Scientific Committee

Minutes of the 69th plenary meeting

Held on 16-17 September 2014, Parma

(Agreed on 11 November 2014)

Participants

- **Scientific Committee Members:**

  Tony Hardy (Chair), Jan Alexander, Diane Benford, Qasim Chaudhry, John Griffin, Michael John Jeger, Robert Luttik, Ambroise Martin, Simon More[1], Birgit Noerrung, Bernadette Ossendorp, Joe Perry[2], Josef Schlatter, Kristen Sejrsen, Vittorio Silano, Ruud Woutersen.

- **European Commission:**
  - Michael Walsh (DG Health and Consumers)

- **EFSA:**
  - **Executive Directorate**: Bernhard Url, Hubert Deluyker
  - **RASA Department:** Marta Hugas, Didier Verloo
  - **REPRO Department:** Per Bergman, José Tarazona[3]
  - **SCISTRAT Department**: Juliane Kleiner, Djien Liem, Stef Bronzwaer[4]
  - **SCER Unit**: Tobin Robinson, Andrea Altieri, Bernard Bottex, Arianna Chiusolo, Jean-Lou Dorne, Tilemachos Goumperis, Angelo Maggiore, Daniela Maurici, Agnes Rortais, Reinhilde Schoonjans.
  - **Evidence Management Unit**: Davide Arcella[5]
- **Hearing experts:**
  - for item 7.1: Ine Van der Fels-Klerx (RIKILT), Esther Van Asselt (RIKILT) and Paul Robb (FERA), Marian Raley (UNEW – University of Newcastle)
  - for item 7.2: Claire Beausoleil (ANSES)[2]

[1] Present on 17 September
[2] Participate via teleconference
[3] Present for agenda item 6.1b
[4] Present for agenda item 6.3a
[5] Present for agenda item 8.3

European Food Safety Authority – Via Carlo Magno 1/a, 43126 Parma, ITALY
Tel: (+39) 0521 036 111 • Fax: (+39) 0521 036 110 • www.efsa.europa.eu

1. Welcome and apologies for absence

The Chair welcomed the participants. Apologies were received from Alicja Mortensen, Chair of the ANS Panel who was replaced by Ruud Woutersen.
Qasim Chaudhry did not participate during agenda point 7.1. Bernadette Ossendorp did not participate during agenda point 7.2.

2. Adoption of agenda

The agenda was adopted without changes.

3. Declarations of interest

In accordance with EFSA's Policy on Independence and Scientific Decision-Making Processes[6] and the Decision of the Executive Director implementing this Policy regarding Declarations of Interests[7], EFSA screened the Annual Declarations of Interest (ADoI) and the Specific Declarations of Interest (SDoI) filled in by the experts invited to the present meeting.
For further details on the outcome of the screening of the SDoI, please refer to Annex I.
No further conflicts of interest, related to the issues discussed in this meeting, were identified at the Oral Declaration of Interest at the beginning of this meeting.

4. Agreement of the minutes of the 68th Plenary meeting held on 08 – 09 July 2014.

After minor editorial changes, the minutes were agreed.

5. Scientific Opinions submitted for discussion and/or possible adoption

There were no opinions submitted for discussion or possible adoption.

6. Feedback from the Scientific Committee/the Scientific Panels, Working Groups, EFSA, the European Commission

6.1a Feedback from the Scientific Panels: Report back from Panel Chairs on issues of common interest for the SC and on guidance documents under public consultation.

ANS

The ANS Panel, has not had a plenary meeting since the last SC plenary meeting of 8-9 July. Re-evaluation of food additives is ongoing and finalisation of the programme is expected by 2018. In order to fulfil this task, four standing WGs on the re-evaluation of approved food additives were established and will be operational until June 2017.

AHAW

While the Panel focuses mainly on delivering opinions on all aspects of animal diseases and animal welfare, the Commission has recently asked the Panel to review the scientific knowledge on electrical stunning of small ruminants and on the use of carbon dioxide for stunning rabbits. This was based on the comparative question asking whether this method can be considered as equivalent to the ones listed in Annex I of the Regulation (EC) 1099/2009. Work is ongoing and will be completed by March 2015.

