

**SCIENTIFIC COMMITTEE AND ADVISORY FORUM UNIT**

Parma, 21 February 2011  
EFSA/AF/M/2011/372/PUB/FIN

**Minutes**

**THIRTY EIGHTH MEETING OF THE ADVISORY FORUM  
BRUSSELS (BELGIUM), 25-26 NOVEMBER 2010**

**MEMBERS OF THE ADVISORY FORUM**

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

Austria	<i>Roland Grossgut</i>	Italy	<i>Giancarlo Belluzzi</i>
Belgium	<i>Benoît Horion</i>	Latvia	<i>Gatis Ozoliņš</i>
Bulgaria	<i>Stefka Petrova</i>	Lithuania	<i>Zenonas Stanevicius</i>
Cyprus	<i>Popi Kanari</i>	Luxembourg	<i>Félix Wildschutz</i>
Czech Republic	<i>Jitka Götzová</i>	Netherlands	<i>Hubert Noteborn</i>
Denmark	<i>Jørgen Schlundt</i>	Norway	<i>Kirstin Færden</i>
Estonia	<i>Külli Rae</i>	Poland	<i>Jan Krzysztof Ludwicki</i>
Finland	<i>Kirsti Savela</i>	Portugal	<i>Maria João Seabra</i>
France	<i>Valérie Baduel</i>	Romania	<i>Liviu Rusu</i>
Germany	<i>Reiner Wittkowski</i>	Slovakia	<i>Zuzana Bírošová</i>
Greece	<i>George-Ioannis Nychas</i>	Slovenia	<i>Ada Hočvar Grom</i>
Hungary	<i>Maria Szeitzné Szabó</i>	Spain	<i>Ana Troncoso</i>
Iceland	<i>Jón Gíslason</i>	Sweden	<i>Leif Busk</i>
Ireland	<i>Raymond Ellard</i>	United Kingdom	<i>Alisdair Wotherspoon</i>

## OBSERVERS

Croatia	<i>Zorica Jurković</i>	European Commission (DG Health and Consumers)	<i>Jeannie Vergnettes</i>
Former Yugoslav Republic of Macedonia	<i>Marina Popovska-Domazetova</i>	European Commission (DG Research)	<i>Valérie Rolland<sup>1</sup></i>
Switzerland	<i>Michael Beer</i>	European Commission (DG Research)	<i>Danièle Tissot<sup>1</sup></i>
Turkey	<i>Nergiz Özbağ</i>		

## REPRESENTATIVES OF THE EUROPEAN FOOD SAFETY AUTHORITY

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

<i>Hubert Deluyker</i>	<i>Tobin Robinson</i>
<i>Anne-Laure Gassin</i>	<i>Laura Smillie</i>
<i>Claudia Heppner</i>	<i>Liisa Valsta<sup>2</sup></i>
<i>Djien Liem</i>	<i>Rolaf Van Leeuwen (Vice-Chair of EFSA's CONTAM Panel)</i>
<i>Riitta Maijala</i>	<i>Victoria Villamar</i>
<i>Pia Makela</i>	

## 1 WELCOME AND OPENING OF THE MEETING

Catherine Geslain-Lanéelle opened the meeting and welcomed the new AF members from Denmark and Iceland. She informed that apologies were received from Malta.

Subsequently, the assistant of the Belgian Minister for Small and Medium-sized Enterprises, the Self-Employed, Agriculture and Scientific Policy, Sabine Laruelle, provided a welcome speech on her behalf, highlighting the importance of EFSA and its cooperation with national scientific organisations.

Catherine Geslain-Lanéelle thanked Belgium for its active contributions in the AF and complimented the interesting events organised on nanotechnologies and the role of science in food policy (please refer to agenda item 8.2) during the Belgian EU Presidency. She said that EFSA can play an important role for innovation.

---

<sup>1</sup> Attended agenda item 6.

<sup>2</sup> Attended agenda item 5.5 (via telephone).

## **2 ADOPTION OF THE MINUTES OF THE 37<sup>TH</sup> ADVISORY FORUM MEETING**

The minutes were adopted.

## **3 ADOPTION OF THE AGENDA**

The agenda was adopted.

