

Final Minutes

28th MEETING OF THE FOCAL POINT NETWORK PARMA (EFSA), 15TH - 16TH SEPTEMBER 2016

Chair/Co-Chair: Jeff Moon / Stef Bronzwaer

Members	
Austria	<i>Johann Steinwider</i>
Belgium	<i>Laurence Ballieux</i>
Bulgaria	<i>Snezhana Todorova</i>
Croatia	<i>Vlatka Buzjak</i>
Cyprus	<i>Georgios Stavroulakis</i>
Czech Republic	<i>Petr Beneš</i>
Denmark	<i>Birgitte Helwich</i>
Estonia	<i>Piret Priisalu</i>
Finland	<i>Kirsi-Maarit Siekkinen</i>
France	<i>Coralie Bultel</i>
Germany	<i>Lea Herges / Nicole Gollnick</i>
Greece	<i>Gorgias Garofalakis</i>
Hungary	<i>Judith Sali</i>
Ireland	<i>Grainne Redmond</i>
Italy	<i>Luca Busani</i>
Latvia	<i>Elina Ciekure</i>
Lithuania	<i>Snieguole Sceponaviciene</i>
Malta	<i>Ingrid Borg</i>
Netherlands	<i>Jacqueline Castenmiller</i>
Norway	<i>Gisle Solstad</i>
Poland	<i>Iwona Wisniewska</i>
Portugal	<i>Filipa Melo de Vasconcelos</i>
Romania	<i>Dida Cozachievi</i>
Slovak Republic	<i>Milo Bystrický</i>
Slovenia	<i>Blaža Nahtigal</i>
Spain	<i>Cristina Alonso-Andicoberry</i>
Sweden	<i>Bitte Aspenström-Fagerlund</i>
United Kingdom	<i>Alison Spalding</i>

Observers

Albania	<i>Shpresa Ohri</i>
FYR of Macedonia	<i>Dušica Santa</i>
Montenegro	<i>Drago Marojevic</i>
Switzerland	<i>Barbara Engeli</i>
Turkey	<i>Muzaffer Nurseren Budak</i>

Focal Point Secretariat

<i>Sérgio Potier Rodeia</i>	<i>Julia Finger</i>
-----------------------------	---------------------

EFSA Staff

<i>Barbara Gallani</i>	<i>Antonio Ciccarelli</i>
<i>Goran Kumric</i>	<i>Shira Tabachnikoff</i>
<i>James Ramsay</i>	<i>Stylianos Koulouris</i>
<i>Giselle Gizzi</i>	<i>Stefano Cappé</i>
<i>Sosanna Tasiou</i>	<i>Isabelle Hubert</i>
<i>Martin Moravek</i>	<i>Elena Caprioli</i>
<i>Kerstin Gross-Helmert</i>	<i>Hubert Deluyker</i>
<i>Nicoline Le Gouriérec</i>	

Apologies: Iceland, Luxembourg, Serbia.

1. OPENING OF MEETING

Jeff Moon, Chair of the meeting, opened the 28th meeting of the Focal Point (FP) network and welcomed all participants, in particular those attending a FP plenary meeting for the first time: Bitte Aspenström-Fagerlund from Sweden; and Alison Spalding from the UK.

Jeff informed that the minutes of the 27th FP meeting, which took place on 11th - 12th May in Zagreb, Croatia, were published on EFSA's website on 5th July 2016. The agenda for the current meeting was amended, with the following additional issues being raised: update on access to the chemical hazard database (Germany); expert survey involving MS institutions; feedback from the last FP meeting. The plenary adopted the final agenda. Oral Declarations of Interest (ODOIs) were requested at the beginning of the meeting with no additional interests being declared.

2. WELCOME BY THE HEAD OF COMMUNICATIONS AND EXTERNAL RELATIONS DEPARTMENT

Jeff Moon welcomed Barbara Gallani, appointed since May 2016 as Head of EFSA's Communications and External Relations Department. Barbara introduced herself and welcomed FPs to the meeting. She underlined the importance of the network in the context of cooperation and networking, highlighting, on the agenda, EFSA's grants and procurements as one among other cooperation tools being used. Barbara also highlighted the active support FPs provide in promoting the BTSF RA trainings, thus contributing to build an European knowledge community, one of the key strategic objectives of EFSA's Strategy 2020.

3. NEW STAKEHOLDER ENGAGEMENT APPROACH

Jeff Moon gave the floor to Goran Kumric, to introduce EFSA's new stakeholder engagement approach (SEA) and the way forward for its implementation. Goran explained that the main aim is to align EFSA's stakeholder engagement with the OPEN EFSA project and with the first strategic objective of EFSA's Strategy 2020, i.e. to prioritise transparency and engagement throughout EFSA's work. Thus, the overall purpose of the new framework for EFSA's new stakeholder engagement approach is to provide stakeholders with a better understanding of its scientific decision-making processes so to improve the quality of EFSA's scientific outputs and the extent to which they meet stakeholders' needs.

The implementation of the new approach will start with the launch of the registration process that should occur in September 2016. A first list of stakeholder organisations will be established around 6 weeks after, however, registrations will always be open. A first meeting of the Stakeholder Forum, consisting of around 100 groups of stakeholders, is envisaged for April 2017. Stakeholder organizations at national level can contribute via their mother organizations at EU level, non EU-members can participate via an umbrella organisation registered in the EU. Goran asked FPs to share their views and experiences in plenary and to support the initiative by promoting it through their existing national networks.

