area of dietary surveys.

Members were informed that the Roadmap is supplemented by background documents and that data collection will be specifically dealt within the Data Roadmap. Members were informed that a call for proposals for thematic grants is under developments and should be launched by the end of the year.

Bernhard Url thanked Member States for their comments. They were asked to provide further comments by the end of the month, in particular on the Member State perspective to the Roadmap, aiming at identifying what should be the added value of scientific cooperation to Member States. Further discussion with the Management Board was foreseen later in the month and is foreseen to come back to the Roadmap at the September meeting of the AF.

Action 1*: Members to provide written comments on the Scientific Cooperation Roadmap by 1st July.*

4.3. EU risk assessment agenda

Jeffrey Moon introduced the EU risk assessment agenda outlining the approach to be taken in its development.

Jeffrey reminded members that the proposal for developing an EU Risk Assessment Agenda was presented at the AF meeting in December 2013 during which a breakout session was conducted to help develop ideas to be taken forward. There was further discussion at the 51st Advisory Forum meeting in March during which members indicated some lack of clarity in the documentation provided and now after further consideration an updated document was being tabled for discussion. It was emphasised that the EU risk assessment agenda would be collaborative in nature and would be a multi-annual programme.

The Netherlands, Spain, Germany, France, Sweden and the UK supported the initiative.

Spain questioned how the agenda related to the mandates, and hence priorities, received from the Commission. Bernhard Url explained that the agenda would be developed in consultation with the Commission and other EU partners, which would be kept under constant review. It was noted that the agenda would only include activities, which supported risk assessment activities and not the development of Opinions.

Germany highlighted the importance of having adequate mechanisms to implement the agenda and supported the idea of having the topics and procedures separated. Bernhard Url suggested that pilot projects could be developed to test the methodologies/mechanisms to implement the EU risk assessment agenda in 2015.

The UK commented that the document brought into focus the scale of the task and highlighted the importance of getting the balance right between prioritisation, managing routine activities and urgent issues. The key issue would be on setting the criteria for prioritisation, which should consider the economic situation and the public health agenda. The UK commented that more coherent mentoring would be appropriate for building capacity and consideration should be given to the evolution of data sets when developing tools for databases. The UK also noted that the choice of criteria could lead to a bias in prioritisation.

Sweden commented that the Commission should be highly visible in the Agenda. The Commission suggested that if the Agenda would include activities relating to analytic standards then national laboratories should be involved in the development of the Agenda.

The Netherlands suggested that the handling of the risk should be included as a criterion and suggested that members of the Forum shared information on risk assessment training available in universities.

Bernhard Url thanked members for their comments and proposed to establish a working group to further discussion the EU risk assessment agenda. Denmark, France The Netherlands, Sweden, Italy, Portugal, Slovenia, Hungary and Croatia expressed an interest in joining the working group.

Action 2*: The Secretariat to establish an Advisory Forum Working Group on the EU risk assessment agenda*

4.4. Annual Management Plan 2015

Bernhard Url presented EFSA's annual management plan for 2015 summarising the background and activities for 2015.

Germany commented that the communication activities in the plan were underdeveloped and suggested that more investment was needed in social science to understand consumer perceptions. Alessia Vecchio responded that EFSA was currently analysing how to incorporate social science with a consultancy group. Members were informed the Advisory Forum Communications Working Group was planning to pilot activities with Member States in this area.

Norway supported the need for efficiency gains in risk assessment and suggested that EFSA should reconsider how to better communicate to increase its profile and attract scientists.

Finland stated that activities on regulated products were expected to increase in the future and should be taken into consideration within the budget.

Action 3*: Members to provide comments on the AMP and SPD by 15th* September.

4.5. Proposals for future of on Network on harmonisation of RA methodologies

Bernhard Url welcomed Bernard Bottex, from the SCER unit who joined the meeting via telephone and invited him to introduce the item.

Members were reminded that at the last AF meeting it was agreed for EFSA to reconsider the objectives of the network. A background note on proposals for the network had been developed and distributed to members.

France stated that the network was useful especially in light of the discussions on the EU RA agenda. It was suggested the network should focus on methodologies, inviting international organisations to join as members and consider establishing specific sub groups to discuss specific or detailed topics. Finland supported the French view and with the continuation of the network. Spain supported the continuation of the network.