France offered to inform the AF about a few new opinions under agenda item 8.4.

## **4 STRATEGIC DISCUSSION ON EFSA'S WORK WITH MEMBER STATES**

### **4.1 Follow up on medium term planning**

Hubert Deluyker informed that the documents on medium term planning (please refer to the minutes of the 37<sup>th</sup> AF meeting) were being finalised following further revision by EFSA's scientific units and based on comments from EFSA's Scientific Committee (SC). He offered that EFSA could contribute to discussions at national level on medium term commitments and said that the Focal Points would discuss this further at their meeting in February 2011.

Upon request from Belgium, Hubert Deluyker confirmed that also a summary report would be prepared.

Catherine Geslain-Lanéelle said that the documents would be updated regularly.

Sweden requested transparency about bilateral discussions and agreements, since good examples could be helpful to facilitate the discussions with decision makers in the Member States.

Catherine Geslain-Lanéelle concluded that the AF agreed on the approach and that the finalised documents would be shared in the beginning of 2011.

Anne-Laure Gassin updated the AF on communications activities in a medium term perspective and launched the idea of an international risk communications conference on food-related issues in October 2011.

Bulgaria, Lithuania, France, Sweden and Austria expressed their support to the proposed conference.

Bulgaria suggested learning from examples of inadequate communications in Europe in past years.

Upon request from France, Anne-Laure Gassin clarified that the two parts of the conference would illustrate broader issues linked with policy and focus on sharing experiences and new tools with those who communicate, respectively.

Sweden emphasised that risk communications are a shared responsibility of risk assessors and risk managers and advocated for more transparency in risk management for increased trust and credibility.

Poland supported EFSA's intention to develop a glossary of terms used in risk communications and offered to contribute to this work by sharing experiences from Poland.

Austria emphasised the importance of risk communications in situations where risk assessments and risk management do not concur and also suggested that the issue of independence could be addressed at the conference.

Anne-Laure Gassin thanked for the inputs and informed that a speaker committee would be established to help develop the programme for the conference. The committee would comprise 8-10 members, including one or two AF members, and representation from the AFCWG and the European Commission would also be sought.

#### **4.2 Calendar for possible future topics for strategic discussions**

Catherine Geslain-Lanéelle said that some possible future topics for strategic discussions had been identified and would be briefly introduced to discuss their relevance and prioritise the topics in preparation of future meetings. She said that the list was not exhaustive and invited the AF members to add topics as needed.

France proposed a discussion on how to handle risk assessments of novel foods in cooperation with the Member States. A rapporteur system, consultations with all Member States and the development of a common approach to ensure mutual confidence were proposed. A working group could be established to define the methodology and explore the best ways to involve Member States in the work. This was particularly important in the novel foods area in order to speak with one voice on sensitive issues like nanotechnology and cloning.

Riitta Maijala proposed a discussion on food safety research funding in Europe to jointly be more proactive in suggesting priority research areas and sharing views on EFSA's role in influencing different research funding sources.

Hubert Deluyker proposed discussions on data collection to harmonise between different areas and avoid duplication of efforts and hazard databases to improve the accessibility to data.

Djien Liem proposed a discussion on alternative risk assessment approaches to share views and experiences and stay at the forefront of new developments within computational approaches in chemical risk assessment.

Catherine Geslain-Lanéelle suggested that the AF could address two strategic topics each year and that, if working groups were established, they should have clear mandates with reasonably short timelines.

Austria found that all the topics were relevant. The first priority would be novel foods to address how to deal with the work burden in this area. The second priority would be alternative risk assessment approaches, while one should be careful to analyse the added value before proceeding to build a new database.

Denmark hesitated regarding novel foods, since the AF would not be the right forum for discussing regulatory aspects. Regarding data collection, it would be important to avoid a mismatch between data collected for compliance monitoring and those needed for risk assessments. Finally, the AF could discuss the [One Health Initiative](#), since Europe has taken an integrated approach to zoonoses for many years, while this is launched as a “new” discovery outside Europe.