BIOHAZ

The Panel adopted five opinions in July and two in September. Part 2 of the opinion on the evaluation of molecular typing methods for major food-borne pathogens is now published and provides practical information for data collection and storage from typing methods. Moreover, the appropriate linking between human and animal databases was described and can be of interest also to other EFSA Panels.

[6] http://www.efsa.europa.eu/en/keydocs/docs/independencepolicy.pdf
[7] http://www.efsa.europa.eu/en/keydocs/docs/independencerules.pdf

Following a request from the European Commission and in the context of minimising food waste, the Panel was asked to assess whether the possible impact of extending the shelf-life could pose a risk to consumers due to *Salmonella enteritidis*. The estimation was done by applying a quantitative model and comparing the actual situation regarding the storage of eggs in the EU with different possible scenarios combined, considering the prolongation of the best-before and the sell-by date from 7 to a maximum of 70 days. The Panel concluded that the absolute risk is greater for uncooked meals compared to lightly cooked meals. An effective way to minimise any increase in risk during extended storage is to keep the eggs refrigerated both at retail and the household.

The risk posed by pathogens in foods from non-animal origin is under evaluation. Examples include the outbreak of *E. coli* from sprouting in Germany.

The Panel is also working on an opinion on the public health risks related to the consumption of raw drinking milk, which is now increasingly for sale on internet. The risk associated with this increase needs to be reviewed by December 2014.

The Chair of the Panel drew the attention of the SC to the risk ranking activity of the Biohaz Panel which is complementary to the work ongoing by an external contractor (see minutes for agenda item 7.1) comparing more specific risk ranking models as available in EU, USA, Canada and Australia.

CEF
During these last few months, the work of the CEF Panel has mainly focussed on the finalisation of the opinion on Bisphenol A that is due by the end of this year.

CONTAM
In relation to the diverging opinions between EFSA and the risk assessment bodies of France and Germany on the public health risk related to the presence of perchlorate in food, discussion is still ongoing and will likely result in the publication of a paper that explains both positions, as requested under Article 30 of the EFSA founding Regulation.

Two years ago, the CONTAM Panel published an opinion on T-2 and HT-2 mycotoxins produced by various *Fusarium species*. The French risk assessment body has recently reached a different conclusion compared to EFSA's, questioning the benchmark dose (BMD) approach used by the CONTAM Panel. In view of the recent experience with perchlorate, EFSA will send an explanatory letter in the spirit of the Article 30 procedure.
The SC underlined the importance of preventing diverging opinions with other EU bodies, both when the work is conducted in parallel but also when it concerns an opinion already published. This issue will be discussed at the next meeting of the Advisory Forum, underlining that such responsibility should also be considered and shared by the Member States' Competent Authorities.

FEEDAP
The Chair of the Panel informed the SC about an ongoing discussion on the applicability of the earthworm reproduction test (OECD TG 222) to the assessment of the safety for the environment of feed additives. The pattern of exposure indicated in the standard test (only the soil is spiked with the test item) is under discussion, as this does not fully reflect the pattern of exposure of feed additives. The SC recommended that the environmental risk assessment experts of the FEEDAP Panel liaise with the PPR Panel experts to discuss this issue.

GMO
At its last plenary meeting in September, the GMO Panel endorsed its draft "Guidance on the Agronomic and Phenotypic Characterisation of Genetically Modified Plants" for public

consultation until 6 November 2014. The document provides specific recommendations on the representativeness of the selected sites of field trials; the representativeness of the selected test materials and their quality; the experimental design of field trials; the selection and description of (ecologically) more relevant endpoints; data analysis; and risk assessment implications.

In October, the Panel will consider for adoption an opinion on a GM plant containing multiple stacked events. The Panel was asked to conclude on lower sub-combinations of these stacked events considering the available information.