Denmark commented that the membership of the network should be carefully re-considered to ensure the right person is appointed as a member.

Bulgaria commented that different working groups were required to discuss the different areas. It was suggested that guidance developed by Panels should be discussed in the relevant network.

Hungary suggested that the network should focus on chemical risk assessment methodology and to consider changing the format of meetings into workshops. Hungary informed the Forum that they had had difficulty in finding a suitable profile for the network.

Germany, Finland, France and Bulgaria supported the establishment of specific working groups to discuss specific topics.

Members supported the continuation of the network with amended Terms of Reference with clearly defined tasks and the expertise required. Members supported more frequent meetings to take place.

Action 4*: EFSA to revise the Terms of Reference and present to members at the AF in September*.

5. UPDATES AND RELATED MATTERS

5.1. Acrylamide

Bernhard Url welcomed Peter Fürst, Chair of the Acrylamide Working Group, Christiane Vleminckx, Vice-Chair of the Acrylamide Working Group and Marco Binaglia and Luisa Ramos Bordajandi from the BIOCONTAM Unit who all joined the meeting by phone.

Peter Fürst provided an update on the draft acrylamide opinion. Members were informed that the CONTAM Panel had endorsed the draft opinion for public consultation. The consultation would be launched at the end of June 2014 and would be open for 2 months. The final adoption of the draft opinion is expected in early 2015.

Members requested the consultation period to be extended to September considering the summer break.

France requested whether acrylamide could be considered as dangerous for human health. Peter Fürst confirmed that although the human studies have not demonstrated acrylamide to be a human carcinogen, the margin of exposures (MOEs) across dietary surveys and age groups indicate a concern with respect to neoplastic effects.

Sweden asked whether the working group had considered data on glycidamide. Peter Fürst confirmed that the working group had evaluated the data on glycidamide.

Denmark asked if the risk assessment had changed since the last time the Panel considered the evidence on acrylamide, and if all epidemiology studies were assessed. Members were informed that specialist epidemiologists were members of the working group and that the working group based its assessment on all available studies. Peter Fürst stated that he was not part of the group, which considered acrylamide previously.

The Netherlands queried if the working group had considered high-risk population groups and if exposure on acrylamide was assessed with combined use of medicines. It was noted that this was addressed as part of the uncertainly analysis of the opinion and exposure to high-risk population groups was considered e.g. children.

Members were informed that the Netherlands would carry out a risk assessment focussing on high-risk population groups.

Action 5*: Agreed to extend the public consultation period for the draft opinion on acrylamide to mid September*

5.2. Nutrivigilance Feedback on Discussions

France provided feedback from the 1st meeting of the Nutrivigilance network which took place on 12th June in Paris.

Sweden asked if it was foreseen for the network to develop a European system for collecting information on adverse effects. France responded that the decision to develop a system would be based on the interest and need of the Commission. It was noted that the network was a first step in sharing information and transferring of knowledge

Germany suggested that any future system should be integrated with adverse effects reported to national poisoning centres.

Finland commented that close cooperation in this area was needed with risk managers. Cyprus commented that preventive measures should also be considered to prevent the risk of adverse effects.

Belgium asked what the next step would be for the network. France replied that the meeting was a first step and further discussions were needed with the Commission on

how to develop the work of the network. France agreed to share the minutes of the meeting with members.

Norway expressed an interest in joining the network.

Bernhard Url stated that the monitoring of adverse effects was a risk management issue and there was no obvious need for further investment by EFSA.

***Action 6**: France agreed to share minutes of the 1st meeting of the Nutrivigilance network with members.*

5.3. Sharing Protocols Experience and Knowledge on Management and Communication during Food Crisis

Spain presented the final report from the working group of the Head of Agencies (HoA). The report involved the analysis of knowledge and experience regarding the assessment and management of communication of protocols during a food crisis. Members welcomed the report.

Tobin Robinson, Head of the SCER unit, provided members with an update of the activities on urgent assistance carried out by EFSA. Members were informed that an external call would be launched soon to exchange experiences in crisis situations and develop capacity for urgent responses.

