European Food Safety Authority

SCIENTIFIC COMMITTEE AND ADVISORY FORUM UNIT

Parma, 22 November 2010
EFSA/AF/M/2010/359/PUB/FIN

Minutes

THIRTY SEVENTH MEETING OF THE ADVISORY FORUM ATTARD (MALTA), 22-23 SEPTEMBER 2010

MEMBERS OF THE ADVISORY FORUM

Chair: *Catherine Geslain-Lanéelle*, Executive Director, EFSA

Austria	*Roland Grossgut*	Latvia	*Gatis Ozoliņš*
Belgium	*Benoît Horion*	Lithuania	*Zenonas Stanevicius*
Bulgaria	*Teri Vrabcheva*	Luxembourg	*Patrick Hau*
Cyprus	*Popi Kanari*	Malta	*Ingrid Busuttil*
Czech Republic	*Jitka Götzová*	Netherlands	*Evert Schouten*
Denmark	*Henrik C. Wegener*	Norway	*Kirsten Færden*
Estonia	*Hendrik Kuusk*	Poland	*Jan Krzysztof Ludwicki*
Finland	*Jaana Husu-Kallio*	Portugal	*Maria João Seabra*
France	*Valérie Baduel*	Romania	*Liviu Rusu*
Germany	*Andreas Hensel*	Slovakia	*Zuzana Bírošová*
Greece	*George-Ioannis Nychas*	Slovenia	*Ada Hočevar Grom*
Hungary	*Maria Szeitzné Szabó*	Spain	*Ana Troncoso*
Ireland	*Alan Reilly*	Sweden	*Leif Busk*
Italy	*Giancarlo Belluzzi*	United Kingdom	*Andrew Wadge*

OBSERVERS

Croatia	*Zorica Jurković*	European Commission	*Jeannie Vergnettes*
Switzerland	*Michael Beer*	European Parliament	*Kartika Liotard*
Turkey	*Nergiz Özbağ*		

REPRESENTATIVES OF THE EUROPEAN FOOD SAFETY AUTHORITY

Advisory Forum secretariat: *Gian Luca Bonduri, Elena Marani, Jeffrey Moon and Torben Nilsson.*

Bernhard Berger	*Riitta Maijala*
Lucia De Luca	*Tobin Robinson*
Hubert Deluyker	*Vittorio Silano* *(Chair of EFSA's Scientific Committee)*
Hugues Kenigswald	*Didier Verloo*[1]
John Christian Larsen *(Chair of EFSA's ANS Panel)*	*Victoria Villamar*
Djien Liem	

1 WELCOME AND OPENING OF THE MEETING

Catherine Geslain-Lanéelle opened the meeting and passed the floor to Ingrid Busuttil, Maltese AF member, for a welcome speech.

Catherine Geslain-Lanéelle announced that with the entry into force on 1 May 2010 of the EEA Joint Committee Decision No. 134/2007, Iceland and Norway have gained status as AF members.

She welcomed the substitute from Bulgaria, the member of the European Parliament, Kartika Liotard, who is a member of the ENVI Committee and responsible for liaison with EFSA, and the Chairs of EFSA's Panel on food Additives and Nutrient Sources added to food (ANS) and EFSA's Scientific Committee (SC). She also informed that apologies were received from Iceland.

2 ADOPTION OF THE AGENDA

Catherine Geslain-Lanéelle informed that agenda item 6.3 would be postponed to the next AF meeting in November 2010, *i.e.* after the AFCWG meeting on 6-7 October 2010.

Catherine Geslain-Lanéelle also advised that general matters arising and events since the last AF meeting were not on the agenda, but that the AF members had received a separate report on these. She invited comments on the usefulness and format of the report and any questions on the matters therein.

Norway indicated that the report on general matters arising was very helpful as a summary to share with colleagues and welcomed the format.

[1] Attended agenda item 6.2 (via telephone).

Finland raised a question in relation to the Eurobarometer survey, asking if the questions to be included therein were finalised and whether they would be shared with the AF.

Lucia De Luca advised that the final questions would be shared with the AF members and the results were expected to be published in October 2010. Catherine Geslain-Lanéelle added that the Eurobarometer would be on the agenda of the next AF meeting.

3 STRATEGIC DISCUSSION ON EFSA'S WORK WITH THE MEMBER STATES

3.1 Medium term planning

Hubert Deluyker introduced the discussion on medium term planning with a presentation summarising the main aspects of the report provided to the AF members. He highlighted scientific cooperation as a tool to reach shared objectives, while not being an objective in itself.