The EFSA taskforce, drafting an explanatory statement for conducting a repeated dose 90-day oral toxicity study in rodent on whole food/feed, has received feedback from the GMO Panel. The request for the explanatory statement was in the frame of the Implementing Regulation 503/2013 which requires a 90-day study in rodents for the risk assessment of genetically modified (GM) plants. The statement illustrates two possible scenarios for 90-day studies, based on the identification (scenario 1) or not (scenario 2) of hazards in previous analyses, and provides information on the study design, conduct and interpretation accordingly. Considerations on the type and source of the test materials and on preparation of test diets are also provided, with illustrative examples. The statement will be published in October.

NDA

The Panel is discussing the extrapolation of reference values used in safety assessments to various age groups, when only data from adults are available. The basis for these values and the processes to derive them will be described in a guidance document, with the aim of clarifying the criteria in use and to enhance consistency in the general approach.

PLH

The PLH Panel will have its next plenary meeting on 25 September and prepared for the adoption of 13 draft opinions on pest categorisation of organisms in the context of the revision of the EU plant health regime.

Recently, a request was received from DG Sanco concerning the PLH Panel Opinion on citrus black spot, a disease not present in the EU territory, published earlier this year. This request regarded a report prepared on behalf of an international group of citrus pathologists which questioned whether the published Opinion had taken on board their comments made during the earlier public consultation on the draft Opinion. EFSA was asked by DG Sanco to make a response to this document, which had been published on the website of Citrus Research International based in South Africa. The previous detailed responses to the comments in the EFSA public consultation report (http://www.efsa.europa.eu/en/supporting/pub/555e.htm) were checked and the Panel was satisfied that all comments received were responded in line with the EFSA procedure. The first author of this document has been contacted by EFSA to determine whether a dialogue could be established to identify and discuss divergent views on the published Opinion.

PPR

The work for the mandates on literature review on epidemiological studies linking exposure to pesticides and health effects will start soon.

6.1b Update on the PPR Guidance Document on Terrestrial Ecotoxicology

José Tarazona, Head of the Pesticides Unit, presented the ongoing work on the revision of the Guidance Document on Terrestrial Ecotoxicology. In the period 2008-2010 a public consultation was held as well as a survey among EU Member States to list the needs for

improvement of the existing DG SANCO Guidance documents to be considered in the revision process and on priorities regarding development of new guidance. The revisions will take on board, to the maximum extent possible, the priorities suggested by the public, by the stakeholders and by Member States. Work is ongoing for five guidance documents to be completed by end 2017 or 2018: guidance on risk assessment for non-target arthropods; guidance on in-soil organisms risk assessment; guidance on risk assessment for non-target terrestrial plants, and for amphibians and reptiles; guidance on good modelling practice. For each of these organism groups, the PPR Panel will first produce a scientific opinion that serves as an information source for the guidance development. Furthermore, these opinions will present the possible options for risk managers, the corresponding levels of protection and the consequences for the environment.

6.1c EFSA's work in the area of Contaminants: an update from the CONTAM Panel

The Chair of the CONTAM Panel gave an overview of recent and ongoing activities on contaminants in food and feed, associated areas and undesirable substances (i.e. natural toxicants, mycotoxins) and residues of non-authorised substances not covered by another Panel. The CONTAM Panel's mandate is typically to deal with unintentional contamination of a substance in the food chain. An overview of the opinions adopted in 2012, 2013 and 2014, as well as those in the pipeline for 2014 and 2015 was presented. 94% of the 136 requests for the CONTAM Panel since 2003 came from the European Commission, 3% from the MSs, and 1% from the European Parliament. 2% were self tasks. The CONTAM Panel issued urgent advice in crisis situations 9 times (e.g. for melamine in food, dioxins in pork and phenylbutazone in horse meat).

The Scientific Committee acknowledged the fruitful cooperation of the CONTAM Panel on substances of overlapping concern (e.g. chromium with the NDA Panel).