Spain suggested that it would be useful for EFSA to participate in the next Head of Agencies meeting where crisis management with risk communication will be discussed.

Germany suggested that harmonisation on communication was needed and suggested the AF had a future role in the development of protocols, and asked why the Commission had never declared a food crisis.

The Commission noted that while the general crisis plan, as set out in the legislation, had never been activated, the mechanisms contained in the plan could be used even when crises were not declared.

Bernhard Url concluded that further integration of the issues raised by the HoA report would be considered in EFSA's activities along with further input to assist in crisis management, including sharing of tools through workshops and exercises.

5.4. Comparison of organic and conventional food and food production – VKM report

Marie Louise Wiborg from Norway presented the report of the Norwegian Scientific Committee for Food Safety (VKM) on the Comparison of Organic and Conventional Foods and Food Production.

Sweden asked if the report impacted on government decisions in the area. Marie Louise stated that the organic association had raised concerns that the outcome of the report may impact on organic production.

Finland asked what the objective of the report was and the cost involved in producing the report. Marie Louise clarified that the request to the VKM was to provide balanced information to the consumer and evaluate the current evidence on organic food. Figures on costs were not available.

5.5. Evidence Management

Bernhard Url welcomed Mary Gilsenan, Head of the Evidence Management Unit by telephone to the meeting.

Mary Gilsenan provided an update on the data warehouse and data roadmap. Members were informed that data for risk assessments will be stored in a new data warehouse and that draft data access rules have been developed outlining proposed access and level of access for different stakeholders. Data providers would also have access to their own data and summary data would be accessible to the public. The draft access rules were presented to the EFSA networks on data collection and the Standing Committee on the Food Chain and Animal Health (SCoFCAH) for agreement. A pilot study of the data warehouse is planned at the end of 2014 on accessing data and members were invited to register their interest in joining the pilot. France, Sweden, The Netherlands, Austria, Italy and Cyprus expressed an interest to join the pilot project

Italy provided details of the access rules to the Ars Alimentaria institutional data warehouse which contains private and public control data. The Commission pledged its support to EFSA in opening access to data and informed members that the Commission has an open policy to data access in the EU. Czech Republic welcomed efforts to open access to data and suggested that the data access policy should be disseminated through the Focal Points for support and comment.

6. PRESENTATION FROM A SCIENTIFIC PANEL

6.1. Activities in the area of Nutrition: NDA Panel

Bernhard Url welcomed Valeriu Curtui, Head of the Nutrition Unit, to present the activities of the NDA Panel and unit.

Valeriu Curtui highlighted the recent activities of the panel, which included assessments of health claims, novel foods applications and dietary reference values. Members were informed that the draft new regulation on novel foods and traditional foods from third countries proposes that risk assessment of applications are centralised in EFSA. The new regulation proposed that EFSA completes the risk assessment for novel food applications within 9 months. For notifications on traditional foods from third countries, EFSA and the Member States will have 4 months to raise safety objections. In case of reasoned objections, the applicant may send an application for evaluation by EFSA. EFSA will have to carry out such an assessment within 6 months. Considering the short time frame, members were asked for advice on how best EFSA and Member States can cooperate in this area.

The UK asked for further details on the final opinion on total diet replacements for weight control and the Article 36 call on the scientific substantiation of health claims. It was noted that the Scientific Advisory Committee Nutrition (UK) would launch a public consultation on its draft report on carbohydrate and health on 26th June.

Valeriu confirmed that it was not planned to launch a public consultation on the opinion on weight control, however if there was interest from Member States to launch a public consultation, EFSA would be happy to discuss the option with the EC, as this would entail a delay in the delivery of the final Opinion.

Spain queried if a public consultation would be launched for the opinion on health benefits of fish consumption. It was noted that a public consultation was not foreseen.
Cyprus asked if the opinion on risk/benefits of fish relating to methyl mercury would assess the benefits of omega 3 and if the opinion on weight control would consider herbal supplements. Sweden requested further clarification on the risk-benefit analysis of the opinion on fish consumption and on the use of the data collected. Valeriu clarified that the request from the Commission is related to the assessment of risks and benefits of fish consumption in relation to methyl mercury. Therefore the NDA opinion on health benefits of fish consumption would focus on health outcomes relevant for methyl mercury. The opinion will consider all scientific evidence relevant for fish/seafood consumption and neurodevelopment in children and cardiovascular outcomes in adults. Members were informed that the mandate specifically related to the risk of methyl mercury. The opinion on diet control would consider total diet replacements and would not consider food supplements.

