Parma, 25 September 2017
EFSA/CONTAM/3178

Scientific Panel on Contaminants in the Food Chain

Minutes of the 86th Plenary meeting

Held on 19-21 September 2017, Parma (Italy)

(Agreed on 12 October 2017)

Meeting open to Observers

Participants

- **Panel Members:**

  Jan Alexander, Lars Barregard, Margherita Bignami, Beat Brüschweiler, Sandra Ceccatelli[1], Bruce Cottrill, Mike Dinovi, Lutz Edler, Bettina Grassl-Kraupp, Christer Hogstrand, Ron Hoogenboom, Helle Knutsen, Carlo Nebbia, Isabelle Oswald[2], Annette Petersen, Martin Rose, Alain-Claude Roudot[2], Tanja Schwerdtle, Günter Vollmer and Heather Wallace.

- **Hearing Experts[3]:**

  -

- **European Commission and/or Member States representatives:**

  Frans Verstraete (European Commission, DG Health and Food Safety, unit E2)[4]

[1] Attendance by audio-web conference on 21 September only.
[2] Attendance on 20 and 21 September only.
[3] As defined in Article 11 of the Decision of the Executive Director on Declarations of Interest: http://www.efsa.europa.eu/en/keydocs/docs/independencerules2014.pdf
[4] Attendance on 20 September only.

EFSA:

- **BIOCONTAM Unit:**

  Katleen Baert, Marco Binaglia, Paolo Colombo, Mari Eskola, Sara Levorato, Karen Mackay, Luisa Ramos Bordajandi, Ruth Roldán Torres, and Hans Steinkellner.

- **DATA Unit:**

  Andrea Altieri (for item 10.2).

- **SCER Unit:**

  Angelo Maggiore and Ana Afonso (for item 11)

- **Observers:**

  See Annex I

- **Others:**

  Not Applicable

CLOSED SESSION

19 September, 13:30 – 16:00

1. Welcome

The Chair of the CONTAM Panel welcomed the participants.

2. Apologies for absence

Christiane Vleminckx (CONTAM Panel), Veerle Vanheusden (European Commission, DG Health and Food Safety, unit E2) and Marina Marini (European Commission, DG Health and Food Safety, unit D1).

3. Adoption of agenda

The agenda was adopted without changes.

4. Declarations of Interest of Scientific Panel members

In accordance with EFSA's Policy on Independence and Scientific Decision-Making Processes[5] and the Decision of the Executive Director on Declarations of Interest[6], EFSA screened the Annual Declarations of Interest and the Specific Declarations of Interest filled in by the Scientific Panel Members invited for the present meeting. No Conflicts of Interest related to the issues discussed in this meeting had been identified during

[5] http://www.efsa.europa.eu/en/keydocs/docs/independencepolicy.pdf
[6] http://www.efsa.europa.eu/en/keydocs/docs/independencerules2014.pdf

the screening process or at the Oral Declaration of Interest at the beginning of this meeting.

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

5.1 Draft Scientific Opinion on the assessment of a decontamination process for hydrocyanic acid in linseed intended for use in animal feed (EFSA-Q-2016-00798)[7]

The Chair of the SWG on Feed Detoxification presented the draft opinion on the assessment of a decontamination process for hydrocyanic acid in linseed together with the main points for discussion. The CONTAM Panel discussed the different parts of the assessment and adopted the opinion, subject to incorporation of changes as suggested during the meeting. The full opinion will be available on the Authority's webpage.

5.2. Draft Scientific Opinion on the assessment of a decontamination process for dioxins and PCBs in fish oil by a two-step filtration procedure (EFSA-Q-2016-00795)[8]

The Chair of the SWG on Feed Detoxification presented the draft opinion on the assessment of decontamination processes for dioxins and dioxin-like PCBs from fish oil together with the main points for discussion. The CONTAM Panel suggested some revisions to the opinion that will be presented for final discussion and possible adoption in a forthcoming Panel plenary meeting.

OPEN SESSION

From 19 September, 16:00

Till 21 September, 13:00

6. Welcome and brief introduction of Panel Members and Observers

The CONTAM Panel welcomed the Observers and the meeting participants introduced themselves.