Catherine Geslain-Lanéelle emphasised the importance of the regular dialogue with the European Commission on short and medium term planning.

The AF members welcomed the report and raised a number of questions.

Ireland highlighted the importance of ensuring that communications from EFSA were understandable to a wider audience and not only to the national food authorities and scientific community.

Germany, supported by Finland, the Netherlands, France, Sweden, Norway and Cyprus, emphasised the need for networking with Member States to ensure that best use is made of available data and suggested ensuring data quality through greater cooperation with national and community reference laboratories on the standardisation of data collection methodologies.

Austria noted a need for clear indications of how the interaction with Member States would work with new regulations such as in the areas of novel foods and plant protection and the need to consider workloads and deadlines.

Finland, Italy, Denmark and Romania raised the issue of training and how developments would proceed in relation to risk assessment training that differs from training provided currently by the European Commission. It was noted that while training is not explicitly in EFSA's remit, it is not excluded either. Denmark, supported by Slovenia, mentioned the training model used by the ECDC in the context of the European Programme for Intervention Epidemiology Training as a good example.

Finland, supported by France, highlighted the need for clear objectives of EFSA's networks and for clarity on how these fit into the overall risk assessment role. The

development of harmonised risk assessment methodologies and involvement of Member States in the risk assessment work were seen as important points by France.

Finland, supported by Sweden, suggested that while the report provided an excellent overview for professionals, a "lighter" paper on scientific cooperation could be useful for the general public.

Sweden suggested discussing how to proceed on medium term planning at national level.

Vittorio Silano stated the need for identifying priorities and suggested cooperation on the harmonisation of risk assessment methodologies as a key priority, *e.g.* the SC working groups addressing various aspects of risk assessment procedures could benefit from a stronger cooperation with experts from the Member States. It would not be possible to associate one expert from each Member State to all working groups, but a closer cooperation and work sharing amongst Member States and with EFSA would be beneficial to all parties.

Catherine Geslain-Lanéelle reminded that Member States already agreed on the importance of harmonising risk assessment methodologies and proposed establishing a new SC network on the harmonisation of risk assessment methodologies.

The United Kingdom agreed on the importance of risk assessment methodologies as a priority, stated that there was a need for cooperative working without duplication, and emphasised that risk management will be influenced by the quality, independence and transparency of risk assessments.

Germany pointed out that the initial risk assessments at national level needed to be robust and there was a need to be able to rely on risk assessments carried out by different countries to avoid duplication and diverging views. Hence, Germany supported the idea of joint working groups on risk assessment methodologies under the SC.

France and Ireland also supported this concept, noting that in cooperation it was important to work according to a common approach and knowing what everyone else was doing.

France further emphasised the importance of involving the Member States in peer reviewing scientific outputs, like in the pesticides area.

Belgium noted the short timeframe for commenting on the report, commented on the different mechanisms to proceed and implement cooperation projects, and highlighted the need for EFSA's Panels to use the information shared by Member States through the IEP.

Ireland noted that genetically modified fish was not reflected in the medium term planning and enquired about EFSA's work and dialogue with the US FDA on that matter. This topic was referred to agenda item 6.4.

The United Kingdom enquired about experiences from the close bilateral cooperation between Germany and France in the field of risk assessments and also highlighted the need to prioritise resources, since the massive workload from applications could potentially derail the work on other tasks.

Germany explained that it is the intention to expand this cooperation further also with other Member States performing risk assessments to share the work. This cooperation builds on transparency and trust in the quality assurance performed by others. France shared this vision and referred to the MED-VET-NET as another example of work sharing amongst various Member States.

Catherine Geslain-Lanéelle acknowledged that 70% of EFSA's scientific outputs are related to applications and said that this work required 40% of the resources available, so it was necessary to find more effective ways of cooperating in order to handle the overall workload for all areas. The strict regulatory deadlines on applications could be detrimental to EFSA's work in other areas and its possibility to support sustainable, science-based innovation. Hence, it would be necessary to consider the right balance between EFSA's different tasks, taking into account its limited resources and the need to address a variety of public health concerns. A simplification and optimisation of the regulatory framework, presently characterised by a high number of specific regulations applicable to the work of EFSA, would be needed and fees should be discussed in relation with priority setting.

