

45th Meeting of the EFSA Management Board
Adopted Minutes of the Public Session
Parma, 17 June 2010, 10.00 h

Members of the Management Board present

Diána Bánáti (Chair)	Matthias Horst
Marianne Elvander (Vice-Chair)	Milan Pogačnik
Bart Sangster (Vice-Chair)	Jiri Ruprich
Paola Testori-Coggi	Sinikka Turunen
Sue Davies	Bernhard Url
Piergiuseppe Facelli	Roland Vaxelaire
Peter Gaemelke	Konstantinos Yazitzoglou
Marion Guillou	

Staff of the European Food Safety Authority present

Catherine Geslain-Lanéelle	Hubert Deluyker
Olivier Ramsayer	Anne-Laure Gassin
Riitta Majjala	Gisèle Gizzi
David Caira	Pedro Pinhal

Also attending:

Prof. Vittorio Silano, Chair of EFSA's Scientific Committee

Table of Contents

Summary of decisions.....	3
Welcome by Chair.....	4
Adoption of Draft Agenda.....	4
Executive Director's Progress Report.....	4
Stakeholder Platform: New Terms of Reference.....	5
Staff Policy Plan 2011-2013.....	6
Financial Statement Accounts 2009.....	8
Amendments to the List of Art. 36 Organisations.....	8
Budget Execution and Year-End Forecast 2010.....	8
Transfers in the EFSA Budget.....	8
Update on Output Targets.....	9
Report on Data Collection: Update.....	9
Update on Fees.....	10
Feedback from the Meeting of the Chairs of EU Agencies' Management Boards.....	11
Update of the Audit Committee.....	11
Update from Parma: Scuola per l'Europa and Final Seat.....	11
Feedback from Members.....	12
Any other business.....	12
Actions arising.....	13

SUMMARY OF DECISIONS

The Management Board:

- Adopted the agenda unchanged
- Adopted the new terms of reference of the Stakeholder Consultative Platform subject to the amendments indicated
- Adopted the Staff Policy Plan 2011-2013 subject to a declaration on compliance with Commission austerity measures
- Adopted the Financial Statement Accounts 2009
- Adopted the amendments to the list of Article 36 organisations
- Noted the Budget Execution as of May 18 and the year-end forecast 2010
- Noted the transfers in the EFSA budget
- Noted the update on targets for scientific outputs for 2010
- Noted the Report on Data Collection
- Noted the update on fees from the Commission representative on the Board
- Confirmed the appointment of Dr. Michael Klein to the PPR Panel

The Management Board also:

- Took note of the Executive Director's Progress Report and congratulated EFSA and its staff on its achievements
- Took note of the ongoing difficulties in relation to the European School in Parma and agreed to write to the Italian authorities
- Noted that the new EFSA building was on track
- Noted the feedback from the Meeting of the Chairs of EU Agencies' Management Boards
- Noted the update by the Chair of the Audit Committee and the need to renew the Committee under the new Board
- Noted the feedback of outgoing Board members and thanked them for their contribution
- Noted the dates of the 2011 Board meetings
- Noted that the new Board would meet in October

Item 1: Welcome by the Chair

1. The Chair opened the Public Session of the 45th Management Board meeting by welcoming Board Members, the EFSA executive and Directors, the audience in Parma and online, stakeholders, Member State authorities, experts and staff members.
2. The Chair announced that prospective dates for 2011 Board meetings would be discussed under any other business and announcement would be made regarding a new member of the PPR Panel.