7. Presentation of the EFSA Guidelines for Observers

The CONTAM Team Leader presented the EFSA Guidelines for Observers attending the open plenary meeting.

[7] http://registerofquestions.efsa.europa.eu/roqFrontend/questionLoader?question=EFSA-Q-2016-00798
[8] http://registerofquestions.efsa.europa.eu/roqFrontend/questionLoader?question=EFSA-Q-2016-00795

8. Agreement of the minutes of the 85th Plenary meeting held on 4 - 6 July 2017, Parma (Italy)

The minutes of the 85th Plenary meeting held on 4 - 6 July 2017 were agreed on 26 July 2017.

9. Report on the written procedures since the 85th Plenary meeting

Not applicable.

10. Scientific outputs submitted for discussion and/or possible adoption

10.1. Draft Scientific opinion on the health risks related to the presence of dioxins and dioxin like-PCBs in feed and food (EFSA-Q-2015-00028)[9]

The Chair of the WG on Dioxins in food and feed presented, for discussion and possible endorsement, some sub-sections on the draft opinion on the risks related to the presence of dioxins and dioxin like-PCBs in feed and food relating to adverse effects in farm and companion animals. The CONTAM Panel discussed and requested revisions to the sub-sections presented, and these will be discussed again at the next CONTAM Panel meeting.

10.2. Draft Scientific opinion on the health risks related to the presence of moniliformin substances in food and feed (EFSA-Q-2010-01006)[10]

The Chair of the WG on Fusarium toxins presented the draft opinion on moniliformin in food and feed for discussion and possible adoption. The CONTAM Panel appreciated the current draft opinion but requested further refinement in the hazard characterization and the application of benchmark dose modelling for the derivation of acute and chronic Health Based Guidance Values. Therefore, the draft opinion was not adopted and it will be presented again for possible adoption at the 87th CONTAM Panel plenary meeting (21-23 November 2017).

10.3. Draft Scientific opinion on the health risks related to the presence of furan and methylfurans in food (EFSA-Q-2016-00025)[11]

The Chair of the WG on Furan in food presented the draft opinion on the health risks related to the presence of furan and methylfurans in

[9] http://registerofquestions.efsa.europa.eu/roqFrontend/questionLoader?question=EFSA-Q-2015-000258
[10] http://registerofquestions.efsa.europa.eu/roqFrontend/questionLoader?question=EFSA-Q-2010-01006
[11] http://registerofquestions.efsa.europa.eu/roqFrontend/questionLoader?question=EFSA-Q-2016-00025

food for discussion and possible adoption. The CONTAM Panel adopted the opinion subject to incorporation of minor changes as suggested during the meeting. The Chair of the CONTAM Panel expressed her appreciation to the WG and EFSA staff.

10.4. Draft Scientific opinion on the update of the risk assessment on 3-monochloropropane diol and its fatty acid esters (EFSA-Q-2016-00839)[12]

The Chair of the WG on the update of the risk assessment on 3-monochloropropanol (3-MCPD) and its fatty acid esters presented for discussion and possible endorsement the sections 3.1. Reproductive and developmental toxicity, 3.2. Identification of critical effects and dose response assessment – Reproductive effects and the related appendices detailing Benchmark dose (BMD) analyses. The CONTAM Panel agreed on the proposed approach and endorsed the aforementioned sections subject to minor revisions. The Panel agreed to present the BMD analyses for renal and reproductive effects to the EFSA Scientific Committee's Standing WG on BMD for endorsement.

10.5. Draft Scientific opinion on the health risks related to the presence of perfluorooctane sulfonate and perfluorooctanoic acid in food

The Chair of the WG on perfluoroalkylated substances in food presented sections of the draft opinion on the health risks related to the presence of perfluorooctane sulfonate and perfluorooctanoic acid in food, for discussion and possible endorsement. Subject to some revisions, the Panel endorsed the following sections: 1.3.5. Environmental fate, 1.3.6. Previous Risk Assessments, 3.3.1. Toxicokinetics, 3.3.3.3. Reproductive and Developmental Toxicity, 3.3.3.4. Neurotoxicity, 3.4.1 Critical Effects and 3.4.2.1 Dose Response Assessment.