Hubert Deluyker noted that IT tools can assist in managing data flows and these need to be integrated across all levels and in all areas where data is collected, *e.g.* microbiology, chemicals and residues. Regarding the role of networks, he referred to the *Decision concerning the establishment and operation of European Networks of scientific organisations operating in the fields within the Authority's mission*, which was adopted by EFSA's Management Board on 7 April 2010 following prior discussion by the AF. The mandate of EFSA's networks is clearly harmonisation. He confirmed that information shared through the IEP was indeed being used by EFSA's Panels as well as Member States. Finally, he agreed that there is an opportunity to review article 36 activities and networks and suggested that the Focal Points could be of help in moving the discussion forward.

Riitta Maijala provided examples of existing networks and mentioned that also other areas were covered by Member State cooperation through other mechanisms, *e.g.* Member State consultations and article 36 projects. She reiterated that the different regulations in different areas result in different ways of cooperating.

Sweden said that not all legal frameworks are equally risk-based, so it would be necessary to consider their purposes, *e.g.* free trade or consumer health protection.

France agreed on the need for simplification of the regulatory framework and said that common objectives were needed to advance on cooperation and work sharing.

Finland pointed to the need for a discussion on priorities and related resource allocations and found that the funds for article 36 projects were too limited.

The United Kingdom recommended a strong message from the AF that the key priority should be risk assessments for public health, while approvals work should be funded by other routes.

Ireland agreed to focus on consumer protection through science-based advice, which was the purpose that EFSA had been established for.

Belgium indicated that by considering gaps in data and methodologies, topics could be identified for delegation.

The European Commission found the debate interesting and useful and mentioned that also the important work on re-evaluations was undertaken for public health purposes.

Hubert Deluyker highlighted differences from the medicines area, where a life cycle approach is taken and the funding from industry is substantial.

Catherine Geslain-Lanéelle summarised the discussion, noting the shared vision from the AF of the importance of risk assessments for public health. She noted the need for more cooperation in the area of data collection to ensure data quality and the best use of the available data. She also agreed that the budgets of article 36 calls were often too limited and compared to the medicines area, where substantially more resources are available for the Member State cooperation.

In outlining the next steps, Catherine Geslain-Lanéelle noted the endorsement of the report by the AF, pending any last comments to be forwarded to the AF secretariat within 2-3 weeks after the meeting, and agreed to have a summary document (such as the leaflet prepared for EFSA's annual management plan) prepared to share with all stakeholders. She also indicated that Member States would be asked to identify practical ways to move ahead based on the report, with the Focal Points playing a role in this task, and that future work would involve mapping of the regulatory provisions for streamlining activities as far as possible, harmonisation of risk assessment methodologies under the umbrella of the SC and engaging with Member State experts through network mechanisms. Finally, the discussion would continue to build on a shared vision of priorities and how to better work on a cooperative basis with a short paper to be prepared with the Advisory Forum.

France supported the conclusions and asked how to cooperate concretely on novel foods. Catherine Geslain-Lanéelle offered to discuss this topic at a future AF meeting. Kartika Liotard provided a brief update on the status and next steps regarding the novel foods regulation currently being prepared.

Action 1: AF members to submit possible additional comments on the report on medium term planning by 15 October 2010.

3.2 Cooperation with the WHO on zoonoses data collection

Hubert Deluyker presented an overview of the EU and global data collection in relation to zoonoses and food-borne disease outbreaks, explaining the WHO activities to enhance capacity building in surveillance and containment of antimicrobial resistance, which will include training, and the invitation for EFSA to participate in the related activities.

It was agreed that the participation of EFSA was supported in principle, while further information would need to be provided on the extent of EFSA's involvement.

Action 2: EFSA to cooperate with the WHO on zoonoses data collection and provide further information on the extent of this work to the AF.

3.3 Cooperation in the area of food additives and nutrient sources added to food (ANS)

John Christian Larsen, Chair of the ANS Panel, and Hugues Kenigswald presented the work of the ANS Panel and the main areas of cooperation with the Member States.

France criticised that Member State competences were not sufficiently drawn upon and suggested a peer review model for the cooperation as in the pesticides area.

Germany congratulated the Panel on its work, noted that the majority of the Panel members are from national authorities, and raised concerns over their exclusion from article 36 projects due to conflicts of interest.

Germany also said that public calls for data leads to extra work and that the use of data generated under article 36 projects for national risk assessments is currently a problem due to property rights.