The CONTAM Panel's approach for uncertainty analysis on large datasets was applauded. It was considered very useful for transparency reasons and also important for communication on controversial issues.

6.2 Feedback on the work-programme of the SC Working groups:

Update on approved mandates

a. <u>EC mandate for a preliminary opinion on the risks arising from the production and consumption of insects as food/feed (EFSA-Q-2012-00578):</u>
EFSA sent its acceptance letter for this mandate (M-2014-0150) to the European Commission on 7 August 2014, including the interpretation of the Terms of Reference. Meanwhile, the Focal Points have been asked to forward to EFSA national risk assessments on insects, if and when available.
The WG is being established. The need and the extent of a literature review will be discussed in the first meeting of the WG. A workshop with stakeholders and representatives from the WG is foreseen in order to get insights on production, processing and consumption of insects and products thereof.

b. <u>Risk benefit of fish/seafood consumption as regards methylmercury (EFSA-Q-2014-00665):</u>
A conference call was held on 1 September to discuss the content of the SC statement that will answer the question from the European Commission. The Scientific Committee will use the previous opinions from CONTAM on mercury, as well as the recently-published NDA opinion on the health benefits of seafood consumption in relation to health risks associated with exposure to methylmercury. The draft statement will be presented at the next Plenary meeting (11-12 November 2014) for discussion. The objective is to adopt the statement by the end of December 2014.

Update on ongoing Working Groups:

c. Compendium of Botanicals (version 3.0) :
The call for tender to transform the currently published MS Excel®-based compendium of botanicals reported to contain naturally-occurring substances of possible concern for human health into a web-searchable database and prepare version 3 of the Compendium will close on 19 September 2014. EFSA will then review the offers received with the objective to sign the contract and start the procurement in December 2014. Version 3 of the Compendium should be published on the EFSA website by summer 2015. The information contained in the compendium will then be further expanded / updated until the end of the contract (end of 2016).

d. Standing WG on Guidance Review:
The guidance on the revised structure of EFSA's Scientific Opinions and Statements was adopted (EFSA-Q-2012-00786) at the last plenary in July and recently published. The EFSA editorial team is working on the accompanying template lay-out for outputs that will be published as from January 2015. A trial phase will start for a period of about 10 months where Panels will have to apply the new structure. After the pilot phase, a revision of the structure and template will be possible, if necessary.

e. Environmental Risk Assessment:
On 4-5 September 2014, the 3 WGs met in parallel and discussed the planning for 2015 in a joint session. Since the consultations on the 3 opinions of EFSA Panels needs to precede the consultations with Agencies and the public, the drafting of opinions and the reports of the consultations will extend into the second half of 2015. The SC agreed with the proposal to extend the deadline of these self-tasking activities until end of 2015.

f. Uncertainty in Risk Assessment:
The status of the activities of the WG is slightly behind the agreed schedule. The workplan of the activities is currently being revised and extra meetings will be scheduled. The public consultation, originally foreseen to take place in the first quarter of 2015, will most likely take place in the second quarter.

g. Standing WG on Emerging Risks:
There has not been a WG meeting since the last SC plenary meeting. The issue of how to achieve better interaction with (and among) the Panels and how to co-ordinate it, should be discussed at the next WG meeting. Another item under discussion is how to formalise the classification of an issue as an emerging risk.

A procurement contract is ready to be signed to test a procedure for the identification of emerging chemical risks using data from the REACH Database. The project will be finalised in 2016.