Italy, France and Belgium raised concerns on whether FPs will be able to target well the requested promotion, as interaction with the desired stakeholders are typically not part of the classical FP target audience. FPs also indicated that the AFCWG might be better placed to give support to this promotional initiative. James Ramsay, Head of the External Relations Unit, clarified that FPs are just asked to raise awareness to the new stakeholder approach within already existing lists of national networks and not to identify new stakeholders at national level. The AFCWG will be approached with a similar request for support. Romania asked for the type of material that will be made available to support publicity and as well for eventual translation, as this would ease the process. James confirmed having multi-media products available to be shared. However no TV or social media spot is intended to be prepared. Currently available documents are in English language, but some translations are foreseen, and FPs can also initiate translations using their FP budget. A template will be sent by e-mail shortly after the FP meeting, explaining in practical terms, what the initiative is about and which actions are asked to be taken. Czech Republic asked to send the registration template and information material in editable format as soon as possible, which would ease translation.

Action Point 1: EFSA to send the registration template for the new SEA to FPs

Action Point 2: FPs to promote new EFSA SEA

4. TRANSPARENCY AND ENGAGEMENT IN RISK ASSESSMENT (TERA)

Jeff Moon introduced Gisele Gizzi from the SCER Unit, to present to FPs the Transparency and Engagement in Risk Assessment project (TERA project). The TERA project is implementing the "Open EFSA" approach and is fully supportive of Strategic Objective 1 of the EFSA Strategy 2020, i.e. to prioritise the public and stakeholders in the process of scientific assessment. Gisele explained the whole cycle of the project, with its single steps and measures, to be implemented during 2016-2019.

France asked to whom the consultation with MS on draft scientific opinions is intended and how the selection process for the external review will be done. Gisele confirmed that MS, via the AF, will be provided with the possibility to provide input to scientific opinions during the consultation period. The external review is intended for controversial opinions as a second review of the peer review and will be tested in a pilot. Norway informed about having a new strategy for stakeholders and asked how EFSA is engaging with the EC as a stakeholder in order to ensure it receives the necessary mandates. Gisele

confirmed that the EC has been taken into consideration even if not explicitly mentioned in the presentation.

In a wider context, Denmark remarked that there is no information available for MS on their national members in EFSA Working Groups and Panels, neither can EFSA provide such information. Sérgio explained that, unlike information for MS representatives such as in Scientific Networks, experts in Working Groups and Panels are acting on their individual capacity rather than on behalf of their originating country, thus data protection clauses prevent the sharing of their personal information. EFSA's Data Protection Officer has been contacted in the past on this issue and confirmed that, in line with the EU Data Protection Regulation, such personal information cannot be disclosed. Gisele added that the reorganisation of EFSA's website, particularly regarding Working Groups, has improved the overview of involved members. She also added that she has made a note on the issue and will pass it on the EFSA Colleagues responsible for the EFSA's Expertise programme.

5. STRATEGIC ISSUES

5.1 Feedback from the last Advisory Forum meeting

Jeff Moon provided feedback from the 60th AF meeting, which took place on 8th and 9th of June in Utrecht, the Netherlands, on the occasion of the Dutch EU Presidency. The meeting was held back-to-back with the meeting of the AFCWG and included a joint workshop of the two groups. The main session was on antimicrobial resistance, with presentations on current activities from EMA, ECDC, the EC and a number of MS, as well as updates on discussions held during the Dutch Presidency on the topic. Other topics included support for the draft update of the Management Board Decision on the operation of the AF, with some suggestions for improving the text and discussions on a draft members' Declaration of Commitment, a document stating the members' commitment to act in the interest of consumers when fulfilling their role at the AF. Both documents are now finalized and will be presented at the AF meeting in Bratislava on 28-29 September. FPs are asked to promote the signature of the new Declaration of Commitment, which will be translated into all EU languages.

Action Point 3: FPs to check the translation of Declaration of Commitment (on request)

Action Point 4: FPs to promote the signature of the Declaration of Commitment

5.2 EU Risk Assessment Agenda Joint Projects

Stef informed FPs about the EU RAA joint projects. EFSA received so far contributions from 14 countries and overall 42 project proposals. A catalogue of project ideas will be available as of the coming AF meeting end of September for another round of additional suggestions for proposals until mid-October. As second step, all countries will be asked to indicate if they wish to express an interest in joining the proposed projects until the AF meeting in December. The table will then be kept as a living document, open for revision on a 5-year circle. There is also the intention to link the catalogue to EFSA's priorities and topics for Thematic Grants, and, in this way, matching them with areas of importance to MS. Stef clarified that not all proposals will receive EFSA funding, so external funding should be investigated. To this end, the exercise on the collation of available funding schemes conducted before summer will be a useful tool. FPs have access to all documents abovementioned in DMS, namely to the concept paper, the catalogue and the funding overview documents.

Germany asked how EFSA will decide to rank the projects it will choose to fund. Stef explained that no criteria have been established yet and further consultations, involving scientific units, are needed to identify which projects will be funded. Not all suggestions will materialize in projects and not all projects will have funding. Greece asked if special support for promoting networking is envisaged. Jeff confirmed that the available IT tools

will be reviewed to this end. Germany suggested considering setting up a link between the table on main forthcoming RA activities and the catalogue. Jeff welcomed the idea that merits further reflection. France posed the general question on the final objectives of the EU-RAA. Stef explained that there is no single and final objective, but the idea is a smooth transition from cooperation to partnership between EFSA and the MS, with the aim to go beyond current resources and join forces through networking. The EU-RAA is a tool to pool the working programmes of the MS and EFSA, and to enable an optimisation of resources and capacities instead of separate programmes fulfilled in isolation.

Action Point 5: EFSA to consider how to best link the EU-RAA joint projects' catalogue and the table on main forthcoming RA activities

5.3 Upcoming AF meeting

Jeff Moon gave an outlook on the upcoming AF meeting, which will be held on 28-29 September in Bratislava, on the occasion of the Slovak EU Presidency. The agenda foresees updates in the area of pesticides and information on the EFSA Independence Policy and on international cooperation. The EU-RAA agenda will be a central topic, as well as the most recent main forthcoming RA activities, to which FPs provided input. The signature of the Declaration of Commitment will take place and the ToR for the AFCWG will be endorsed. Finland asked about the possibility for FPs to still comment on the scoping paper for the data quality pilot project. Jeff confirmed that the document has been circulated to FPs and will be discussed at the AF meeting. Comments, questions and EFSA replies on the scoping paper on data quality have been collated and uploaded on the DMS meeting folder.