Item 2: Adoption of the Draft Agenda

3. The agenda was adopted unchanged.

Item 3: Executive Director's Progress Report

4. The Chair invited the Executive Director to present the progress report.
5. The Executive Director updated the Board on progress from March to early June 2010. A separate PowerPoint presentation is available for a detailed description.
6. On behalf of the Board, the Chair congratulated the Executive Director and EFSA staff on the achievements during the reporting period.
7. The first set of questions/comments were received on the following points: which area of EFSA's operations will be under most pressure in relation to workload; webcasting of the GMO meeting with Member States on environmental risk assessment and the possibility for the online audience to comment; difficulties for consumer organisations in attending the recent health claims meeting with stakeholders; the importance of EFSA not compromising its independence in its interactions with stakeholders; the role of the Stakeholder Consultative Platform working group on emerging risks; the timeframe for EFSA's mandates on meat inspection and cloning; current status of tele-meetings at EFSA; the number of scientific outputs of the NDA Panel; positive feedback on the technical meeting with stakeholders on health claims; establishing criteria for foods carrying health claims; EFSA's medium-term planning with Member States and the Commission on health claims; EFSA's imminent report on emerging risks; the drivers of EFSA's fast track responses in areas such as the volcanic ash-fall; and the current status of the review of EFSA's communications strategy.
8. In response, the Executive Director pointed out that EFSA would be challenged to maintain and enhance the quality of its science in light of the increasing workload in areas such as applications. Therefore, the panels would have to be adequately supported to enable them to deliver and that included support on methodologies. She noted that the Scientific Committee had organised a work shop on trends in risk assessment for the following week and events such as these were important in keeping EFSA at the forefront of the science. The importance of data collection in EFSA's work was underlined. The latest statistics show that tele-meetings represent close to 10% of meeting hours. In relation to health claims, the Executive Director emphasised that EFSA does not have dialogue with applicants only but also with consumer groups. While EFSA's work programme depended on the Commission mainly, the Authority has the capacity to self-task and it uses it when necessary.
9. The Director of Scientific Cooperation & Assistance added that the recent launch of an Article 36 project on Q fever illustrated EFSA's proactive approach. In relation to emerging risks, he urged

caution so as not to create crises where none existed and he emphasised the need for a cost effective approach taking into consideration existing data. In addition, work on emerging risks should benefit the daily work of the panels. He continued that the initial focus of EFSA's work would be on food and feed and indications from stakeholders suggest that they want to engage in the work in an open and collaborative manner.

10. In relation to meat inspection, the Director of Risk Assessment described the scope of the mandate which will involve three panels and six units in EFSA and several units in DG SANCO. Deadlines were not yet available but this multi-annual work will start with pigs. A stakeholder workshop will be organised for early autumn 2010 to discuss the mandate. She explained that NDA outputs were dependent on the grouping of health claims, the final list of which had been received from the Commission.
11. The Director of Communications told the meeting that the public consultation on the Communication Strategy was open until July 5 and it had also been discussed in meetings of the Advisory Forum and the Stakeholder Consultative Platform. The review would also be informed by the Eurobarometer survey that is currently underway. The meeting with Member States on environmental risk assessment was webcast publicly but it did not include an interactive element.
12. Further questions/comments were received on nutrient profiling and the role of data collection not just in public health but also in innovation.
13. The Executive Director replied that EFSA had previously delivered advice on nutrient profiles and worked with the Commission on feasibility and it was now incumbent on risk managers to make decisions.
14. In summing up, the Chair noted that the Executive would provide information on self-tasking activities and that the Communications Strategy would be discussed at a later meeting.

Item 4: Stakeholder Consultative Platform: New Terms of Reference

15. The Director of Administration outlined the context of the terms of reference of the Platform and presented the proposed revised terms, the main features of which are: the number of members is 24; criteria for membership are clarified; associate membership is phased out; criteria for invitation of observers are defined; and criteria for establishment of working groups are clarified. He added that the work of the Platform was forging ahead and it was proposed that, if the revised terms were adopted, an open call for membership would be launched in 2011. The Board was therefore asked to extend the current platform for an additional year, until December 2011.
16. The Commission representative on the Board remarked that, according to experience in her institution, a membership of 24 was too small and unrepresentative. She added that the criteria for observer status were too bureaucratic and the reference to consensus was inappropriate for the Platform. Some criteria should be simplified, she said, adding that the formal procedures for the appointment of delegates were unnecessary. The Commission representative also considered that the proposed three-year term for members was unnecessary and the criterion that a member organisation should be present in at least 15 Member States was too rigid, suggesting instead a wording of "a significant number of Member States".

17. While there was agreement that some criteria could be simplified, most Board members felt that a certain level of consensus had already been achieved regarding 24 members and that the issue should not be re-opened. One member urged caution in relation to working groups to ensure that their remit was specific and horizontal and their membership was representative of all interest groups. As well as broad EU representation, it was pointed out that membership should also reflect an appropriate balance of interests of stakeholders. Another member suggested that the changes to the terms proposed by the Commission representative would inevitably change the fundamental concept of the Platform. It was pointed out that EFSA has effective communication routes with stakeholders other than the Platform and that inclusion of organisations with significant differences in size could mislead the public in relation to the representativeness of the member organisations of the Platform. Other comments suggested that a three-year term was important to enable the Platform to renew itself on a regular basis and that stakeholder meetings in which many minority interests were represented were ineffective.
18. In summing up the options for adopting the document, the Chair indicated that three options were available: (1) adopt the document at the meeting unchanged; (2) delay the decision and reopen the discussion; or (3) adopt the document at the meeting subject to the changes indicated by members being implemented. The Board decided on the third option and the Executive Director outlined the changes that would be made (including simplification of the text on observers and modification of the text on reaching consensus), with the Commission representative reiterating her view that the Board should not have a specified term. The document was adopted subject to the suggested amendments and the mandate of the existing Platform was extended to December 2011.

