



## European Food Safety Authority

---

### **AD HOC ADVISORY FORUM WORKING GROUP ON THE INPUT OF NATIONAL AUTHORITIES INTO THE WORK OF EFSA'S SCIENTIFIC COMMITTEE, PANELS AND OTHER EXPERT GROUPS (INA-AFWG)**

---

#### **A. Introduction and explanation of following step**

This paper is the result of the second meeting of the INA-AFWG that took place on 14<sup>th</sup> October 2005 in Parma. At this meeting three papers were discussed; one on *when* to exchange scientific info (the question on confidentiality versus transparency), one on *what* kind of scientific info and the last one on *how, by which means*.

As a following step, it was proposed to elaborate on the conclusions of the discussions in one new document which will be dealt with at the next meeting of the Group on 20<sup>th</sup> January 2006.

The outline of this document can be found below. In this document we also make suggestions for the contributors as well as the coordinators of the several parts of the paper. The names of the members who just showed their interest to participate, but not for a particular subject, are listed in italic. We also have indicated, in bold, suggestions for a coordinator/rapporteur per section.

However if you do not entirely agree with the arrangements; if you want to contribute to another part of the paper or if you have any other comment, please do not hesitate to contact us. We like to facilitate and support as much as possible.

In order to have a fruitful meeting in January, we would like to amalgamate the different documents beforehand to one discussion paper. Therefore, we would like to receive all the contributions on **11 January** at the latest.

#### **B. Participants at the October-meeting:**

AF representatives: Roland Grossgut, Charles Crémer, Eleni Ioannou-Kakouri, Petr Benes, Marianne Schauzu, Marie-Hélène Loulergue, Sotirios Kiokias, Alan Reilly, Dace Santare, Benno ter Kuile, Beate Folgerø, Anders Glynn, David Gott, Jeannie Vergnettes, Rolanas Kliucinskas, Alexandra Veiga de Barros, Kirsti Savela

Representatives of EFSA's Scientific Committee and Panels: Tito Fernandes, Philippe Vannier, Jiri Ruprich

EFSA staff: Herman Koëter (chair), Jan Bloemendal (secretary), Djien Liem, Pilar Rodriguez Iglesias, Juliane Kleiner, Anne Laure Gassin (morning session), Irene van Geest

**C. Outline of and drafters for the January-document**

Content	Drafters - rapporteur in bold - names in <i>Italic</i> are suggestions made by the secretariat, not confirmed yet
<p><b>TITLE</b></p> <p><b>A. COMMON OBJECTIVES</b></p> <p><b>B. PRINCIPLES</b></p> <p>B.1. Confidentiality of Panel Members  <i>* This chapter should elaborate on how discrete scientists in national panels have to treat information they receive as member of an EFSA Panel and vice-versa.</i>  <i>* In that sense it is perhaps useful to make a distinction whether members report back to their AF members, to the scientific institutes they are working in or to the outside world in their respective countries.</i></p> <p>B.2 Role of the Advisory Forum  <i>* This piece should elaborate in what way and detail the AF could be the platform to discuss <b>progress</b> with the development of national and EFSA opinions and other scientific issues.</i>  <i>* In what sense can the Forum add information useful for the discussions taking place in the scientific committees and panels?</i>  <i>* How can we avoid that the Forum is jeopardizing the independence of the Panels?</i>  <i>* In the real world experts participating in both a national and an EFSA Panel will share some of the extra information they have with either panel. Is this phenomenon hampering the independent nature of EFSA's panel?</i>  <i>* Do we have to deal with, and if so how, with the fact that certain AF members do have experts (from their staff and or countries) participating in panels while others don't?</i>  <i>* Role of the art. 36 network in this respect</i></p>	<p>EFSA</p> <p><b>Philippe Vannier</b>,  <i>David Gott, Juliane Kleiner, Hans Peter Jensen</i></p> <p><b>Alan Reilly</b>, Charles Cremer, Jeannie Vergnettes</p>