6. GRANTS AND PROCUREMENT

6.1 Workplan 2017

Jeff Moon gave the floor to Sosanna Tasiou from the Finance Unit to present to FPs the Science Grants and Procurement draft workplan for 2017 and 2018. The document has been circulated to the AF (as well as to EFSA's sister agencies ECDC, ECHA and EMA) on 6 August, for consultation, until 7 October. The consultation process aims the identification of activities of common interest, thus avoiding duplication of efforts and resources. Sosanna then gave an overview on the activities to be included on the final draft of the workplan, explaining that all information is currently indicative and will be prioritized further. The consultation process is also a key topic at the upcoming AF meeting. Sosanna invited FPs to support their AF members in indicating the appropriateness of the topics and in highlighting possible duplication of projects. Projects will be chosen according to prioritization rather than funding, thus the budget is not published yet with the document. Greece asked for information on the Thematic Grant that had been published and on subsequent calls. Sosanna explained that the currently awarded Thematic Grant received only positive feedback to date and that the chosen beneficiaries are working hard on the project. A second Thematic Grant is now being evaluated.

6.2 Use of unit costs for grants

Jeff Moon introduced Martin Moravek from the Finance Unit to explain to FPs the use of unit costs for grants, intended to simplify funding and administrative burdens, as well as reporting, and preventing the need for demonstration of real costs. The use of unit costs is foreseen under of the Financial Regulation and is based on historical data collected by EFSA, the EC and EUROSTAT overtime. The new concept leads to easier budget estimation, easier cost declaration and less documentation while increasing transparency. Martin then explained the details of this procedure. Finland asked about the timeline for the launch of the concept; France questioned the applicability to current grants and about the optional application of the procedure. Martin explained that the procedure is not applicable to current grants and that it will be launched in 2017, date as of when it will be applicable to all grants without exception, thus not being optional.

Belgium asked about applicability to the current FP Agreements, which was confirmed as not applicable. On question from Spain, Martin explained that financial documentation should always be kept, in any case, by grant beneficiaries, for the duration foreseen on national legislation.

6.3 Upcoming Grants and Procurement

Jeff Moon gave the floor to Sosanna Tasiou, who gave an overview of current and upcoming Grants and Procurements.

6.4 Review of Article 36 procedures

Jeff Moon welcomed Kerstin Gross-Helmert to the meeting, who presented the new EFSA project to develop an "Innovative approach for Article 36 networking and management of the List". It will take aboard the experience of FPs as main actors in the process and continuously inform the AF of developments. A FP Task Force will be established, with 4-6 FPs as members, to support the project by providing feedback for the new concept, and input to the new procedures and IT tool, as well as to receive/deliver trainings. Kerstin gave an overview of the project phases and the activities of the Task Force, after which she invited FPs to each vote for up to three countries to become members of the Task Force. The Task Force will be chaired by Luca Busani, FP from Italy, who will join EFSA as a Guest Scientist in autumn. A background document with the ToR for the Task Force has been shared with FPs for their information. A document for performing a SWOT analysis will be circulated after the meeting, to give all FPs the opportunity to provide input to the SWOT analysis, highlight problems of the current procedures and IT tool, and make suggestions for future procedures and tool, which will then be taken into consideration by the Task Force.

Greece questioned the expected outcome of the project, as legal requirements will remain the same. Kerstin explained that the first step was a reflection on how to change the concept. The following steps will aim to ease the process and make use of new IT tools, abandoning the current questionnaire, etc. The Czech Republic asked for the reasons and potential implications of considering the possible inclusion of the Scientific Networks organisations into the Article 36 List. Kerstin highlighted the advantage for Network member organisations to be on the list, as by this they will be entitled to receive grants. An analysis will be performed to identify how many Scientific Network organisations are not on the Article 36 List and to check the feasibility of including them on the list. The Chair concluded that the new concept follows the idea to give MS more ownership and move away from a non-efficient process onto a concept of partnership with MS organisations and sharing of responsibilities.

Action Point 6: EFSA to circulate the SWOT analysis template for input on the current procedures and IT tool for managing the Article 36 List

Action Point 7: FPs to provide feedback via the SWOT analysis template

7. UPDATE ON THE FELLOWSHIP PROGRAMME

Jeff Moon welcomed Nicoline Le Gouriérec to give an update on the EFSA fellowship programme. Programme Key Performance Indicators (KPIs) and impact indicators, as well as fellow selection criteria, have been defined. A draft outline of the synopsis programme has also been shared with FPs last July. The procurement call for developing and delivering the training modules has been published, with deadline set to 15 September, and the grant call for proposals for selecting fellow hosting sites is currently being drafted. Nicoline presented milestones for the upcoming months as well as major milestones for the next years. When invited to choose a name for the programme, FPs expressed their preference for the acronym "EUFORIA Fellowship" (European Food Risk Assessment Fellowship). Nicoline also gave an overview on the communication strategy for the programme and an outlook on the grant call for proposals for fellow hosting sites. FPs were invited to volunteer to be part of the programme committee currently composed by Norway, UK and Germany, in order to fill the vacant post left by Latvia.

A Q&A session followed the presentation, with reference to the main questions and respective answers collated to date. Spain asked about the possibility for the participation of post-doctorate students working in the university which are not hired by Article 36 organisations, however working there on the base of fellow-grants. Nicoline replied this will be further clarified on the call. Italy questioned possible differences between hosting sites, which might be crucial for the running of the programme. The issue was acknowledged by Nicoline, who reassured that trainings will face weekly evaluations to guarantee a uniform training programme. On question from Germany about the eligibility of PhD students and tutors, many of which on part-time contract, Nicoline underlined that the ideal fellow would be a mid-or early career fellow, working in full-time on employment by an Article 36 organisation, but that all conditions will be clearly stated on the call. Nicoline added that the Q&A catalogue will be kept up-to-date and that FPs can still contribute with additional questions.