The WG discussed potential cross-cutting issues linked to the transition from long-chain poly- and perfluorinated alkyl substances (PFASs) to new fluorinated alternatives. The use of perfluorinated alkyl substances (PFASs) by industry is extensive since the 1960s, however, as these compounds are highly stable a global accumulation in the environment and human populations has occurred. For some of these compounds health risks are well documented, and industry is now trying to find alternatives, these often being other PFASs where the biological effects are unknown. The EFSA CEF and

CONTAM Panels have already assessed most common PFASs (PFOS and PFOA). In addition, the EFSA CONTAM Panel is now considering whether there is a need to update its previous risk assessment, based on newly published toxicological information on PFASs, their precursors and potential replacements (see also EFSA external report recently published). The CONTAM Panel will discuss this report at its 68th Plenary meeting to be held 25-27 November 2014. The Scientific Committee suggested that similar issues could be anticipated in the future by requesting to the applicants an assessment of the entire lifecycle of these kind of food contact material, including their environmental fate and the potential contamination of the food/feed chain.

h. Standing WG on Genotoxicity:
The WG will have its kick-off meeting on 10 October. Four requests for advice were received from PRAS, FEED, Nutrition and AFSCO Units. The outcome of the discussion at the meeting will be reported in the minutes as a possible advice of the standing WG to the requestors. Additional meetings will be scheduled on an *ad hoc* basis.

6.3 Feedback from EFSA:

6.3a Draft Scientific Cooperation Roadmap

The Head of the AFSCO Unit displayed the many existing and envisaged routes of MS and EFSA cooperation on food safety in Europe. The aims of these enabling tools for cooperation are to ensure Europe's food is safe, to gain consumer confidence, to have joint responsibility, share the same goals, and to increase efficiency while cooperating on food safety priorities. One set of tools is focused on scientific capacity building through numerous ways of trainings in risk assessment and on intelligent use of resources through data sharing. As food safety has increasingly become a global matter, a second focus is to build a coherent international voice so that MS and EFSA can take up an international role together. The vision for the future is to go beyond the operation of specific cooperation tools towards building a common EU risk assessment agenda, with defined priorities for MS and EFSA cooperation. The budget for implementing this Cooperation Roadmap in 2014-2016 was allocated to the different steps and actions.

In the context of disseminating and harmonising risk assessment practices between MS and EFSA, the SC asked to clarify (and harmonise, if possible) the level of initiative expected from the national Focal Points. EFSA clarified that it makes the resources available, but has little influence on the MS-level organisation of food safety and the statutory power/mandate given to the Focal Points.

6.3b Report back on issues relevant for the Scientific Committee

A list of the international scientific cooperation activities of EFSA and the relative outcomes, particularly multilateral and bilateral meetings with international bodies that took place during June-July, was distributed to the SC.

6.3c Scoping paper on methodological approaches in EFSA

An EFSA editorial will be published in the EFSA Journal to clarify the role and interplay of upcoming mandates to increase robustness, transparency and openness of EFSA's scientific assessments. This editorial work particularly concerns EFSA's activities regarding analysis of uncertainty in risk assessment, the Weight of Evidence (WoE) approach in scientific assessment, the biological relevance in risk assessment and evidence-based scientific assessment (so called Prometheus-Promoting methods for Evidence use in Science). These activities will be described in relation to the wider landscape of scientific assessment and therefore the editorial and mandates for the above-mentioned activities will

benefit from consultations with sister agencies, Member States Competent Authorities and international bodies. The received comments will be considered when updating the Terms of Reference of the respective activities. Consulted parties may suggest participation of observers to the WGs of interest. An international workshop addressing guiding principles, methods and tools for these activities is included in the planning for 2015. The SC asked to also ensure a fluent dissemination of information and documents to the Panels through the Chairs.

Comments from the SC on the scoping paper are to be submitted by end of September. The text will be tabled for endorsement at the November SC plenary meeting.

6.3d Feedback on Panel consultation on Horizon 2020 research priorities

The EFSA Panels, SC and Advisory Forum (AF) were consulted in 2012-2013 to identify priority research topics. The 8 Priority Research Areas identified in 2012 and the 56 identified in 2013 were reported to the DGs Research and Innovation, DG AGRI and DG SANCO who recommended continuing the yearly consultations in support of the EC Horizon 2020 research programme. The responses were grouped and ranked according to 5 criteria (1) High/Unclear risk level, (2) Broad EU perspective, (3) Limited previous research/knowledge, (4) Clear outcome of proposed research, and (5) Link to EU 2020 Strategy.
For 2014, over 42 priority research topics were identified and will be reported to the above-mentioned DGs (and published) after the AF and SC have given their feedback. 2015 consultations will be initiated in March 2015.