The United Kingdom suggested that the strategic discussions on medium term planning could cover also how to deal with applications and novel foods. In relation with the proposal regarding research funding, the United Kingdom offered to share experiences from the [SAFEFOODERA](#).

Sweden found that the proposals were very good and suggested that rather than prioritising the different projects, they could go on simultaneously. Sweden found that the French proposal was very good to avoid duplication of work. There would be a need for a continuous working group on research funding and a discussion with the European Commission on data collection for intake assessments. Sweden also informed that they had an ongoing project on computational toxicology. Finally, strategic thinking on the blurring between pharmaceuticals and food supplements was recommended.

France clarified that the proposal regarding novel foods would not address the regulatory aspects, but how to implement the work. A strategic discussion on data collection would be very important in order to improve the coordination. Databases were important too, but complex due to the myriad of existing databases. Regarding research, the present approach could be continued.

Belgium supported the proposed involvement of Member States in the work on novel foods due to their experience. In relation with data collection, it would be important to involve the European Commission and national risk managers in the discussions. Finally, alternative risk assessment approaches could be addressed by the new SC network on the harmonisation of risk assessment methodologies.

The European Commission agreed with France that EFSA should not work on the regulatory aspects, while cooperation and synergies with the Member States would be important.

Catherine Geslain-Lanéelle shared this vision.

Germany said that in order for research to address open questions, EFSA together with the Member States should formulate and prioritise these questions.

Bulgaria supported the cooperation with DG Research and emphasised the importance of harmonised legislations.

Lithuania referred to nitrate in organic products and supported the proposed discussion on hazard databases.

Finland supported the proposals, asked if total diet studies would be considered under data collection, and stated that research funding is important.

Norway saw data collection and food supplements as priority issues for future discussion.

Italy found that all the topics were important, while data collection and alternative risk assessment approaches were the priorities.

Hubert Deluyker informed that EFSA would visit interested Member States to solve institutional issues regarding data collection, an inventory of hazard databases would be prepared before going ahead, and DG Research would fund a total diet study.

Riitta Maijala offered to share EFSA's ongoing work on mapping existing legislations in the food safety area.

Catherine Geslain-Lanéelle concluded that EFSA would reflect further and work with those who made the proposals on how to best address the different topics, for example through the establishment of working groups with AF members, EFSA staff and other key players. EFSA would then propose a calendar for the coming years and draft mandates at the next AF meeting.

*Action 1: Member States interested in receiving a visit from EFSA to address institutional issues related with data collection to inform the AF secretariat.*

## **5 OTHER MATTERS RAISED BY EFSA AND THE MEMBER STATES**

### **5.1 Eurobarometer 2010 on food-related risks**

Anne-Laure Gassin presented the results of the [Eurobarometer 2010 on food-related risks](#), commented on the perceptions of food and food-related risks and thanked those who communicated on the findings.

Germany said that German many consumers believe that pesticides are illegal and that pesticide residues in food constitute the biggest food safety problem. Germany also shared experiences regarding consumers' reactions to advice on how to avoid acrylamide in the cooking process.

France appreciated the work and reflected on the complexity of communicating with media and politicians on food-related risks.

Cyprus said that the results show where there is a need to improve risk communications and reemphasised the support to the international risk communications conference on food-related issues.

The United Kingdom noted that the Eurobarometer was a very valuable source of information on what worries people. It would be more interesting to consider why the reported views were expressed.

Hungary commented on the role of media in influencing consumers' perceptions and regretted that news stories are not always well founded.

Ireland asked why the perceptions of respectively national and European authorities were grouped under one question in the Eurobarometer.

Denmark referred to work done by the ECDC and the WHO on disease burden from food and proposed linking the issues with disease burden in communications.

Finland commented on how media influence risk perceptions.

Austria said that the results were similar to national surveys, that a comparison with the results of the Eurobarometer in 2005 showed the results of the work by national authorities and EFSA, and that it could be useful for each country to provide their perspective and learning with respect to the Eurobarometer findings. Austria regretted that media stories were often driven by NGOs without scientific knowledge.

Sweden agreed on the importance of putting issues in perspective by considering the burden of disease. In this regards, Sweden referred to a valuable Dutch report entitled "Our food, our health" and said that the adverse health effects of bad nutrition were significantly worse than chemical and biological contaminants.