Action Point 8: FPs to express interest in volunteering to the Programme Committee of the EUFORIA Fellowship Programme

8. NATIONAL NETWORKING

8.1 Introduction

Stef Bronzwaer introduced the breakout session on national networking, aiming at an exchange of views on the current outreach of FPs in their national networking and to reflect on difficulties and possible improvements on the interaction with national players.

8.2 Breakout session

FPs split into 5 groups to discuss the following questions:

1. How can FPs further extend their networking outreach beyond the classical national networks (e.g. Art. 36 organisations, Scientific Networks, other national distribution lists), in order to cover the full spectrum of relevant national stakeholders (i.e. ensuring that all relevant national organisations - from local, regional and central level - and areas falling within EFSA's remit are covered)?
2. How can FPs further improve the interaction with their national networks, e.g. by clustering stakeholders per areas of expertise, better targeting information and activities, and increasing their responsibility and visibility as "EFSA ambassadors"?
3. What are the difficulties encountered for promoting an efficient national networking and how can these be overcome?

8.3 Discussion

The rapporteurs of each group summarized the discussions during the plenary. Written summaries are provided as an annex to the minutes.

9. NEW COLLABORATION PLATFORM

9.1 Introduction

Jeff Moon briefly introduced the new collaboration platform - MS Office 365. He highlighted that a pilot on sharing the table on main forthcoming RA activities was run with the participation of FPs and that all technical issues raised were overcome.

9.2 Live Demo of MS Office 365 – Collaboration Environments

Jeff Moon then welcomed to the meeting Antonio Ciccarelli, from the Planning Transformation and Technology (PTT) Unit, to present to FPs the new platform and its potential as a collaborative tool. Antonio explained the basic functionality of document sharing and collaborative editing, avoiding e-mail exchange, and highlighted that it allows for a single repository of documentation to be accessible from anywhere and from any device, without the need for a Microsoft license. It has also been highlighted that the

official document repository for the final version of the document at the end of each collaboration phase remains the EFSA Document Management System (DMS). Future integration of other software e.g. Yammer, a shared Calendar, and Skype for Business, is envisaged. Antonio then explained how a Microsoft account can be created linked to any email address, enabling access to collaborative workspaces on a protected mode. A live demo of MS Office 365 was then provided.

9.3 Discussion

Two FPs, Belgium and Norway, informed that their organisations are using Office 365.

With regards to concerns raised about data protection, Antonio explained that, once a Microsoft account is created (a process that requires just a valid e-mail address) it is possible to operate under a protected environment. For security reasons it was recommended to use different passwords for Office 365 than those used to access the account to which the organisational emails refer to.

It was proposed that MS Office 365 would start to be used as the platform for provision of updates to the table on main forthcoming risk assessment activities immediately. Detailed procedures for setting up usernames per country (enabling traceability of changes in the shared document) and for account creation will be provided by EFSA.

Action Point 9: EFSA to send e-mail with detailed procedures for setting up MS Office 365 accounts per country

10. UPDATE ON THE ADVISORY FORUM COMMUNICATION WORKING GROUP

Jeff Moon gave the floor to Shira Tabachnikoff to provide FPs with the latest information regarding the Advisory Forum Communication Working Group (AFCWG). Shira explained that it has been proposed the change of the AFCWG into a Network, and that its future name should be CEN - EFSA Communications Experts Network. The change in governance opens opportunities for a stronger link with the AF, for better integration of social sciences and for more autonomy, in particular regarding the possibility of inviting external experts to meetings. Designation of members and meeting organisation procedures will remain the same. Shira also gave an outlook on upcoming COMMS activities and finally proposed to share the newly developed COMMS calendar on quarterly basis with FPs, who welcomed the proposal. Greece asked if news-stories could be produced in a format that would easily allow translation. Shira confirmed to bring this proposal to the attention of the AFCWG. She explained that FPs are not asked to disseminate further the new calendar but instead use it for raising EFSA's visibility when the opportunity arises. She also clarified that the weekly media monitoring will resume.

Action Point 10: EFSA to share the COMMS calendar with FPs on quarterly basis

The Chair closed the meeting of the first day.

11. FOCAL POINT TECHNICAL REPORTS

11.1 Reporting Season

Jeff Moon gave the floor to Sérgio Potier Rodeia to provide an update on the launch of the FP reporting season for 2016. The template for the technical reports 2016 has been revised and sent to FPs end of 2015. On 9 September an e-mail announcing the opening of the reporting season has been sent out to FPs. The deadline for submission of final reports and of the respective letter is the 31 October 2016, although they are welcome earlier if possible. For the first time there is also the opportunity to send draft reports by 7 October 2016 for a first check before submitting the final version. After receiving the final reports (and until 15 November) EFSA will communicate their approval and confirm the payment of the balance. Until the end of November the exchange of letters for the

renewal of FP agreements and payment of the first instalment of the 2017 grant will take place. On question from Spain, Sérgio explained that the letter has to be digitally signed or, alternatively, digitally certified. Czech Republic asked what to insert under the comment section. Sérgio explained that any information not provided on Part I of the template and that concerns FP activities should be included on Part II, e.g. description of the FP resources and/or how budget has been spent for acquiring supporting equipment to FP tasks. Denmark asked about the level of detail to be provided for each FP task and if all activities have to be reported. Sérgio clarified that sufficient detail is necessary through reference to examples, e.g. by making reference to concrete emails demonstrating the FP has carried out information exchange within the FP network and at national level.