Item 5: Staff Policy Plan 2011-2013

19. In his presentation, the Director of Administration outlined the main objective of the Plan which is to optimise human resource allocation in the light of stable staff numbers and an anticipated increase in activities particularly in operational areas such as the evaluation of the efficacy of plant protection products, GMOs, novel foods, packaging materials and the re-evaluation of food additives. To achieve this would require gains in productivity and a realignment of the distribution of knowledge workers to support staff. Work has been carried out on the segmentation of jobs into three function groups and the planned evolution of the groups over the timeframe covered by the Plan was outlined.
20. Questions/comments were received on: the small increase (2%) in personnel costs indicated in the Plan; administration costs of 23%; and staff promotion opportunities.
21. The Director of Administration responded that growth in personnel costs will be curtailed by a number of factors including replacing positions by recruitment at entry grade levels and more accurate forecasting of staff costs. He pointed out that, administration is a broad term in EFSA, covering areas such as human resource management and financial management. The 23% mentioned in the Plan refers to the proportion of staff, not costs. The Director outlined the career development and internal mobility policies within EFSA, emphasising the importance of staff flexibility in light of the anticipated budgetary and workload demands. Pay and promotion aspects were built into the staff regulations and approximately 10% of staff are eligible for promotion per annum, he added.
22. The Commission representative remarked that, in light of the economic austerity measures in place across the public sector in Europe, she could not agree with the increase of five Temporary

Agents/Officials posts in the period 2012/2013. She also pointed to the need to align the grade of EFSA's Directors to the EC standards.

23. A member emphasised the importance of the European School to staff working conditions so as to attract and retain high-quality staff. Another question was asked on payment of seconded national experts in EFSA.
24. In replying, the Director of Administration noted the comment on grades by the Commission representative and agreed to check if EFSA's implementing rules of the Staff Regulations defined Directors' grades. He added that national experts are normally paid by their employers, the national agencies, and EFSA provides compensation for the additional costs involved in working for EFSA. In relation to the Temporary Agents/Officials posts required for 2012-2013, he commented that the increase indicated is in line with the mid-term strategy adopted by the board and, if budget was not available, planning would need to be adjusted accordingly. It was a Board decision, he added.
25. The Commission representative reiterated that she felt it was inappropriate to plan staff increases in light of the economic climate, stating: "The Commission Representative insists on the need to respect the general political commitment made by the Commission that it will not ask for additional human resources until 2013. This commitment also applies to agencies such as EFSA which has come to the end of its growth period."
26. The Chair solicited the views of members. A member asked whether an official Commission document existed that instructed Heads of Agencies to limit budget and staff demands. The Commission representative replied that there was no official decision but that there was a political statement by the Commission on zero growth.
27. Another member suggested that, because austerity measures are in place across Europe, the document be adopted but with a declaration regarding the general economic policy adopted by the Commission. While EFSA would abide by any austerity measure, it would like to discuss its workload with the Commission, the member added. She concluded that EFSA's growing workload should be closely matched with its budget, i.e., the Authority must be properly resourced. Another member commented that EFSA's budget was not a "top-down" approach but reflected the actual demands on the organisation. It was also mentioned that a 1% increase in posts for Temporary Agents/Officials would not impact significantly on EFSA's ability to deliver and perhaps the symbolic and political message on zero growth would be more beneficial.
28. The Executive Director stressed the efficiency gains in recent years in EFSA and pointed out that the footnote to the slight increase in resources requested stated that it was subject to the review of the budgetary process.
29. A member added that internal flexibility, i.e. staff reallocation, should be fully explored before any demand for additional resources was issued. The need for legislators to consider the impact of their legislation on EFSA's work programme was also mentioned.
30. As there was no consensus, the Chair called for a vote, the result of which was seven in favour of adopting the document as proposed versus six who were in favour of adopting the document with the deletion of the reference to possible extra staff in 2012-2013. The document was therefore adopted.