The SC enquired about the impact of these general written reports, compared with topical workshops with DG R&I and DG AGRI as were organised e.g. for AHAW, where EFSA could give more direct and more detailed input for research. EFSA will try to investigate and have a feedback on the usefulness of the proposals.

6.3e Update on EFSA ongoing collaborations

- Collaboration with the Joint Research Centre (JRC):

Hubert Deluyker, the EFSA Scientific Adviser, presented the topics of cooperation between EFSA and the DG Joint Research Centre (JRC – Institute IHCP, IES, IRMM and IPSC). This cooperation was so far based on an *ad hoc* service approach with Service-Level Agreements (SLA), but for the topics envisaged for longer-term support, the cooperation will be covered by a Memorandum of Understanding that is under preparation. The SC noted that this would be an opportunity to be able to follow-up on the many recommendations made in several EFSA opinions, most frequently of a technical nature. It was suggested that such recommendations could be systematically catalogued on an annual basis and monitored for follow-up.

- Collaboration with the Global Coalition for Regulatory Science Research (GCRSR)

The objectives of the Global Coalition for Regulatory Science Research (GCRSR), an FDA initiative, were presented. Europe will join the coalition through the participation of EFSA, the European Medicines Agency (EMA) and the DG Joint Research Centre. This participation allows covering food and medical safety areas together, both from a regulatory view and from an applied research perspective, similar to the FDA model.

6.3f Risk assessment on multiple stressors in bees: strategies, methodologies and data collection

The different exploratory EFSA activities on bee health during 2010-2014 gave rise to a multi-annual strategic plan for the development of a holistic approach to the risk assessment on multiple stressors in bees (2014-2019). In this period, specific datasets and tools will be delivered through outsourcing, networking and other supporting activities such as the evaluation and implementation of the BEEHAVE model (a systems model of honeybee colony dynamics and foraging to explore multifactorial causes of colony failure) and the

preliminary development of predictive models on the risk assessment of multiple stressors on bees (DEBtox model).

For the full development and implementation of this plan, the Scientific Committee agreed that a Standing Working Group (SWG) of the Scientific Committee should be established to provide scientific and strategic support in developing such a complex risk assessment approach. This programme includes the active involvement of several EFSA units (SCER as the coordinating unit supported by PRAS, ALPHA, AMU, AFSCO and COMMs), and the EFSA "Bees" Task Force. It involves regular communication with the relevant stakeholders via the design of a dedicated webspace on bee health on the EFSA website, and through continuous reports to the relevant EFSA networks and via exchanges of information with the EU Bee Initiative project that is supported by the European Commission and several involved stakeholders.

7. Other scientific topics for information and/or discussion

7.1 Update on the procurement on risk ranking

In 2013 EFSA launched a procurement contract on "Critical review of methodology and application of risk ranking for prioritisation of food and feed related issues, on the basis of the size of anticipated health impact". The contracted consortium is led by RIKILT in cooperation with the University of Newcastle, the Food and Environmental Research Agency (FERA) and the Technical University of Denmark (DTU). The scope of this work is to critically review suitable methodologies, tools and appropriate proposals for ranking risks for diet and health, food and feed in support of the implementation of a structured and transparent framework for prioritisation of requests for scientific work in EFSA. The existing methods applied to chemical/toxicological, microbiological and nutritional risks, as well as social science issues in the food/feed area, and their characteristics were collected via a literature search. Main method categories evidenced through the literature search in the above mentioned areas are: risk assessment, comparative risk assessment, risk ratio method, scoring method, cost of illness (CoI), DALY/QALY, willingness to pay (WTP), multi criteria decision analysis (NCDA), risk matrix, flow charts/decision trees and expert synthesis.