Action Point 11: FPs to send their Technical Reports and respective signed letters until 31.10.2016 (and eventual drafts until 07.10.2016)

11.2 Auditing of FP Technical Reports

Sérgio then informed that FP reports will be for the first time subject to auditing, as provided for in the Grant Agreements. In 2016 one country will be audited on a pilot basis, while in 2017 and 2018 two countries will be audited. The countries are chosen on the base of a pre-defined risk matrix. The audit process aims to verify the implementation of the mandatory activities through the provision of documental evidence by FPs. The pilot in 2016 will allow the testing of the audit template and of internal audit procedures, for which an internal Task Force made up AFSCO, Finance and Internal Audit has been set up. On question from Czech Republic, Sérgio explained that the evidence to be provided is e.g. e-mails sent out by FPs demonstrating their information exchange activities, agendas of FP events, etc. Examples of documental evidence to be provided are indicated on the audit template. On question from Belgium, Sérgio confirmed that documentation should be in English or, if in national language, accompanied by a short summary in English. France asked about the timeline to provide documentation. Sérgio further explained that the process should be concluded ideally during the course of November, although it will depend on the provision of the documental evidence by the FPs concerned. Should there be a delay on the provision of such evidence the renewal of the FP agreement may be postponed to the next calendar year.

12 ISSUES RAISED BY FOCAL POINTS

12.1 Antimicrobial Resistance – Activity of the National FP (SK)

Jeff Moon gave the floor to Milo Bystrický, FP from Slovakia, to give a presentation on the activities of the Slovak FP in the area of Antimicrobial Resistance (AMR). A report released in 2016 on the state of AMR in the Slovak Republic gave the basis for a national risk assessment in this area. Milo then presented the outcomes of the risk assessment and gave an overview on events taking place in Slovakia in this context. Beatriz Guerra from EFSA's BIOCONTAM Unit thanked Milo for the presentation underlining the importance of national reports that are helping EFSA to collect data on this domain.

12.2 Advice on preliminary reference doses for allergens in foods (NL)

Jeff Moon gave the floor to Jacqueline Castenmiller, FP from the Netherlands, to present the Dutch advice on preliminary reference doses for allergens in foods. Referring to Annex II of Regulation EU 1169/2011 on the provision of food information to consumers, the questions raised were if allergens cause a serious health problem and what to do with traces of allergens. The VITAL (Voluntary Incidental Trace Allergen Labelling) system, first developed by industry, and now managed by the Allergen Bureau of Australia and New Zealand, indicates reference doses that are considered to be safe for allergic consumers. Though the VITAL approach is considered a valid one, the NVWA was not granted access to the database, thus the question remains on how the VITAL expert panel derive reference doses from the threshold values. The Netherlands suggested

moving towards a harmonised approach within Europe where one could find data on allowed traces of allergens and, if this could not be achieved, adapt national food laws. The advice is to set up a database to enable determining reference doses for allergens and establish a European Reference Laboratory (EU-RL) for allergens. The Netherlands will therefore ask EFSA to issue an opinion on setting up reference doses for allergens. Jeff thanked Jacqueline for the presentation and suggested the inclusion of this proposal under the EU-RAA, in which allergens have already been identified as a possible area for future cooperation. Upon question to the plenary regarding the existence of national reference laboratories on allergens, FPs expressed, in general, lack of knowledge / information, thus agreeing to further investigate. France questioned EFSA, in this context, about ongoing discussions with the EC on a possible role of EU-RL, which have not taken place yet. Spain added that, despite the fact that labelling of traces of allergens is currently not mandatory but up to food business operators, it seems helpful to develop a harmonized approach on the subject.

Action Point 12: FPs to further investigate at national level the existence of national reference laboratories in the area of allergens and report back to NL and the FP network

12.3 Feedback on the training on the risk assessment model IMPRORISK (CY)

Jeff Moon gave the floor to Georgios Stavroulakis, FP from Cyprus, to give feedback on the training on the IMPRORISK model that took place on 17-18 May in Cyprus. The IMPRORISK model is a joint project agreed on the occasion of the visit of EFSA's Executive Director to Cyprus and supported through an EFSA grant. Georgios explained that the model is available directly for those who have participated in the workshop and that further distribution is possible upon request via the FPs. The tool will be updated on a regular basis by Cyprus and after communicated to users. A first update has already taken place. Georgios also gave an overview on the feedback received on the workshop and as well on training delivered to Pre-Accession countries in Montenegro. Finally he summarized the benefits of the IMPRORISK model. Belgium added that a national training was organised in the beginning of September. This national event was provided by the Belgium participant on the workshop taken place in Cyprus. Cyprus invited FPs to provide additional feedback on the IMPRORISK tool and on national training initiatives.

Action Point 13: FPs to give feedback on the IMPRORISK model to Cyprus

12.4 Norwegian Opinion on CWD in Norway (NOR)

Jeff Moon gave the floor to Gisle Solstad, FP from Norway to give a presentation on a Norwegian scientific opinion regarding Chronic Waste Disease (CWD). The disease has been discovered for the first time in Europe as it was, up to now, only diagnosed in North America. Due to the outbreak in Norway, the NFSA issued this scientific opinion. The respective ToR are available in English. The opinion concludes that there is currently no information to identify the origin of CWD in Norway and that an introduction from North America or other countries cannot be excluded. Sporadic occurrence of prion disease in cervids is possible, as well as circulation of low levels of CWD in the cervid population for years without being identified. Cattle and sheep, however, are at very low risk of developing CWD. The opinion also considers that the possible risk of transmission to humans is very low though it has not been excluded. The incubation period of CWD is about 2 years. Finland informed that CWD is part of the Finnish monitoring programme as well, and has been monitored since 2003 with no case being discovered to date. Monitoring has increased since the outbreak in Norway. Sweden confirmed increased monitoring as well since the outbreak, without any case being reported so far. Denmark asked if molecular typing has been considered to check if the disease is identical to the cases discovered in North America. Gisle confirmed that, in Norway, awareness to the disease has also been raised, namely that the disease could be transported via shoes and equipment of hunters. On the question from Denmark, he also confirmed that molecular typing has revealed that the prion in reindeer is the same as in North America,

while the one in moose is a completely new prion. France questioned the general perception of the public to the disease. Gisle answered that it is estimated to be quite low, as awareness mainly occurred within the public institutions dealing with the issue.