Ireland noted the comprehensive nature of the work and questioned the capacity for dealing with emergency situations. Ireland also asked how to perform risk assessments when data are lacking or poor.

The United Kingdom expressed similar concerns.

Lithuania welcomed the detailed overview and noted that the extensive usage of additives across the food chain was often questioned by the media, so the work of the Panel was very useful.

Hungary welcomed the presentation, noting that food consumption databases are limited and total diet studies should provide more information on additives.

The Netherlands enquired about the risk assessment of additives in nanoform.

John Christian Larsen agreed that lack of data did present difficulties in completing a comprehensive risk assessment and Hugues Kenigswald added that the problem is often in terms of access to data.

John Christian Larsen further said that emergency issues are dealt with as they arise, since the Panel has to have capacity to deal with such issues, and stated that the Panel is aware of the potential problem with nanoparticles and follows the general developments through the SC work on nanoparticles.

Hugues Kenigswald said that this is not a new topic, since nanoparticles have been assessed already in the past.

Catherine Geslain-Lanéelle mentioned the new SC opinion on nanoparticles to be delivered in April 2011 following public and Member State consultation.

Riitta Maijala reminded that EFSA has to comply with general EU procedures, so those who participate in drafting the call cannot be awarded the contract.

Hubert Deluyker commented on the access to data and the related work of EFSA.

Catherine Geslain-Lanéelle agreed that data quality is determining for the quality of risk assessments.

4 EXCHANGE OF VIEWS WITH THE EUROPEAN COMMISSIONER FOR HEALTH AND CONSUMER POLICY, JOHN DALLI

Catherine Geslain-Lanéelle welcomed the Maltese Minister for Health, the Elderly and Community Care, Joe Cassar, who introduced the session by welcoming the AF to Malta and outlining the local issues relating to food safety and public health.

Catherine Geslain-Lanéelle thanked the Minister and welcomed the European Commissioner for Health and Consumer Policy, John Dalli, to the meeting and gave him the floor.

Commissioner Dalli gave a speech on the essential role of EFSA in the European context of risk assessment and the challenges being faced balancing the increasing workload with the resources available. He made reference to the need for cooperation with the Member States and the importance of the discussion

being held on medium term planning. He also emphasised his primary objective of ensuring that EFSA operates in total independence and on the highest scientific level and that its perception is one of impeachable credibility.

Catherine Geslain-Lanéelle opened the discussion by emphasising the dialogue between risk managers and risk assessors and highlighting the importance of the scientific work performed by experts from national authorities and academia in EFSA's Panels, SC and working groups as well as through close cooperation with the Member States in areas such as data collection and harmonisation of risk assessment methodologies and in relation with coherence of risk communications. She mentioned that the *Strategy for cooperation and networking between the EU Member States and EFSA* was prepared by the AF and implemented with support from national focal points. She further referred to the strategic discussion on medium term planning, which will assist in allocating resources in the most adequate way, *i.e.* to address major public health concerns as well as innovation, and having a shared vision with Member States.

Sweden presented information on data collection activities, using the example of the EU Menu project and ongoing work on food classification, and emphasised the importance of the cooperation in this area.

France presented an overview of work in the pesticides area and highlighted the peer review approach involving Member States in a network of European risk assessors as fundamental to obtain agreement.

The United Kingdom made a presentation on emerging risk activities, saying that emerging risk monitoring is needed to avoid food safety crises, since there is little publicity when everything goes well, while there is a lot of attention when something goes wrong.

The European Commissioner noted the importance of sharing information and ensuring its quality through foolproof, cost-effective systems. While appreciating the French views on risk assessment cooperation, he questioned whether the peer review approach used for pesticides would be relevant for all the many substances assessed. Finally, he agreed on the need to manage communications properly.

Catherine Geslain-Lanéelle reemphasised the importance of data quality and its relation with proper data collection approaches. She added that post-marketing monitoring of products would require additional resources.

Finland complimented EFSA's work on data collection, emphasised the importance of data collection both for the European Commission and EFSA, and suggested coordinating efforts for a better EU system for data collection and increasing the related funding.

The European Commissioner said that it is important for EFSA to develop it own abilities and to focus on prevention rather than cure. Alternative ways of funding could comprise fees.

Catherine Geslain-Lanéelle said that the industry could contribute where they benefit from EFSA's work, so that public funding could be used for other areas.