The Netherlands informed that the [report](#) referred to by Sweden had been prepared by the RIVM and added that risk ranking is difficult.

Germany agreed that media and NGO campaigns play a role for the consumer perception of risks, *e.g.* pesticides in Germany. Such campaigns are hazard-based, while regulatory measures for safety are risk-based.

The Czech Republic agreed with Germany and proposed neutral information campaigns, since information on the Internet is often biased by different interests.

Riitta Maijala suggested that the AFCWG could investigate if NGO campaigns had an impact on country results and discuss with NGOs how to do effective campaigns and communications.

Hubert Deluyker said that consumer perceptions are also linked with the affordability of food.

Catherine Geslain-Lanéelle said that there is a need to address real health concerns as well as perceived risks.

Anne-Laure Gassin said that the findings would be discussed with the AFCWG and that the work on disease burden could be reflected in thematic communications. With respect to the question on trust in information sources on food safety issues, she clarified that due to the complexity of the EU food safety system and the similar type of information provided by national and European food safety agencies, these had been grouped together as one information source.

Catherine Geslain-Lanéelle invited feedback from the AFCWG on the national perspectives on the Eurobarometer findings at EU level and emphasised the importance of conducting the Eurobarometer every five years.

*Action 2: AFCWG members to provide feedback on the Eurobarometer 2010 on food-related risks.*

## **5.2 Communications on the independence of risk assessment advice: Feedback from the AFCWG**

Anne-Laure Gassin updated the AF on communications on the independence of risk assessment advice and informed that a task force comprising EFSA, France, Norway and the United Kingdom had been established under the AFCWG.

The Netherlands enquired about the link between transparency and independence.

France questioned what was meant by independence, suggested linking the discussion on independence with the ongoing work on terminology, and advocated for defining minimum standards for independence, considering independence from both financial interests and scientific paradigms.

Germany agreed that independence is important for trust. However, science is always interest-driven, so the only solution would be to focus on the quality of science, *i.e.* to separate good science from bad science, and to consider how to address uncertainty.

Hubert Deluyker agreed with Germany.

Austria warned against loosing the best scientists through excessive focus on independence, since only experts who are involved in an area will be competent. What is needed is to ensure transparency.

Anne-Laure Gassin acknowledged that the perception of independence is closely related with transparency.

Catherine Geslain-Lanéelle concluded that the AFCWG should not only focus on independence, but consider quality, independence and openness in its broader context.

### **5.3 New SC network on the harmonisation of risk assessment methodologies**

Djen Liem introduced the draft mandate of the new SC network on the harmonisation of risk assessment methodologies that would start in 2011.

Austria and France welcomed the new SC network, while requesting clarification of its relation with networks covering specific areas.

Upon request from France, Djien Liem acknowledged that the required profile of the network members should be clearer in the amended mandate.

Hungary considered that a small working group would be most effective.

Catherine Geslain-Lanéelle indicated that the SC network should be labelled as other networks.

### **5.4 External report on terminology in EFSA risk assessments – for discussion**

Djen Liem introduced the external scientific report on terminology in EFSA risk assessments, which will be taken as a starting point by the SC working group on risk assessment terminology. The working group will prepare a draft opinion for adoption by the SC. A public consultation and consultation of the AF on the draft SC opinion is foreseen around the end of 2011. The advice provided to EFSA in the external report will already be considered in the short term to guide Panels and improve consistency.

Hungary informed about similar work in Hungary, which had shown a need to harmonise terminology used in different areas, and suggested that EFSA should have a common glossary.

Likewise, Germany was addressing this issue to harmonise terminology in order to facilitate the understanding of risk assessments by the risk managers.

Catherine Geslain-Lanéelle proposed liaising on current work.

### **5.5 Update on the EU Menu project**

Liisa Valsta updated the AF on the EU Menu project, saying that the pilot studies are going well. Capacity building will take place in parallel with the pilot studies and dietary surveys in Member States would start in 2013.

The United Kingdom reiterated its support to the project and asked about the funding situation.