12.5 Publication of the ANSES activity report 2015

Jeff Moon gave the floor to Coralie Bultel, FP from France to give an overview on the publication of the ANSES activity report 2015. The report has been published on the ANSES website (in French and English languages) and download of both the complete activity report and of specific activity reports of the different ANSES entities is possible. The specific activity reports are, for example, those from the European and International Affairs Department, the Laboratory for Food Safety, and this year, a specific report concerning plant protection products, fertilisers, growing media and biocides, linked with ANSES new missions. Hard copies of the complete report were sent to the FPs, AF members and EFSA during the summer.

12.6 Recent BfR training events and symposia / announcement of upcoming events

Jeff Moon gave the floor to Lea Herges, FP from Germany, to inform about recent BfR training events and announce upcoming events. Lea highlighted the SPICED Symposium "Spices and Herbs - a risk real taste experience", taken place on 1-2 June 2016 at BfR, and based on the SPICED project 2013-2016. This project investigated the safety of spices and herb product chains against natural, accidental and deliberate contamination. Lea also provided feedback on the 5th BfR Summer Academy on Risk Assessment and Risk Communication in Food Safety that took place between 27 June and 8 July, and announced as well upcoming events until the end of the year.

13 ANY OTHER BUSINESS

13.1 Pilot on new platform for information exchange

Jeff Moon welcomed Stylianos Koulouris to the meeting, who informed FPs about a pilot project for a new platform for information exchange. This platform will replace the IEP platform (which is being phased out) and is part of the wider "Open SCAIE" project, i.e. the Scientific Advanced Information and Evidence Hub project. The new tool will retain functionalities and metadata of the IEP and old IEP files will be migrated. It will act as an open access repository, with MS being able to directly upload content. Stylianos informed that the testing phase will start in October and invited 2 FPs to volunteer for a pilot phase, aiming to test the upload, download and search functionalities. On question from Norway about the timeframe for finishing the project, Stylianos explained that the SCAIE project is supposed to go live as a whole, comprising various components, and that the timeline will depend on the feedback received during the pilot phase for all its components. He confirmed that the tool is similar to the IEP, but of more simple use, with some additional features. Norway then mentioned that several tools are currently being used for information exchange purposes (e.g. DMS, IEP, Office 365, etc.) and if this could not be harmonised in one single tool. Jeff explained that the SCAIE project is meant to materialise the concept of a virtual library thus has, in its essence, such objective.

Action Point 14: Two FPs to volunteer for participating on the pilot SCAIE project

13.2 Pilot on data quality – current status

Jeff Moon gave the floor to Stefano Cappe, to answer questions from FPs regarding the state-of-play of the pilot on data quality, a project that has been presented to FPs on the last meeting in May in Zagreb. Stefano delivered first a presentation addressing questions raised by FPs on the concept paper circulated last June. FPs then raised additional questions that Stefano replied to. Stefano highlighted the key objectives of the

pilot as well as the next steps of the project. The pilot phase will include 5 countries that have been chosen among 12 volunteers according to geographical and demographical distribution criteria. On question from Denmark on the role of FPs, Stefano explained that the pilot will lead to a better definition of actors and actions in 2017, namely at the kick-off meeting and physical meeting with the selected countries. Further details will be made available after the FP and AF meetings of September.

Denmark questioned the efficiency of discussions about the project carried out at AF level, as there may be gaps in knowledge concerning the different data collection domains. Jeff reminded FPs that their task, at this stage and in preparation of the AF meeting, is to discuss with their AF members the concept for the pilot, the possible involvement of the FP as national coordinator and other national players to be involved. Stefano added that discussions with the AF members and at the AF meeting are a first step for a high-level agreement, while subsequent discussions at national level with key players are a second step of the process. During October, additional details (e.g. KPIs) will also be discussed at the level of the Scientific Networks, thus with the data providers. The data domains covered by the pilot are chemical contaminants, pesticide residues, zoonoses (including AMR and foodborne outbreaks) and veterinary medicinal products. Slovakia asked about the data format to be used during the pilot and the deadlines during the pilot phase for submission of data. Stefano explained that no change in the data format is planned, as the project is focussing on the quality of data. He also explained that the deadlines for data submission during the pilot will remain the same, i.e. they will continue to comply with currently agreed legal and/or formal deadlines for the different data domains. Germany asked if the co-funding from EFSA's side will be adapted to the needs of the individual countries participating in the pilot. Stefano replied that the proportion of funding allocated is fixed and listed in the documents of the pilot. A joint meeting with all 5 countries of the pilot is not currently planned but could be considered if needed.

In this context, Germany raised the question of MS access to the chemical hazard database. Stefano informed that the database is almost ready but still undergoing final data quality adjustments, namely concerning the validation of the data being extracted from opinions. An update on this database will be given at the next FP meeting.

Action Point 15: EFSA to provide an update on the Chemical Hazards Database at the next FP meeting

13.3 Expert survey involving MS institutions

Jeff Moon introduced Hubert Deluyker, Scientific Advisor to EFSA's ED, who informed FPs about an initiative concerning of an expert survey involving MS institutions. The main aim of the survey is to further engage with the employers of EFSA's independent experts (who have not been nominated by the MS) and investigate the conditions for ensuring their continued support and potential improvements. AF members, with the support of FPs, will be asked to identify contact details of relevant institutions to take part in the survey. The survey will measure the impact of the work of institutions in EFSA's activities deriving from the involvement of their experts, in particular of Panel members. The AF will be informed of this initiative on their upcoming meeting in September.