11. Presentation of activities of the EFSA Emerging Risks Team

An update on the relevant on-going activities of the EFSA Emerging Risks Team and related Network was given. In particular, on-going and future projects to identify possible emerging risk drivers for contaminants in the food chain were presented, as well as emerging issues identified in the last year. The CONTAM Panel expressed their appreciation and confirmed the interest for a regular update and stronger cooperation of the activities of the Emerging Risk Team.

[12] http://registerofquestions.efsa.europa.eu/roqFrontend/questionLoader?question=EFSA-Q-2016-00839

12. Feedback from the Scientific Committee/Scientific Panels, EFSA, the European Commission

12.1. European Commission

The European Commission representative gave feedback on the activities of the European Commission in relation to the scientific opinions of the CONTAM Panel. Several amendments of current legislation are under discussion with the Member States as an outcome of the CONTAM Panel scientific opinions. In addition, several recommendations to the Member States are in preparation by the European Commission, based on CONTAM opinions.

12.2. CONTAM Panel Working Groups

12.2.1. Update from WG on Fusarium toxins

See item 10.2.

12.2.2. Update from WG on Dioxins in food and feed

See item 10.1

12.2.3. Update from WG on Group HBGV for mycotoxins

The Chair of the WG presented the approach to assess the appropriateness to set group health based guidance values for fumonisins and their modified forms. A reassessment of the parent fumonisins has been carried out already and a HBGV for fumonisins B was proposed based on animal evidence. The relevant modified forms of fumonisins have been identified. Currently it is assessed if and how modified forms of fumonisins can be included in a group HBGV with fumonisins. The Panel thanked the WG for the work already carried out and endorsed the proposed approach.

12.2.4. Update from WG on Perfluoroalkylated substances in food

See item 10.5

12.2.5. Update from WG on Furan in food

See item 10.3

12.2.6. Update from WG on 3-MCPD update

See item 10.4

12.2.7. Update from WG on Opium alkaloids

The EFSA secretariat informed the members of the CONTAM Panel that the work on the draft opinion is progressing well. The WG will discuss the submitted occurrence data at a WG meeting that will take place on 27-29 September, together with the toxicity of opium alkaloids, as well as the supporting information for the assessment.

12.2.8. Update from standing WG on Feed detoxification

See items 5.1 and 5.2.

12.2.9. Update from WG on Fumonisins in feed

The Chair of the WG Fumonisins in feed informed the members of the CONTAM Panel that a teleconference was held in July. The WG started the discussions of the toxicity of fumonisins and its occurrence in feed.

12.2.10. Update from WG on Hydrocyanic acid in food

The Chair of the WG on Hydrocyanic acid in food informed that the work is progressing well. The 3rd WG meeting took place right after the end of the Panel plenary meeting.

12.2.11 Update from WG on Chlorinated paraffins in food

The Chair of the WG on Chlorinated paraffins informed that the WG held its first meeting and Agreed on the literature search protocol. Literature search is currently ongoing.

12.3. EFSA

12.3.1. Advisory Forum

The CONTAM Panel was informed that the 65th meeting of the EFSA Advisory Forum will be held on 3-4 October 2017. Additional information is available on the EFSA website[13].

12.3.2. Management Board

The CONTAM Panel was informed that the 74th meeting of the EFSA Management Board will be held on 11 October 2017. Additional information is available on the EFSA website[14].

12.3.3. Other

The CONTAM Team Leader gave an update on the process of renewal of the EFSA Panels and Scientific Committee. The CONTAM Team Leader proposed that a presentation on the new EFSA Policy on Declaration of Interests will be given to the Panel at the next plenary meeting.