Based on the critical evaluation of the methods, an overall conceptual framework, in the format of a decision tool, was developed to select the most appropriate method(s), given the characteristics of the risk ranking question at hand, the risk management requirements and the data availability. On behalf of the consortium, Ine Van der Fels-Klerx gave a detailed presentation with the conclusions and recommendations of the draft report.

The SC highlighted that the risk ranking tools should be able to facilitate the communication with the public, the stakeholders and risk managers, especially with respect to uncertainties. A useful follow-up of this project would be to run a case study through the various methods and select those methods that meet the requirements for communication on uncertainties. It was noted that none of the methods have been used for combined exposure to multiple stressors. The SC was asked to provide any additional comments in writing in the n ext two weeks. These comments will be forwarded to the contractor and considered for the finalisation of the report. The report will be probably published by the end of the year.

7.2 Update on procurement on non-monotonic dose-response (NMDR)

A consortium led by ANSES in cooperation with AGES, Karolinska and RIVM has been contracted to deliver a "Review of non-monotonic dose-response of substances for human risk assessment (Reference: GP/EFSA/SCER/2014/01)" in 18 months. Claire Beausoleil (ANSES) presented, via conference call and on behalf of the consortium, the work program under this contract. The overall objective is to critically review literature and to evaluate the evidence for NMDR hypothesis in the last decade (from 2002 onward) for substances (other than essential nutrients) in the food safety area. A set of existing reports will be used to

identify NMDRs, key events and Mode of Action (MoA); current strategies used to capture effects and substances in the food/feed chain for which there is evidence for NMDRs in *vivo, in vitro,* or from epidemiological studies. This first step will help to identify key words and combinations to be used for the literature search. This first step will also help to define the methods and criteria for deciding whether a given dataset shows sufficient evidence for a NMDR and the data requirements needed for evidence on a NMDR. This "NMDR tool kit" will be the basis of data analysis and collection in this project.
The SC asked the consortium to add "adverse effect" in the criteria for selecting relevant studies with claimed non-monotonic dose responses. The SC expressed its great interest in this activity and asked to be kept regularly updated on progress.

8. Any other business

8.1 Update on the EU-ANSA network of EU Agencies:
Under the initiative of the Chief Scientific Advisor for the EU, Ann Glover, the EU Agencies Network on Scientific Advice (EU-ANSA) was established and convened to discuss common priorities, aims and objectives. Terms of Reference were proposed and the work programme for 2015 will be presented in the November meeting. Hubert Deluyker, the EFSA Scientific Adviser, was appointed as Chair of the network for 1 year.

8.2 Draft 2015 work programme for grants and procurement in science:
The Head of the SCER Unit summarised the different EFSA mechanisms for outsourcing projects and briefly presented the draft work-programme for 2015. Comments from the SC are welcomed in the following days.

8.3 Feedback on the EFSA-WHO-FAO meeting on development and use of post harmonised databases of individual food consumption at EU and global level, 3 July 2014:
Davide Arcella, EFSA Evidence Management Unit, presented the outcome of the meeting held. He reported that FAO and WHO are looking for cooperation with EFSA in the area of food consumption data. The challenge to share the data available to EFSA will be further discussed. They are also exploring the possibility of using the platform developed by EFSA for data transfer (Data Collection Framework) and the FoodEx system (for food description and classification). EFSA welcomes such cooperation.

8.4 Update on the procurement of glossary for lay audience on scientific terms used in risk assessment
The Scientific Committee was presented with the outsourced project that aims to provide layman definitions of scientific terms most commonly used in EFSA Communications (e.g. press releases, web stories etc). This project will help to improve understanding of EFSA's work by reaching wider audiences such as the general public and the media. A list of scientific terms was circulated to selected SC members to get an agreement on the scientific definition on which the layman definition will then be based. Finalisation of the project is foreseen by the end of the year.