Action Point 16: FPs to support their AF members in identifying the contact details of experts' employers for the expert survey

13.4 Upcoming results of campaigns (ANS & CEF Panel renewal 2017; Trainee call) and upcoming SNE call

Jeff Moon welcomed Isabelle Hubert and Elena Caprioli to the meeting, to inform FPs about latest developments in recruitment. Isabelle gave an overview on the outcome of the ANS and CEF Panel renewal and explicitly thanked FPs for their support in promoting the campaign. To measure adequately the impact of the promotion activities FPs carry out it is planned to include "national authorities" as a possible source of information

when asking applicants from whom they got information about the call. Isabelle also informed about the trainee call that has been recently concluded and that was equally promoted by FPs. Isabelle asked FPs how they could be better supported from EFSA side in promoting recruitment campaigns. To this end, it was agreed to conduct a survey among FPs on the preferred tools currently being used. Elena Caprioli then introduced the upcoming call for Seconded National Experts (SNE), which will be launched in October. It was clarified that the call will remain open and candidates will be chosen from the SNE database. All information will be available on the EFSA website. Italy suggested better defining the desired/preferred profiles of applicants in the call in order to allow a more targeted promotion. Elena confirmed that the new tool to be used is more specific and takes into account the predefined expertise of applicants. Denmark suggested that the SNE call highlights the advantages for MS in allowing their experts to be detached in EFSA so to improve the number of applications submitted.

Action Point 17: EFSA to conduct a survey among FPs regarding preferred tools for promoting EFSA calls

Action Point 18: FPs to promote the upcoming SNE call once launched

13.5 Upcoming FP meetings and other FP/National Events & FP feedback from last FP meeting

At the end of the meeting, Jeff Moon invited Sérgio Potier Rodeia to give an overview on upcoming FP meetings and events. The next FP meeting will take place in Uppsala on 8-9 November 2016. The dates for 2017 are: 8-9 February (Parma); 17-18 May (Helsinki); 13-14 September (Prague); 15-16 November (Parma). Sérgio also gave an overview on upcoming national FP events and ED visits for September and October 2016 and reminded FPs to continue updating the overview table on DMS.

CLOSURE OF THE MEETING

Jeff Moon closed the meeting, thanking participants for their attendance and active contribution. The 29th FP meeting will take place on 8-9 November in Uppsala.

Reference	Who	What
Action 1	EFSA	to send the registration template for the new SEA to FPs
Action 2	FPs	to promote new EFSA SEA
Action 3	FPs	to check translation of Declaration of Commitment (on request)
Action 4	FPs	to promote signature of Declaration of Commitment
Action 5	EFSA	to consider how to best link the EU-RAA joint projects' catalogue and the table on main forthcoming RA activities
Action 6	EFSA	to circulate the SWOT analysis template for input on the current procedures and IT tool for managing the Article 36 List
Action 7	FPs	to provide feedback via the SWOT analysis template on the new Article 36 concept
Action 8	FPs	to express interest in volunteering to the Programme Committee of the EUFORIA Fellowship Programme
Action 9	EFSA	to send e-mail with detailed procedures for setting up MS Office 365 accounts per country
Action 10	EFSA	to share the COMMS calendar with FPs on quarterly basis
Action 11	FPs	to send their Technical Reports and respective signed letters until 31.10.2016 (and eventual drafts until 07.10.2016)
Action 12	FPs	to further investigate at national level the existence of national reference laboratories in the area of allergens and report back to NL and the FP network
Action 13	FPs	to give feedback on the IMPRORISK model to Cyprus
Action 14	2 FPs	to volunteer for participating on the pilot SCAIE project
Action 15	EFSA	to provide an update on the Chemical Hazards Database at the next FP meeting
Action 16	FPs	to support their AF members in identifying the contact details of experts' employers for the expert survey
Action 17	EFSA	to conduct a survey among FPs regarding preferred tools for promoting EFSA calls
Action 18	FPs	to promote the upcoming SNE call once launched

Annex

Summary of discussions of breakout session (Agenda item 8)

Group 1

Question 1 - How can FPs further extend their networking outreach?

- With regards to the use of distribution lists:
 - Enable the possibility to select experts per institution / expertise, depending on the subject of the question;
 - Use newsletters from institutions instead of distribution lists, e.g. with support of the communications department;
- Request feedback on information disseminated;
- Include on the list of institutions to contact professional associations and use them as multipliers;
- Further promote Focal Points and their role at national level, e.g. at conferences;
- Social Media – use existing channels of your institution for information dissemination.

Question 3 - Difficulties encountered for promoting an efficient national networking.

- Communication via email normally does not generate feedback;
- Communication by email may become a burden both the FPs and recipients, due to overload, leading to the question whether emails are all read and have proper follow up?
- Language barriers were not considered an issue for the group;
- When referring to national stakeholders, would be good to have further clarity on: who are the relevant stakeholders FPs should address (e.g. federal associations vs. locals associations, etc.)? In other words, how far FPs should go on the national level to address?

Group 2

Question 2 – How can FPs further improve the interaction with their national networks?

- Two steps were identified for achieving interaction with a target audience: provision of information (the message/ request) and engagement (the reaction/ output);
- Regarding the provision of information, these aspects should be considered:
 - Compilation, review and update of contact lists, possibly organised in meaningful ways, e.g., thematically, by area of expertise of stakeholders or by stakeholder group, etc.;
 - Formulation and communication of messages with relevance to the intended audience;
 - Selection of the appropriate communication route;
 - Use of proper information cascading channels, i.e. sending information to multipliers, such as associations or professional bodies, asking them to relay the information to their members;
- Regarding engagement, these aspects should be considered:
 - Provision of an umbrella for activities, where contacts can be engaged, e.g. having a national RA agenda, where different stakeholders are involved in different activities / studies / etc.;
 - Organising meetings involving stakeholders. Smaller meetings may allow for better engagement but larger events (such as conferences) are better for promoting messages to a larger audience;
 - Combination of tasks to achieve better engagement, e.g. using Committees or Working Groups of the Organisation to implement compatible activities for EFSA and/or the FP network.