Item 6: Financial Statement Accounts 2009

31. The EFSA Accountant presented the document which had been discussed earlier at the meeting of the Audit Committee. He outlined the timeline of the accounting process and indicated that the preliminary findings of the Court of Auditors, which had been forwarded to Board members, showed that annual accounts of EFSA are in all material respects legal and regular. The EFSA Accountant has certified the accounts with no reservations and proposed this opinion to the Board.
32. The Chair of the Audit Committee confirmed the views of the Accountant and the Management Board opinion was adopted.

Item 7: Amendments to the List of Article 36 Institutions

33. The Director of Scientific Cooperation & Assistance presented the document which required a decision on three institutions which have undergone substantial changes. The changes, he said, are fully in line with the provisions.
34. A member enquired about the criteria for inclusion in the Article 36 list of organisations as the levels of the institutions were very different. The Director indicated that this had been discussed at the Advisory Forum and would shortly be reviewed.
35. The document was adopted.

Item 8: Budget Execution and Year-End Forecast 2010

36. The document presented by the Director of Administration updated the Board on the status of executions of both commitments and payments for EFSA's main activities as of May 18, 2010. While most activities were on track, there was a delay in data collection, and in particular in scientific cooperation and networking. However, he was confident, he said, that EFSA would recover the situation. EFSA's performance on payments was improving, 16% ahead of the situation at the same time last year. In closing, the Director said that more indicative data would be available for the October meeting and he was confident that EFSA will commit more than the 97% achieved in 2009.
37. The Commission representative emphasised the importance of execution of both commitment and payments. She noted that EFSA's execution of payments for 2009 was 89% of target less than the Commission target of 95%, and below which penalties are applied. In relation to the request for extra resources, she added that execution of the budget was essential.

Item 9: Transfers in the EFSA Budget

38. The Director of Administration described transfers of 1.22% made on 25 May 2010 under the authority of the Executive Director.

Item 10: Update on Output Targets

39. The Director of Risk Assessment outlined changes to the projected number of outputs for 2010. The number cited in the Management Plan for 2010 was 1006 but that has been revised downwards to make allowance for non-receipt of mandates, stop-clocks, revised Commission priorities and, in particular regrouping of health claims now that the final list has been received. The revised number of outputs for 2010 is now 736.
40. The Commission representative said it was important that the outputs adhered to the agreed classification and queried whether the “other outputs” were associated with EFSA’s core tasks.
41. The Director of Risk Assessment responded that the Panel outputs represented the core outputs in line with the Founding Regulation but other types of output, such as data collection and networking reports, are crucial to supporting the core business. Outsourcing reports, EFSA Scientific Cooperation Reports (ESCO) reports and inventory reports were included in the original classification and this is clarified in the review of outputs. She added that the EFSA Journal focuses on scientific outputs and work to further clarify “other outputs” is underway.
42. The Executive Director confirmed that the “other published outputs” are feeding the work of the Panels and Scientific Committee and they are included for the sake of transparency as they require resources to produce.
43. Other questions were received on whether the lower number of outputs in the NDA Panel meant less use of resources and the need to be more explicit on why the number of expected outputs has been revised downwards. The Director of Risk Assessment outlined the expected reduction in pesticide peer review conclusions which was due to delays in submissions by Member States and the measures put in place to focus resources on that area.

Item 11: Report on Data Collection: update

44. The presentation by the Director of Scientific Cooperation & Assistance focused on data collection activities as covered under Article 33 of the Founding Regulation, which stipulates that EFSA shall collect data on food consumption and occurrence of microbial and chemical contaminants. It describes the networks and mechanisms EFSA has established to exchange data and harmonise methodologies and the initiation of EFSA’s quality control programme in relation to data. The presentation is available separately for further information.
45. Questions from Board members were received on: the extent of the challenge facing EFSA in relation to data collection; the need to emphasise that the availability of data is crucial for European innovation and hence competitiveness; the ability to retrieve rejected data in future; the need for post-authorisation monitoring of GMOs as well as chemicals; and the need for Member States to ensure that their data collection methodologies are compatible with those of EFSA.
46. The Director of Scientific Cooperation & Assistance said he would be happy to add text on the importance of data collection in innovation. He added in relation to pre- and post-marketing that, when a regulatory framework exists, the Member States appoint institutions that participate in EFSA’s networks. EFSA does not have an explicit mandate in food consumption data collection but there is an implicit requirement. A variety of institutions carry out this activity in Member States and most are

interested in participating in EFSA's network. In relation to data retrieval, he said that this was an illustration of the quality assurance system that needed to be harmonised. He concluded by saying that acceptance of innovation is greatly enhanced if credible post-marketing systems are in place.