[13] https://www.efsa.europa.eu/en/events/event/171003
[14] https://www.efsa.europa.eu/it/events/event/171011-1

12.4 Scientific Committee and its Working Groups of interest to the CONTAM Panel

The Chair of the CONTAM Panel highlighted the main items discussed at the 84th and 85th plenary meeting of the Scientific Committee (SC), held on 12-13 July and 2017, respectively. In particular, the Scientific Committee adopted the Guidance on biological relevance and on weight of evidence, and endorsed for public consultation the opinion on the clarification on some aspects relative to genotoxicity assessment. The Chair informed that the SWG on Benchmark Dose modelling will become operative by the end of September. Other draft opinions of relevance to the CONTAM Panel were discussed, namely the draft guidance for risk assessment on nanomaterials in food and feed and the draft guidance on risk assessment of chemical mixtures. Finally, outcomes of the trial phase of the Uncertainty in Risk Assessment guidance and feedback on the internal workshop were discussed.

The respective CONTAM Panel members who are members of the SC WGs of interest to the CONTAM Panel reported on the current status of these WGs, the WG on Mixtures and SWG on Genotoxicity.

13. Other scientific topics for information and/or discussion

13.1. Present status of current outsourcing activities of the CONTAM Team (BIOCONTAM Unit)

Due to lack of time this agenda item was deferred to the next meeting.

14. Answers to questions from Observers

No written questions were submitted in advance to the meeting by the Observers present in the room and via web-streaming. Questions asked during the meeting were addressed by the meeting participants. Details are available in Annex II

15. Any other business

Not applicable

Annex I

List of registered Observers at the 86th CONTAM Panel meeting

Registered for physical attendance to the meeting		
Observer	**Affiliation**	**Country**
Maria Cesarina Abete	EU body	Italy
Neil Buck	Private sector	Switzerland
Roberto Chincarini*	University/public research institute	Italy
Panagiota Katikou*	National Authority	Greece
Federica Manini	Private sector	Italy
Daniel Ribera	Private sector	Belgium

*Registered observer not attending the meeting

Registered for attendance by web-streaming		
Observer	**Affiliation**	**Country**
Ruth Bevan	International organization	United Kingdom
Elena Maria Bozzetta*	EU body	Italy
Mathieu Brucker	Private sector	Belgium
Emma Di Consiglio	University/public research institute	Italy
Stefanie Geiser	Private sector	Belgium
Kalila Hajjar	Private sector	Belgium
Helen Håkansson	University/public research institute	Sweden
Elisa Jäkel	Private sector	Germany
Anet Režek Jambrak*	University/public research institute	Croatia
Panagiota Katikou*	National Authority	Greece
Hyun Kim*	National Authority	South Korea
Ylenia Maitino*	Private sector	Belgium
Gro Mathisen	National Authority	Norway
Evangelia Mavromichali	Private sector	Belgium
Monica Olsen*	National Authority	Sweden
Caroline Rey	Private sector	Belgium
Ligia Schreiner*	National Authority	Brazil
Silvia Tombesi	Private sector	Belgium
Kate Trollope	Press/media	United Kingdom
Nico van Belzen	Private sector	The Netherlands
Dustin Williams	Private sector	Germany
Veronika Winkler	Private sector	Germany

*Registered observer not attending the meeting

Annex II

Answers to questions from Observers

Q1. Neil Buck (private sector)
Will the opinion on Dioxins and Dioxin-like PCBs in food and feed include an evaluation of contamination levels in animal feed that would pose a risk to human health via their transfer in food of animal origin?

A1. Ron Hoogenboom (Chair of WG on dioxins in food and feed)
The WG will look at the transfer from feed to food, but not try to estimate the feed levels that would result in exceedance of current MLs for animal derived products. This specific issue is not included in the Terms of Reference of the mandate received from the European Commission and therefore it will not be addressed in the opinion.

Q2. Neil Buck (private sector)
Is a direct genotoxicity mechanism of furan relevant at human doses given the differences in kinetics and metabolic activation. Has the interaction between the active metabolite and proteins and GSH been taken into account?
Have you considered to use epidemiological studies on coffee?