Austria urged the risk managers to consider work load and cost implications before making new regulations and to harmonise legislation to avoid so many different systems.

Catherine Geslain-Lanéelle found that the dialogue with the European Commission on the consequences of regulations had greatly improved, but a simplification of the regulatory framework, *i.e.* the 32 different regulations in the food safety area with at least as many regulatory workflows, would be beneficial to EFSA, Member States, the European Commission, and the industry. It would also be in line with the Europe 2020 strategy in terms of contributing to smart and sustainable competitiveness and growth.

The European Commissioner said that it would be important to address risk management and risk assessment in a holistic way and act to rectify criticism. He agreed on harmonisation for clarity and effectiveness.

Sweden commented that a holistic view from the consumer perspective would comprise also social and ethical aspects, while EFSA focuses exclusively on scientific aspects, *i.e.* there is no independent advice on social, ethical and economical consequences.

The European Commissioner replied that EFSA's objective was limited for historical reasons, but taking note of the enormous evolvement today, it could be adapted when EFSA's Founding Regulation would soon be up for revision. It would be important to consider responsible innovation of benefit to the society.

The United Kingdom emphasised the importance of perception and stressed the importance of informing on the benefits of EFSA's work and distinguishing scientific criticism from views of interested parties.

The European Commissioner stated that perception could be managed as well, although this was presently not the case, so there would be a need to build credibility, establish a new level of fiduciary relationship with consumers, and document and communicate benefits.

Catherine Geslain-Lanéelle indicated that as requested by EU legislation EFSA looks at benefits/efficacy in some areas, such as efficacy in the areas of feed additives and soon pesticides and benefits in connection with health claims, whereas in other areas this is not in EFSA's mandate.

Denmark advocated that the EU should play a stronger role in the global dialogue on food safety issues in order to communicate on the EU food safety system to non-EU countries.

Ireland outlined the incident of dioxin contamination in pork in 2008 as an example of effective handling a food safety crisis. The rapid response and the independence of the risk assessment were important to calming down consumers and the product was back in business after only 6 days. The European network based on trust and cooperation proved very valuable also during the crisis.

Latvia gave a perspective on the usefulness of EFSA's scientific outputs.

Germany presented views on risk communications and risk perceptions, emphasising that many factors influence consumer perceptions, so there would be a need to engage in participatory efforts to build trust and to reflect on how to deal with scientific uncertainty from a communications perspective.

Catherine Geslain-Lanéelle concluded that EFSA is delivering according to its mandate and will have to evolve to respond to the expectations of the risk managers and partners. On behalf of the AF, Catherine Geslain-Lanéelle thanked the European Commissioner for the exchange of views and for sharing his vision, providing new energy, and expressing trust in EFSA.

5 EMERGING RISKS

5.1 Follow up on possible emerging risks raised at previous AF meetings

Energy drinks

Tobin Robinson presented an overview of information relating to the ongoing concern on the consumption of energy drinks, noting the lack of up-to-date consumption data and offering that EFSA could gather more consumption data.

France expressed concern that high consumers of energy drinks were young people and that there was a lack of data on consumption patterns.

Austria pointed out that the concern was on a variety of products with high caffeine content, where there was no reliable data and no reference values set. Lithuania noted that the rise in the consumption of energy drinks was being discussed nationally by risk managers.

Hubert Deluyker acknowledged the lack of data and suggested the possibility of launching an article 36 call in this area.

This was supported by Norway who also noted that sales of energy drinks were also at sports centres and not just food retailers.

Belgium indicated the need for clarity on the different product types and different measures being taken in different Member States.

Sweden supported further work on the topic and noted that while the consumption of energy drinks was increasing, there were other related issues, including the combined consumption of alcohol and caffeine containing products in conjunction with physical exercise.

Hugues Kenigswald highlighted difficulties in the collection of consumption data due to the combined consumption of energy drinks with other drinks, including alcohol, and the need to have representative data for extreme cases.

Ireland, supported by the United Kingdom, suggested that the issue was a risk management problem relating to acceptable use in society rather in combination with alcohol.

Sweden, supported by Belgium, partially agreed with this view, but stated the need for a scientific basis to inform the risk managers.

Denmark stated the need for accurately defining energy drinks before gathering consumption data.

Djien Liem highlighted the potential difficulty with exposure assessment because of various exposure scenarios, including coffee consumption, energy drink consumption with alcohol and the combined effects with different mixtures.