France requested further clarification on the assessment of botanicals. Members noted that the safety assessment of botanicals was the responsibility of the Member States and EFSA's Scientific Committee had issued guidance on the matter. The health claims of botanicals were currently on hold and EFSA was awaiting a decision from the Commission before proceeding with the assessment.

Sweden queried if cancer risk was considered in the opinion of dietary reference value for folate. Valeriu explained that the opinion would be on the dietary reference value for folate and therefore the Panel will only marginally consider risks related to cancer.

Bernhard Url suggested establishing an ad hoc network on the novel foods *and traditional foods from third countries* to further discuss how EFSA and Member States could work together in this area.

Action 7*: EFSA to draft the terms of reference of an ad-hoc network on novel foods and traditional foods from third countries. Draft terms of reference to be presented at the next AF meeting in September.*

7. OTHER MATTERS RAISED BY EFSA AND MEMBER STATES

7.1. Matrix Project

This item was postponed to the next meeting.

7.2. Forthcoming Risk Assessment Activities

Jeffrey Moon provided an update on the tools available to share information on risk assessment activities.

France, Norway, The Netherlands, UK and Hungary provided a verbal update on upcoming risk assessment activities.

Bernhard Url suggested a *tour de table* for announcing upcoming risk assessment activities as a standing item for future meetings. The members agreed to this proposal.

***Action 8**: Forthcoming risk assessment announcements activities to be included as a standing item for future meetings.*

7.3. Nitrates/Nitrites in water

Cyprus provided a presentation on nitrates levels in water intended for infant consumption.

The Netherlands informed members that they were planning to publish an opinion on nitrates relating to new interpretation on existing nitrates data and their conclusions raised concerns for infants under six months old similar to those presented by Cyprus.

Finland commented that consideration should be given to updating the ADI for infants. Luxembourg commented that Member States can enforce national legislation for baby water under the regulation framework and this is an area, which could be harmonised at the EU level. This is an issue to be taken up by national risk managers.

7.4. Risk ranking in Austria

Austria presented their current activities related to risk ranking and risk mapping.

Sweden informed members that work had started a project on risk ranking which was similar to the Austrian model and that presented by Germany at a previous meeting on risk profiling. Sweden welcomed to collaborate with other countries working in the same area. Hungary supported further activity in this area.

The UK informed members of a report on a recent event related to tackling campylobacter, which would be published soon and could be shared with members.

Marta Hugas welcomed the work carried out by Austria with the opportunity to combine ranking for chemical and microbiological risks.

***Action 9:** EFSA to consider the work by Austria on Risk Ranking and provide the Forum with the outcome of the current project on risk ranking when complete.*

7.5. EFSA Scientific Conference 2015

Hubert Deluyker updated members of the planning activities of the scientific conference due to take place as part of EXPO 2015.

Members were asked to provide suggestions on keynote speakers, topics for sessions and register their interest in contributing to a breakout session.

***Action 10**: Members to provide suggestions to secretariat by 18th July.*

7.6. Update of terms of reference of EMRISK network

Juliane Kleiner introduced the updated Terms of Reference (TOR) of the Emerging Risks Exchange Network (EREN) highlighted the changes. Members were reminded that the EREN network has been in existence for three years and following the recommendation of the self-review of EFSA's scientific networks, the TOR have been reviewed and updated.

Hungary and Cyprus supported the continuation of the networks and the updated TOR. France supported the continuation of the network and related good experience from participation but suggested that a stronger link was needed between the network and the Advisory Forum. France noted that the scope of competencies did not include animal health and welfare and nutrition.

Spain reiterated their request to have access to the network spaces and reminded the secretariat that the request for access had been requested some time ago. Jeffrey Moon confirmed that access to all extranet spaces of networks had been provided with the exception of the EREN network, which was accessible to AF members only and not FPs. This decision was based on confidentially issues.