Item 12: Update on Fees

47. The Commission representative described the legislative basis and the consultation process undertaken by the Commission beginning in 2006 and the presentation is available separately for further information. The consultation showed that the majority of Member States did not object in principle to fees but stakeholders were generally not in favour. Concerns were expressed over the impact on the perceived independence of EFSA and problems existed in relation to identifying the beneficiaries of generic authorisations. The consultation also indicated concerns over the effects of the introduction of fees on EFSA's budgetary stability. The Commission has worked closely with EFSA on the issue and at present about one-third of EFSA's budget is devoted to applications, both generic and individual. The cost per application can vary considerably for a number of reasons, including the level of input by EFSA. This would have to be taken into consideration in the analysis as well as the limited resources of SMEs. The Commission concludes that fees might be feasible in areas where there is a clear authorization holder and where there are clear profits that derive from the work of the EFSA. The Commission will adopt the report on its analysis and present it to Council and Parliament in July with a proposal to introduce a fee system for EFSA subject to impact assessment.
48. The main questions and comments focused on the following: the risks of fees to EFSA's perceived independence; it is more appropriate for the Commission to collect fees; stratification of fees is inappropriate; the risk that fees might discourage experts from joining Panels and their employers from allowing them to join; graduation of fees should not be according to the size of the applicant company but rather the quality of the application; only applicants that profit directly should pay fees; fees should improve the quality of applications; the dangers associated with a significant proportion of EFSA's budget being derived from fees and applicants believing that a service-client relationship exists; whether fees would in reality have a significant impact on EFSA's budget; the suggestion that fees could be charged for the approval rather than for the actual assessment; whether the concept of fees could be extended to other scientific advice; the impact on EFSA's budgetary stability; the risk that fee-earning activities such as applications would skew EFSA's priorities; the likelihood that a fees system would be cumbersome and expensive to operate; EFSA should be remunerated by applicants that make financial gain from its work; the importance of fees to the future sustainability of EFSA; other agencies such as EMA charge fees without any questions arising on their independence; the already existing fees system for Member States for pesticides and its simplification by introducing a European system; and whether post-marketing data would continue to be publicly funded.
49. The Commission representative said the comments of members would be fully considered in its reflections.
50. In summing up, the Chair noted the concerns over, in particular, independence and budget stability and the suggestion that the Commission should administer any fees system. The Board looks forward to receiving the final report and it will be on the agenda of the October meeting. The Chair asked the Executive Director to prepare a document to present EFSA's viewpoint.

Item 13: Feedback from the Meeting of the Chairs of EU Agencies' Management Boards

51. The Chair briefly described the meeting which was attended by 13 EU Agency Chairs. The meeting emphasised the difference between the agencies in terms of size and structure. The outcomes of audits by the Internal Audit Service and the Court of Auditors were discussed and the importance of having clear performance criteria for the individual agencies was mentioned. The meeting agreed brief terms of reference which would be sent to Board members when they are available. EFSA is the only agency whose Management Board meetings are broadcast live and the Chair invited the EFSA Executive to present data on the webcasting as requested.
52. Noting that EFSA's Founding Regulation stipulated that meetings of its Management Board be held in public, the Executive Director told the meeting that the webcasting of each board meeting cost €52 k. The cost of alternative options - on-demand, publicly available transcript, and audio only - were described and it was agreed to discuss these options at the October Board meeting.

Item 14: Update of the Audit Committee

53. The Audit Meeting has met that morning and the Chair told the meeting that the following items had been discussed: the financial statements account for 2009 as already discussed; a brief from the Court of Auditors for the financial report of 2008; the Internal Audit report for 2009 which will be sent to the European Parliament; internal audit plans; and EFSA's IT cost evaluation. On the latter, the Head of EFSA's IT had made a presentation to the Committee and he outlined that the spend on IT was about €10 m or 15% of EFSA's total budget. This proportion will be benchmarked against similar organisations and the efficiency analysed. The rating of EFSA's banking provider was also discussed and it is still rated as A. The Chair thanked the outgoing members of the Committee and noted the need to appoint new members from the new Board.