A2. Margherita Bignami (Member WG on furan in food) and Katleen Baert (Member CONTAM team)
No data were identified regarding the differences in metabolic capacity between species. Only data on experimental animals could be used for the risk assessment. One of the main questions to address in this opinion was whether the genotoxic data were solid enough to justify the observed carcinogenic effects. The Panel decided that it is more likely that a non-genotoxic mechanism is responsible for the long-term effects.
The WG did not take the epidemiological studies on coffee into account for the risk assessment of furan since these studies do not allow conclusions to be drawn regarding furan. This decision was made on the consideration that coffee is a mixture of a high number of substances and furan occurs in different food groups, resulting in exposure of coffee drinkers and non-coffee drinkers.

Q3. Daniel Ribera (private sector)
Will the TDI for 3-MCPD and its fatty acid ester be revisited?
.

A3. Christer Hogstrand (Chair WG on 3-MCPD update)
The WG is currently re-evaluating the dose response analysis of 3-MCPD data using the Scientific Committee updated guidance on the use of Benchmark dose in risk assessment. The outcome of this re-evaluation will be sent to the Standing WG on BMD for possible endorsement and subsequently used to assess whether an update of the TDI for 3-MCPD and its fatty acid esters is warranted. The WG is also assessing the effects of 3-MCPD on the male reproductive system and it is presently unclear if this will influence the TDI.

Q4. Daniel Ribera (private sector)
Did EFSA check whether the diverging outcome of the BMD analysis between EFSA and JECFA is due to differences in the approach taken or rather to differences in the applied BMD software?

A4. Marco Binaglia (Team Leader CONTAM) and Christer Hogstrand (Chair WG on 3-MCPD update)
The WG Chair noted that EFSA and JECFA selected the same endpoint from the same study and derived a different TDI due to different approaches used in the BMD analysis of the data. He noted that the five-fold difference in the TDIs should be put in the context of the existing uncertainties included in the 100-fold uncertainty factor applied when using animal data.

The CONTAM Team Leader confirmed that the divergence between the EFSA and JECFA TDIs is uniquely due to a different approach applied in the BMD analysis and not to the use of different BMD software.

Q5. Kalila Hajjar (private sector)
At this stage of discussions on the reopened 3-MCPD esters opinion, to what extent do you expect the recent developments (JECFA outcome, EFSA guidance on the use of the benchmark dose approach in risk assessment of January 2017, new discussions in the working group etc.) will possibly trigger a recalculation of the BMDL10, and/or the use of another modelling approach compared to the EFSA opinion 2016?

A5. Christer Hogstrand (Chair WG on 3-MCPD update)
The WG is currently re-evaluating the dose response analysis of 3-MCPD data using the Scientific Committee updated guidance on the use of Benchmark dose in risk assessment. The outcome of this re-evaluation will be sent to the Standing WG on BMD for possible endorsement and subsequently used to assess whether an update of the TDI for 3-MCPD and its fatty acid esters is warranted.

Q6. Nico van Belzen (private sector)
Are there new insights into the divergence on 3-MCPD with JECFA? Any plans to address the divergence?

A6. Christer Hogstrand (Chair WG on 3-MCPD update)
The divergence is being addressed in the on-going opinion on the update of the assessment on 3-MCPD and its fatty acid esters (see item 10.4). Some details on the nature of the divergence and the proposed approach to address it are discussed in the background of the self-task mandate that will be addressed in the aforementioned opinion (EFSA-Q-2016-00839)[12]

Q7. Mathieu Brucker (private sector)
Does the panel plan to consider, and publish, details of existing and ongoing actions by oilseed producers that have been successful at reducing levels of contaminants? Specifically, the initial Opinion acknowledged reduced levels of contaminants in palm oil, without detailed explanation or analysis. Malaysian Palm oil producers, and government, have taken significant steps to reduce

contaminants: would this be recognised in the panel's discussions and in future published documentation?

A6. Marco Binaglia (Team Leader CONTAM)
Neither the assessment of occurrence levels of process contaminants in palm oil or other vegetable oils, nor the evaluation of mitigation measures undertaken to reduce such levels are included in the Terms of reference of the current mandate to update the assessment on 3-MCPD and its fatty acid esters. Hence these issues will not be addressed in the Opinion.