The European Commission noted the importance of avoiding duplication of data collection efforts, so there would be a need to check whether Member State data on energy drink consumption are already being gathered by the European Commission.

Cyprus shared results on the caffeine content in various products and suggested that energy drinks should bear warning labels.

Finland supported concerted action by risk managers and risk assessors on this topic.

Catherine Geslain-Lanéelle concluded that EFSA would follow up with the European Commission and then move ahead with interested countries regarding the proposed article 36 project on energy drinks.

Pine nuts

Tobin Robinson updated the AF on new information relating to bitter taste from pine nuts, saying that the Chinese Chamber of Commerce had indicated that pine nuts from *Pinus armandi* were the source of bitter aftertaste, mainly from underdeveloped kernels that had been blended with other pine nut varieties of Chinese origin by dishonest shippers due to the significant increase in pine nut

prices and exported prior to November 2009. The Chinese Pine Nut Association had therefore reinforced their veto on such blending.

France noted that pine nuts from *Pinus armandi* are not authorised in Europe.

Luxembourg and Ireland reported new cases.

6 OTHER MATTERS RAISED BY EFSA AND THE MEMBER STATES

6.1 EFSA technical report on endocrine active substances – for discussion and possible endorsement of the recommendations

Djien Liem introduced the report and provided an overview of the current state of play in relation to the work on mapping the situation regarding endocrine active substances. The recommendations of the report had been endorsed by the SC at its meeting on 14-15 September 2010, while communication aspects would be addressed by the AFCWG.

Germany found the document excellent, even though the important feed area was missing. Germany agreed with the SC that a lot of work on endocrine active substances is needed and said that definitions would need to be clarified internationally, so a working group and close links with communications work were recommended.

France complimented the report and raised questions on how the Member States and international organisations would be involved and the timeline for completing the work.

Djien Liem agreed that the feed area should be included and that the involvement of Member States should be considered. He suggested creating a working group for setting priorities and emphasised the need to coordinate with DG Environment to avoid duplication of efforts.

Catherine Geslain-Lanéelle concluded that EFSA would move ahead on the basis of the report and propose a mandate and composition of a working group on endocrine active substances for endorsement by the AF.

6.2 Update on the work of the EFSA working group on isoflavones

Didier Verloo presented a summary of the activities of the EFSA working group on isoflavones. Asked by Norway, he confirmed that the review considered the benefits alongside the possible risks and conclusions will be drawn.

6.3 Communications on the independence of risk assessment advice: Feedback from the AFCWG

This agenda item was postponed to the next AF meeting in November 2010, *i.e.* after the AFCWG meeting on 6-7 October 2010.

6.4 Other matters raised by EFSA and the Member States

In reply to the Irish enquiry regarding genetically modified fish under agenda item 3.1, Riitta Maijala updated the AF on EFSA's ongoing work regarding the guidance on evaluation of the safety of genetically modified animals and referred to EFSA's website for further information. She further said that EFSA would consult the Member States on the draft guidance documents that were currently being developed by the GMO and AHAW Panels. EFSA is also following closely the authorisation process for genetically modified salmon in the USA and has asked information from the US FDA relating to genetically modified fish.

Hungary presented an overview of the identification of emerging risks in Hungary through scanning that is currently carried out using all types of media and sources. Hungary also referred to its regular communications on this topic through a newsletter.

The Netherlands asked whether the information gathered led to discussions with risk managers at national level. Hungary confirmed that this information is sensitive, so dialogue is important.

Tobin Robinson welcomed the sharing of the information and indicated that the first meeting of EFSA's network on emerging risks would take place in November 2010, where this type of activity would be discussed in detail. He also encouraged those AF members who had not nominated experts to take part in the network to send nominations as soon as possible.

Germany reported on the finding of gyanotoxins from rhododendron plants in honey from the Black Sea area. Catherine Geslain-Lanéelle encouraged Germany to share further information through the network on emerging risks.

7 ANY OTHER BUSINESS

Catherine Geslain-Lanéelle provided an overview of seconded national experts at EFSA and invited further seconded national experts to assist in the nutrition and health claims area.

8 CLOSURE OF THE MEETING

Catherine Geslain-Lanéelle thanked Malta for the good meeting organisation and the AF members and observers for the very good discussions. She also thanked Kartika Liotard for attending the meeting as well as the speakers, interpreters and EFSA staff.