Question 3 - Difficulties encountered for promoting an efficient national networking.

- Finding who does what, which is limited by the networking base of the FP and its capacity in identifying new stakeholders / contacts;
- Having the capacity to engage the national networks, enabling the allocation of capacity / resources to respond to queries, provide feedback to contacts' reactions, etc. and to follow-up any communication and/or cooperation instances;
- Hurdles in addressing some audiences, e.g. if they fall beyond of the (current) scope of FPs;

- *Limited visibility of EFSA or of the FP at the national level, in combination with the lack for legal or formal framework for the FPs to carry out their mission at the national level;*
- *Changes in people / contact details in organisations overtime;*
- *Lack of appropriate motivation of contacts / stakeholders; lack of resources on behalf of the contacts / stakeholders to interact / engage with the FPs and in following up requests;*
- *Lack of best practices regarding interaction with stakeholders (although compiling harmonised best practices may be challenging since achieving effective stakeholder interaction may need different approaches across countries);*
- *Limitations on the available information between FPs and EFSA regarding the entities that interact with the Authority. This could possibly be improved (keeping in mind the legal provisions regarding the protection of personal data and the acceptable practices regarding confidentiality).*

Group 3

Question 1 - How can FPs further extend their networking outreach?

- *Use the experience of FPs to identify what subjects and which networks (apart from those already identified, like article 36, scientific networks, etc.) FPs have reached to date. This does not mean a full stakeholder mapping but mainly listing them per country and pool results together;*
- *Explore opportunities of further networking with existing networks, allowing for a broader spread of information beyond single subjects;*
- *Explore innovative ways to share information so to enlarge the proper target audience;*
- *Understand and identify better the EU stakeholders in order to understand if at national level there is a good "linkage" and "fitness" with the EU counterparts;*
- *Define strategies to be "attractive" for institutions and networks not yet involved, promoting their engagement.*

Question 3 - Difficulties encountered for promoting an efficient national networking.

- *Existing natural institutional barriers;*
- *Limited resources available (not only in financial terms) that FPs can use to allocate to their activities; and difficulty in ensuring sustainability of the activities planned;*
- *Recognition of the FP role by institutions / experts, poor feedback, and difficulties in the interaction with the networking organisations.*

Group 4

Question 2 – How can FPs further improve the interaction with their national networks?

- *Promote targeted communication through, e.g.:*
 - *Dividing stakeholders into different categories e.g. scientists / experts, public, risk managers, etc.;*
 - *Improving mailing lists by maybe sub-dividing them according areas of interest;*
- *Consider setting up an on-line platform for national networking;*
- *Encourage Article 36 organisations to keep their profiles up-to-date;*
- *Obtain by-in and additional support from higher management;*
- *Create summaries in national language, highlighting key points (when disseminating emails);*
- *Consider lectures at University level (this is sometimes the first contact students have with EFSA);*
- *Make best use of social media: TV, Twitter, etc. Also leaflets with utility bills may prove useful;*
- *Ensure clear feedback from stakeholders on their actions and outreach;*
- *Consider the use of short snippets of information, which FPs can then distribute.*

Question 3 - Difficulties encountered for promoting an efficient national networking.

- *One way communication;*
- *"Red-tape";*
- *Language barriers;*
- *Lack of support from Ministers / Government;*
- *RA language is often too "heavy" thus target audience may have difficulty in understanding it;*

- Information does not reach the right people (i.e. lack of proper targeting);
- Lack of resources (time / money / people);
- Added value / benefit not always clear / visible to (Article 36) organisations.

Group 5

Question 1 - How can FPs further extend their networking outreach?

- Whereas EFSA in the question uses a top-down approach ("how to be perfect at once"), the group felt that a more bottom-up approach would be beneficial ("how to build networking capacity over time in order to achieve...etc."). Time, milestones, and how to reach the milestones to go further in capacity-building would be a better approach;
- One of the steps in achieving the desired networking capacity would be to gather the best possible overview of relevant organisations, e.g. through mapping of stakeholders / organisations;
- To make the good choice between a personal (e.g. contact persons) vs. an institutional approach would be another point for consideration (with reference to the last bullet-point above);
- Another step to foster such capacity-building would be to prioritise relevant stakeholders / organisations in the network, and as well prioritise the information to be disseminated within the network (which information and to whom, and in which way it should be disseminated (see other bullet-points concerning modes of communication).

Question 3 - Difficulties encountered for promoting an efficient national networking.

- The different "personalities" of the contact persons in relevant organisations, in particular in small and mid-sized organisations at national level, are sometimes an obstacle;
- Lack of knowledge – relevant organisations might not react to contacts through a networking approach from EFSA or FPs because they do not know the benefits / added value of such networking (not enough insight of "what's in it for us");
- The big-sized networking partners have a tendency to only look into their benefits (too much emphasis on "what's in it for me");
- Lack of resources might limit networking on both sides (i.e. from FPs and networking organisations);
- High turn-over of the contact persons in relevant organisations (e.g. Article 36 network);
- Different types of "communication language" between different stakeholders, as in scientific language vs. non-scientific language;
- "Competition" between networking organisations (namely between organisations with partially overlapping remits);
- The type of communication modes / tools used (example: is an email to many stakeholders / relevant organisations always the best approach for networking?).

Document history

Document reference FP.160915-m	Version 1.2
Prepared by	Julia Finger
Reviewed by	Sérgio Potier Rodeia
Last date modified	13.10.2016