Hubert Deluyker informed that the pilot studies would be funded by EFSA, subject to Management Board approval.

Denmark made a general comment that harmonisation in areas where Member States have good systems in place may deteriorate the existing systems.

Sweden recalled that the harmonisation had already been agreed, since it was important to use common formats. However, Sweden was considering running the EU Menu project in parallel with its existing system in order to be able to compare to old data too.

Bulgaria said that it was a great initiative to collect reliable data for exposure assessments and recalled that every Member State had expressed a favourable opinion on the usefulness of this project.

Italy was not worried about the harmonisation and wanted to become involved in the project already at the pilot stage.

Hubert Deluyker mentioned that similar studies are performed on an annual basis in the USA and China. He said that the AF would be updated regularly on the progress of the EU Menu project.

## **6 EXCHANGE OF VIEWS WITH DG RESEARCH ON RESEARCH PRIORITIES**

Catherine Geslain-Lanéelle welcomed Valérie Rolland and Danièle Tissot from DG Research and thanked DG Research for having taken into account two of the key priority areas that had been identified for research funding last year.

Valérie Rolland replied that EFSA's input was important, so DG Research considered it with pleasure. She then presented recent developments in DG Research in light of the focus on innovation in the [Innovation Union](#) flagship initiative of the [EU 2020 Strategy](#), criteria for funding under the 7<sup>th</sup> Framework Programme this year and general trends for the future. Danièle Tissot provided further details on the future trends.

Catherine Geslain-Lanéelle emphasised the importance of understanding the impact of the EU 2020 Strategy.

Upon request from Hungary, Danièle Tissot clarified that support for biodiversity is currently considered an agricultural issue.

Upon request from Finland, Valérie Rolland explained that for each DG Research theme there is a Programme Committee, which comprises official representatives from the Member States. The final selection of research priorities and topics is discussed with and approved by the Programme Committee. Draft proposals are prepared by DG Research based on inputs received from all stakeholders and taking into account outcomes on ongoing projects.

The United Kingdom recommended that EFSA should be involved in the appraisal of proposals.

Valérie Rolland confirmed that among the independent experts involved as DG Research evaluators, some were also involved in EFSA's work.

Upon request from the Netherlands, Valérie Rolland explained that all inputs received are considered, while the Programme Committee has the final word. So AF members could liaise with their national representatives in the Programme Committee to provide input.

Catherine Geslain-Lanéelle said that it is important that the AF members bring their priorities to the attention of the Member State representatives in the Programme Committee.

Riitta Maijala noted that the growing involvement of the industry in research projects could have implications for EFSA's selection of experts.

France noted that innovation in the industry was mentioned and warned against supporting unsustainable products.

Valérie Rolland clarified that innovation funding was not restricted to increasing the budget directly allocated to industry participants. In the end, industry should benefit from the innovative research initiatives.

Catherine Geslain-Lanéelle referred to the research proposals collected by EFSA from its staff, experts and AF members and discussed with the SC.

Jeffrey Moon presented the priority themes proposed for research funding, including examples of specific research proposals falling under these themes.

Djien Liem mentioned that there will be future research needs in the area of nanotechnologies as well. However, the development of the specific proposal would await the finalisation of the SC opinion on nanotechnology.

Belgium commented on the proposed themes.

Jeffrey Moon informed that following this discussion, a consolidated proposal on research priorities would be forwarded to DG Research in December 2010.

Danièle Tissot thanked EFSA for the input in a very timely and well structured manner. This would help in defining priorities.

Valérie Rolland suggested highlighting new topics and gaps, since some areas were already well funded following the last calls.

Germany found that some project proposals were not specific enough.

Jeffrey Moon explained that all proposals received were included in the overview table for full transparency. On the basis of this “raw material”, the proposed priority themes had been elaborated.

The United Kingdom suggested focusing on areas with the biggest health impact.

Danièle Tissot recalled the importance of highlighting missing areas for EFSA’s risk assessments.

Sweden complimented the major step forward taken by this structured approach to collecting and consolidating research proposals.

Riitta Maijala reminded that sometimes ongoing research projects have not yet produced results, so new proposals may occur in the same area.