Bernhard Url noted that the members agreed to the continuation of the network and the updated terms of reference.

7.7. Horizon 2020

Jeffrey Moon informed members that the yearly consultation will take place with the AF to identify research needs which would be prioritised according to previously agreed criteria for submission to DG Research and DG AGRI for consideration in the calls under Horizon 2020. Members were reminded that to increase the likelihood of success in the proposals being taken forward, it was important to demonstrate a link to the themes and priorities stated within the Horizon 2020 framework. Members would receive written details of the consultation after the meeting.

Action 11*: Members to submit suggestions for priority research proposals as part of the consultation for Horizon 2020 proposals.*

8. ANY OTHER BUSINESS

8.1. Expert Database Report

Jeffrey Moon introduced the 5-year review of the EDB, highlighting the recommendations of the review.

The members noted the recommendations of the review.

8.2. Update on Guest Scientific Scheme

Stef Bronzwaer provided an overview of the requests received from Member States and the next steps. Members were informed that the scheme would be evaluated at the end of the year.

Spain provided feedback on a recent successful staff exchange between EFSA and AESAN and made a number of recommendations on how the scheme could be improved for the future. It was agreed that the Spanish report on the staff exchange between EFSA and AESAN would be shared with members.

***Action 12**: Secretariat to circulate the report to members.*

8.3. Update on call for renewal of Scientific Committee and Panels

Juliane Kleiner presented an update on the current call for Panels. Members were informed that the deadline for applications had been extended to 7th July 2014.

8.4. Cancer and red meat

Sweden announced the publication of a report on the incidence of colorectal cancer in relation to red meat consumption. The Swedish national food agency has issued updated dietary advice to consumers to limit red meat consumption to 500g/week.

It was agreed that the report would be shared with members.

8.5. 10th Anniversary of the Romanian Food Authority

Romania thanked EFSA and Members who attended the event to celebrate the 10th anniversary of the Romanian National Veterinary and Food Safety Authority.

9. CLOSURE OF THE MEETING

Bernhard Url closed the meeting and thanked the Norwegian hosts, members, observers and external attendees for their contributions as well as the secretariat and staff of EFSA involved.

The next meeting will be held on 24-25 September 2014 in Venice.

52ND ADVISORY FORUM MEETING

SUMMARY OF ACTION POINTS

Action Number	Agenda Item	Issue/Topic	Action
1	4.2	Scientific Cooperation Roadmap	Members to provide written comments on the Scientific Cooperation Roadmap by 1st July 2014.
2	4.3	EU risk assessment agenda	The Secretariat to establish an Advisory Forum Working Group on the EU risk assessment agenda
3	4.4	Single Programming Document and Annual Management Programme	Members to provide comments on the SPD and AMP by 15th September 2014.
4	4.5	Scientific Network on Harmonisation of Risk Assessment Methodologies	EFSA to revise the terms of reference of the Network on Harmonisation of RA Methodology and present at to members at the AF meeting in September.
5	5.1	Acrylamide	EFSA to extend the public consultation on the draft opinion on acrylamide until mid September 2014.
6	5.2	Feedback from the Nutrivigilance network meeting	France agreed to share minutes of the 1st meeting of the Nutrivigilance network with members.
7	6.1	Novel Food Regulation	EFSA to draft the terms of reference of an ad-hoc network on novel foods and traditional foods from third countries. Draft terms of reference to be presented at the next AF meeting in September.
8	7.2	Forthcoming Risk Assessment Activities	Forthcoming risk assessment announcements activities to be included as a standing item for future meetings.
9	7.4	Risk ranking	EFSA to consider the work by Austria on Risk Ranking and provide the Forum with the outcome of the current project on risk ranking when complete. (Critical review of methodology and application of risk ranking for prioritisation of food and feed related issues, on the basis of the size of the anticipated health impact, OC/EFSA/SCOM/2013/01).

10	7.5	EFSA Scientific Conference 2015	Members to provide suggestions on keynote speakers, topics and register their interest in contributing to a breakout session by 18th July.
11	7.7	Horizon 2020	Members to submit suggestions for priority research proposals as part of the consultation for Horizon 2020 proposals.
12	8.2	Guest Scientist	Secretariat to circulate report by Spain to members.