8.5 Feedback from the EFSA colloquium on chemical mixtures, Edinburgh, 11 September 2014:
144 participants from 21 countries attended the EFSA colloquium, which was held back-to-back with the Eurotox 2014 Congress. This was a unique opportunity to bring highly informed people together who contributed to the event. The event report is foreseen in early 2015.

8.6 Update on the Scientific conference in the context of EXPO 2015:

In October 2015, EFSA will organise a scientific conference in Milan in the context of the EXPO. The general programme of the conference will be finalised in November and the detailed scientific programme will probably be ready in December 2014. Registrations will be opened in March and the EFSA event will take place on 14-16 October at the Milan Expo site. The draft programmes will be circulated to the SC for comments during the next SC plenary.

8.7 Update on the EFSA/WHO event on Threshold of Toxicological Concern (TTC), 2-5 December 2014:

A stakeholder conference will be held on 2 December in Brussels, followed by an expert workshop on 3-5 December. The registration for the stakeholder event is open until 20 October whereas the call for experts for the workshop will close on 30 September. The aim of the events is to review the science underlying the TTC concept. During the stakeholder conference all interested parties can express their views that will be taken into consideration in the following workshop. This is the first time that EFSA and WHO jointly organise a workshop on TTC.

8.8 Draft agenda Nanotechnologies network, 21-22 October 2014:

The 2014 meeting of the EFSA network for risk assessment of nanotechnologies in food and feed will be held in Parma on 21-22 October and the main topics for discussion are: (1) the Nano Inventory of EFSA, illustrating (as a snapshot) the products used by the food/feed industry, (2) the details of the Nano particle definition, particularly the size thresholds set therein, (3) studies from the MS with nanomaterials currently in use in the food/feed chain, and (4) clarifications regarding solubility and toxicity.

The SC pointed out that for nanopesticides the current legal framework is not clear in relation to the responsibility for the assessment. A recent publication reviews how nanopesticides can be regulated and what are the guiding principles for risk assessment and regulation.

A recent publication reviews the current approach for environmental risk assessment of nanopesticides and whether these approaches are fit for purpose under the current legal framework.

Update on SC plenary meeting dates in 2015:

Some dates for 2015 are overlapping with Panel plenary meetings and must be renegotiated so that the Chairs will be available.

Annex I

Interests and actions resulting from the screening of Specific Declaration of Interests (SDoI)[8]

a) CONFLICT OF INTEREST:

In the SDoI filled for the present meeting **DR. BERNADETTE OSSENDORP** declared the following interest: Involvement in the consortium that was awarded the procurement GP/EFSA/SCER/2014/01 “Review of non-monotonic dose-responses of substances for human risk assessment”. In accordance with EFSA’s Policy on Independence and Scientific Decision-Making Processes and the Decision of the Executive Director implementing this Policy regarding Declarations of Interests, and taking into account the specific matters discussed at the meeting in question, the interest above was deemed to represent a conflict of Interest.

This results in the impossibility for the experts to be present when the item 7.2 (Update on the procurement on non-monotonic dose response) is discussed, voted on or in anyway processed by that concerned scientific group.

In the SDoI filled for the present meeting **DR. QASIM CHAUDHRY** declared the following interests: Participation in a literature review carried out by the Consortium established by the awarded call for proposal OC/EFSA/SCOM/2013/01 on “Critical review of methodology and application of risk ranking for prioritisation of food and feed related issues, on the basis of the size of anticipated health impact”. In accordance with EFSA’s Policy on Independence and Scientific Decision-Making Processes and the Decision of the Executive Director implementing this Policy regarding Declarations of Interests, and taking into account the specific matters discussed at the meeting in question, the interest above was deemed to represent a conflict of Interest.

This results in the impossibility for the experts to be present when the item 7.1 (Update on the procurement on risk ranking) is discussed, voted on or in anyway processed by that concerned scientific group.

[8] The Annual Declarations of Interests have been screened and approved before inviting the experts to the meeting, in accordance with the Decision of the Executive Director implementing the Policy on Independence regarding Declarations of Interests.