Catherine Geslain-Lanéelle thanked DG Research for coming as well as for the regular contacts and fruitful cooperation.

*Action 3: EFSA to submit the consolidated proposal on research priorities to DG Research in December 2010.*

## **7 STRATEGIC DISCUSSION ON EFSA’S WORK WITH MEMBER STATES (PART II)**

### **7.1 Cooperation in the area of contaminants**

Catherine Geslain-Lanéelle welcomed Rolaf Van Leeuwen, Vice-Chair of EFSA’s CONTAM Panel, who presented the work of the Panel and illustrated the importance of the cooperation with Member States and international organisations using the example of EFSA’s evaluation of marine biotoxins.

France appreciated that data collected by EFSA’s DATEX unit and national risk assessments shared through the Information Exchange Platform were used by the Panel. Since France was working on many of the same issues as the Panel, cooperation was essential and the network on harmonisation of risk assessment methodologies would be useful to facilitate sharing of risk assessments.

The United Kingdom made similar comments and underlined the importance of working together and sharing information, *e.g.* with the Joint FAO/WHO Expert Committee on Food Additives (JECFA), to help minimise timescales in producing opinions and address possible divergences of opinions.

Austria said that it would be useful for the Member States to receive feedback from EFSA on possible data gaps.

Cyprus agreed with Austria, complimented the good work of the Panel and encouraged the use of self-tasking for new contaminants. Cyprus also proposed taking a look at nitrate levels in vegetables.

Denmark enquired about the cooperation with JECFA and stressed its importance.

The Czech Republic raised an issue about cadmium in poppy seeds.

Italy complimented the work of the Panel and requested guidance on data collection regarding marine biotoxins.

Rolaf Van Leeuwen replied that the Panel would welcome requests from the Member States on the issues raised and that guidance on reporting formats would be provided.

Rolaf Van Leeuwen and Catherine Geslain-Lanéelle acknowledged the need for a more structured approach on data gaps.

Hubert Deluyker mentioned that EFSA had received a new mandate in the area of monitoring the occurrence of contaminants, so a move towards a harmonised approach was planned. The experiences from the pesticide monitoring were seen as a good model.

Sweden and Rolaf Van Leeuwen exchanged ideas on how to further strengthen the collection of occurrence and consumption data.

Hubert Deluyker reminded the AF about the open call for seconded national experts also in this area.

Finland informed that a report on nitrate levels in vegetables and meat would become available in 2011.

Catherine Geslain-Lanéelle referred the further discussion on data gaps to the networks on occurrence and food consumption data. The AF would also have a strategic discussion on data collection. She thanked the CONTAM Panel for its excellent work.

## **7.2 Cooperation in the area of zoonoses**

Pia Makela presented the cooperation in the area of zoonoses data collection. She emphasised the paramount importance of the cooperation with the ECDC and Member States, highlighted the role of the zoonoses task force and raised some questions for discussion.

Austria recommended using the same system for data transfer as in the pesticide area.

France thanked for the useful reports on zoonoses and suggested harmonising the methodology applied for monitoring to address the gaps in some areas and Member States. The [Med-Vet-Net](#) network on zoonoses involves national reference centres and the cooperation with EFSA could be strengthened.

Denmark said that the work and results in the zoonoses area are one of the greatest successes of the EU in the food safety area. This positive news ought to be actively communicated in the media and scientific papers, possibly linking the results to the reduced disease burden and consequent savings of life and money.

Catherine Geslain-Lanéelle thanked for this plea to promote the success stories and found that EFSA could be bolder in its communications.

The United Kingdom agreed to the suggested focus on disease burden in order to identify and address real public health issues such as listeriosis.

Pia Makela confirmed the networking with community and national reference laboratories and that the data transfer model would be aligned for zoonoses, pesticides and chemicals. She agreed on linking the good results in the zoonoses area to the reduced disease burden and communicating on this in cooperation with the ECDC and the European Commission.

Anne-Laure Gassin agreed on the opportunity to communicate more on the positive news in the zoonoses area and advised that this would need to be done jointly by risk assessors and risk managers.

Catherine Geslain-Lanéelle concluded that this would be one of the priority themes for communications.