Item 15: Update from Parma: Scuola per l'Europa and Final Seat

54. Opening with the comment that the situation in relation to the Scuola per l'Europa was not satisfactory, the Director of Administration outlined the commitment by the Italian authorities in the Final Seat agreement to provide educational facilities for the children of EFSA staff. The commitment had two main pillars: delivery of a suitable school building and creating a legal framework which would allow the schools to function as part of the European School system with conditions appropriate for the delivery of an international curriculum. The lack of delivery on the commitment is causing significant difficulties for EFSA parents, he said, who had accepted employment in EFSA under the understanding that adequate education facilities would be provided. A recent EFSA Staff Committee survey indicated widespread dissatisfaction with the school with up to one-third of those surveyed indicating that they are considering seeking alternative employment as a result. EFSA has been waiting for the signing by the Italian authorities of a decree to enhance the status of the school since October 2009 and the concerns of EFSA management and staff are extremely high. In addition, there are significant problems in the day-to-day operation of the school.
55. The Executive Director reported that the Italian authorities had confirmed in writing that the decree would be signed by the end of July but she urged vigilance to ensure that it happens. She urged the management of the school to improve its communication with parents and to ensure the adequacy of facilities and security of the school, the quality of education and continuity for teachers.

56. The Chair said that she had been personally approached by EFSA staff who are very worried.
57. Board members expressed their disappointment and dissatisfaction with the situation. It was suggested that the Chair write to the Italian authorities, while another suggested a stronger approach indicating that EFSA's presence in Parma is dependent on the availability of proper educational facilities. Enlisting the support of the European Parliament was also suggested. Another member suggested that the decree had taken the wrong route through the Italian legislative process.
58. The Chair summarised that the lack of progress could put EFSA's operations in Parma at risk and she would write to the Italian authorities to express the views of the Board.
59. In relation to the Final Seat, the Director of Administration reported that construction was on track. The Chair commented that the Board would like to see similar developments with regard to the new school building.
60. A Member asked why the contractor meant to support EFSA in the monitoring of the construction was not in place and the Director of Administration replied that due to unsatisfactory execution of tasks a change of personnel had been sought and achieved.

Item 16: Feedback from Members

61. The Chair briefly summarised the key achievements of the current Board and asked its four outgoing members for feedback on their term. Some of the key memories related to the establishment of EFSA in 2002 in Brussels and the move to Parma in 2005. Tribute was paid to the Executive Directors and Chairs of the organisation since its inception and the current incumbents were congratulated on their contribution to the development of EFSA. The Board was reminded that Europe had avoided food crises in recent years and that EFSA had played an important role in this success. The outgoing members thanked all EFSA experts, staff and fellow Board members for their professionalism, support and friendship. One of the outgoing members commented on EFSA's name and suggested adding the strap-line: EU agency for risk assessment and nutrition. Another member commented that EFSA is a role model of what can be achieved in Europe through cooperation. Since EFSA was established it is concentrated on the hard skills - system, procedures, buildings – and it was now time to concentrate on the “soft skills”: team spirit, motivation and culture, another outgoing member commented.
62. The Executive Director thanked the outgoing members for their immense contribution and the Chair of the Scientific Committee did likewise on behalf of EFSA's experts.

Item 17: AOB

63. The Chair announced the proposed dates of the 2011 Board meetings and reported that the Management Board has appointed Dr. Michael Klein to the PPR Panel.
64. In closing, the Chair noted that her mandate and those of her two vice-Chairs expired at the end of June. She thanked the Board members and outgoing members and in particular those who had served for a long time for their contribution. In addition, she thanked the two Vice-Chairs for their support and Victoria Silano as Chair of the Scientific Committee. In addition, she thanked EFSA's

mb 17.06.10 – Adopted minutes

Executive Director and her Directors, EFSA staff, the experts working in EFSA Panels and Scientific Committee, the audience in Parma and those watching via webstreaming, the webcast team and the interpreters.

END

Actions arising

Meeting reference	Action	Deadline	Status
June 17, 2010	Provide update on EFSA's self-tasking activities	For October Board meeting	Open
June 17, 2010	Amend the revised Terms of Reference of the Stakeholder Consultative Platform as requested by Board members	asap	Open
June 17, 2010	Prepare declaration on austerity measures to accompany Staff Policy Plan	asap	Open
June 17, 2010	Dispatch Staff Policy Plan to EU institutions	End-June	Open
June 17, 2010	Add text to the Report on Data Collection to emphasise the importance of data to collection in innovation	End-June	Open
June 17, 2010	Prepare document to present EFSA's views on fees	For October Board meeting	Open
June 17, 2010	Report on options and cost/benefit analysis to broadcast the public meeting of the Management Board	For October Board meeting	Open
June 17, 2010	Chair to prepare correspondence to the Italian authorities on the European School	asap	Open