<p><b>B. 3 Accessibility of meetings</b>  <i>* What are the pros and cons of making meetings more accessible to silent observers such as:</i></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• fellow scientists;</li> <li>• AF members;</li> <li>• relevant stakeholders;</li> <li>• layman and the media?</li> </ul> <p><i>* In what sense matters the nature of a meeting (eg. meetings of panels or working groups on ‘general’ assessments or on the authorisation of substances) when it should be accessible to observers or not? Should (parts of) the AF meetings become public?</i></p>	<p><b>Tito Fernandes,</b>  <i>Djien Liem, Beate Folgerø, Charles Cremer</i></p>
<p><b>C. SHARING SCIENTIFIC INFORMATION</b></p>	
<p><b>C.1. Working Programmes and action plans</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• set layouts; when and how to exchange these?</li> <li>• compare working programmes  <i>* the idea was raised during the meeting to put all future areas of scientific consideration of EFSA and the National Authorities in one matrix, in order to be able to compare who is going to do the same kind of activities to know where collaboration could take place, etc.;</i>  <i>* this matrix should also be applicable for ad hoc and emerging activities.</i></li> </ul>	<p><b>Roland Grosgut,</b>  <i>Petr Benes, Anders Glynn, Bo Jansson</i></p>
<p><b>C.2 Draft Opinions</b>  <i>* What are the pros and cons of exchanging <b>draft</b> opinions, in stead of approved opinions which is the procedure right now, in terms of:</i></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• quality of the opinion;</li> <li>• timing;</li> <li>• independence?</li> </ul>	<p><b>Marie-Hélène Loul-ergue,</b> Roland Grossgut, Juri Riprich, Pilar Rodriguez</p>
<p><b>C.3 Agenda and minutes of scientific meetings</b>  <i>* What are the pros and cons of sharing agenda and minutes of scientific meetings, as regards:</i></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• the nature of the meetings;</li> <li>• the timing of the exchange and</li> <li>• the language?</li> </ul>	<p><b>Marianna Schauzu,</b>  <i>Juri Riprich, Eleni Ioannou-Kakouri</i></p>
<p><b>C.4 Data in general</b>  <i>* What are the characteristics of data valuable to exchange?</i>  <i>* How to get access to the right data avoiding in the mean-</i></p>	<p><b>David Gott,</b> Alan Reilly, Tito Fernan-</p>

**AF 25.11.2005 - 5**  
**INA-AFWG – Outline for 20 January-document**

<p><i>time to become overloaded?</i></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"><li><i>* How to alert others about valuable info just available?</i></li><li><i>* How to inform others about your needs?</i></li></ul> <p><b>C.5 Language</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"><li><i>* To what extent is the difference of languages an issue?</i></li><li><i>* To what extent can we join the scientific world, where English is the working language?</i></li><li><i>* To what extent are national authorities able to translate parts of their work and which are the most valuable parts then?</i></li></ul> <p><b>D. TOOLS TO EXCHANGE SCIENTIFIC INFO</b></p> <p><b>D.1 Specifying requirements for the Extranet:</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"><li><i>* to upload and download documents;</i></li><li><i>* the specification of Domains;</i></li><li><i>* arrangements dedicated to information from MS;</i></li><li><i>* to develop a search machine and</i></li><li><i>* to develop a database for national experts.</i></li></ul> <p><b>D. 2 To set up a Rapid Scientific Networking System (RSNS)</b></p>	<p><i>des, Rolanas Kliu- cinskas, Claudia Roncancio Peña</i></p> <p><b><i>Irene van Geest, Ro- land Grossgut, Ale- xandra Veiga de Barros, Sotirios Kio- kas</i></b></p> <p><b>Benno ter Kuile, Anders Glynn, Petr Benes</b></p> <p><b>Dace Santare, Alan Reilly, Rolanas Kliu- cinskas</b></p>
---	---