Hubert Deluyker agreed on the importance of telling the story in international scientific journals too.

The European Commission mentioned that political decisions on monitoring are often seen as useful after crises, while regular monitoring would be important.

Belgium complimented the base line studies and suggested that risk factors could be identified by considering different production steps.

Austria suggested estimating the savings resulting from avoiding crises.

Pia Makela said that work on source attribution was done in the case of salmonella in an external report that would be shared with the Member States for consultation when it became available. Risk factors are analysed in the baseline surveys, while a more in-depth analysis of risk factors would require a different survey design and the risk factors vary between different Member States.

Hubert Deluyker confirmed that the baseline studies focus on prevalence monitoring and advised to be careful not to spend a lot of resources on analysing risk factors when the data available is not optimal.

Catherine Geslain-Lanéelle expressed appreciation of the very good work.

## 8 OTHER MATTERS RAISED BY EFSA AND THE MEMBER STATES (PART II)

### 8.1 Methodology for the prioritisation of animal diseases

France presented a methodology for prioritisation of animal diseases.

Catherine Geslain-Lanéelle thanked France for sharing this important work.

Tobin Robinson asked if France had access to quantitative data on illegal trade, which would also be relevant for emerging risks work.

Denmark noted that the model gave equal weight to the impact on human and animal health.

France replied that no precise data were available on illegal trade, since this was an area characterised by high uncertainty. The criteria used in the model could easily be fine tuned in agreement with the “client”.

### 8.2 Feedback from the round table on the role of science in food policy

Belgium provided a feedback from the round table on the role of science in food policy, which was organised in Brussels on 20 October 2010 under the Belgium EU Presidency. The report would be published at [www.health.fgov.be](http://www.health.fgov.be).

Catherine Geslain-Lanéelle said that the AF might come back to some points from this interesting event when the report becomes available.

### 8.3 Allergic reactions caused by ‘easy to bake’ products with hydrolysed wheat protein

Denmark informed about five cases of serious allergic reactions caused by “easy to bake” products with hydrolysed wheat protein in Denmark.

Finland had experienced six cases and a specific baking mix had been withdrawn from the market.

France suggested that the observed effects were process-related.

Tobin Robinson informed that EFSA followed the issue through the European Rapid Alert System for Food and Feed (RASFF). The topic was also discussed by the [emerging risks exchange network](#) at its 1<sup>st</sup> meeting on 16-17 November 2010 and addressed in an [opinion of EFSA’s NDA Panel](#) from October 2004.

The European Commission was also aware of this issue through the RASFF.

*Action 4: EFSA to report back to the AF on allergic reactions caused by hydrolysed wheat protein following feedback from members of the emerging risks exchange network on this topic.*

#### **8.4 Other matters raised by EFSA and the Member States**

Anne-Laure Gassin showed a [new video on EFSA's risk assessments of food and feed](#), which would also be made available to the Member States.

France shared information about a few new opinions, including an assessment of risks related to dietary weight-loss practices.

The United Kingdom informed that a hypothetical application under the Novel Foods Regulations for the approval of meat and milk from cloned cattle and their progeny had been considered by one of its independent Scientific Advisory Committees and its advice presented at the FSA Board. The scientific conclusions were similar to those of EFSA.

The Netherlands informed about a study investigating the possible health effects of nano-silica particles in food. A full report would be provided at the AFCWG meeting in Vienna on 1-2 December 2010 in order to discuss communication perspectives on this work.

#### **9 ANY OTHER BUSINESS**

Catherine Geslain-Lanéelle informed that the next AF meeting in Parma on 15-16 March 2011 would comprise a joint session with EFSA's Management Board. She invited the AF members to share ideas and suggestions for topics to be addressed during this session.

*Action 5: AF members to submit their suggestions for topics to be discussed during the joint session between the AF and EFSA's Management Board to the AF secretariat by 10 December 2010.*

#### **10 CLOSURE OF THE MEETING**

Catherine Geslain-Lanéelle thanked Belgium and its AF member for the excellent meeting organisation and hospitality. She also thanked the AF members and observers, interpreters and EFSA staff. Finally, she wished a merry Christmas.