

Minutes

30th MEETING OF THE ADVISORY FORUM WORKING GROUP ON COMMUNICATIONS

PARMA (ITALY), 23-24 MARCH 2011

MEMBERS OF THE ADVISORY FORUM WORKING GROUP ON COMMUNICATIONS:

Chair: GASSIN Anne-Laure, Communications Director

Members:

Austria	PUBLIG Elisabeth	Ireland	CONWAY Edel
Belgium	CASSART Pierre	Norway	BJERKÅS Astrid
Cyprus	PARTASSIDES Dora	Poland	WISNIEWSKA Iwona
Czech Republic	BALGA Josef	Portugal	SEABRA Maria João
Estonia	PRIISALU Piret	Slovak Republic	THEISZOVA Marica
Finland	LAESLEHTO Marja	Slovenia	VRDELJA Mitja
France	THOMANN Carole	Spain	GARRIDO-GARCIA Carmen
Germany	FIACK Suzan	Sweden	LINDAHL WARNSBERG Christina
Greece	TSIGARIDA Eirini	The Netherlands	KRIKKEN Chris
Hungary	CSEH Júlia	United Kingdom	EVERARD Justin

Observers:

Croatia	MIKRUT Sara	Turkey	ÖZCAN Fatma Nevra
FYROM	JONOVSKA Katerina		

European Food Safety Authority Staff:

ADAMOVA Monika	DE LUCA Lucia	KENIGSWALD Hugues	RAMSAY James
BULLER Christoph	GASSIN Anne-Laure	NILSSON Torben	SMILLIE Laura
BERGER Bernard	GESLAIN-LANÉELLE Catherine	PAGANI Steve	TESTA Elena
CARLANDER David	GROSS-HELMERT Kerstin	PALOMBI Ian	



Apologies:

Bulgaria	PCHELINSKA Mariela	Luxembourg	HAU Patrick
Denmark	KORNHOLT Heidi	Romania	MONEA Alina-Ioana
Italia	TARANTO Mirella	European Commission	STYLIANOU George
Lithuania	KUNICKIS Saulius		

DAY 1: 23RD MARCH 2011 - 14H00 – 17H30

1. WELCOME AND INTRODUCTION

1.1. Anne-Laure Gassin opened the meeting by welcoming all participants and thanking them for their attendance. She then gave the floor to Catherine Geslain-Lanéelle, who in her welcome speech highlighted the importance of working together and forging greater cooperation. Catherine Geslain-Lanéelle pointed out that both the Management Board and Advisory Forum recognise the progress made in joined up communication with Member States and the significant contribution of the AFCWG. Anne-Laure Gassin thanked Catherine Geslain-Lanéelle for her supportive words.

1.2. Anne-Laure Gassin then welcomed the new member from Sweden and the new observer from Turkey. She also informed the group that apologies had been received from Bulgaria, Greece, Denmark, Italy, Lithuania, Luxembourg, Romania and the European Commission.

2. ADOPTION OF THE AGENDA (Doc AF Comm WG 23 3 11 – 1)

2.1. Anne-Laure Gassin thanked the members who had already filled in their Declarations of Interests and reminded the remaining few that they should complete the electronic form as soon as possible. As no additional items were indicated by the members, the agenda was adopted as proposed.

3. MINUTES OF THE MEETING IN VIENNA ON 1-2 DECEMBER AND MATTERS ARISING
(Doc AF Comm WG 23 3 11 – 2)

3.1. Anne-Laure Gassin informed the members that the minutes of the meeting held on 1-2 December in Vienna were approved by written procedure and published on the Extranet and the EFSA website.

3.2. She outlined the matters arising from the meeting in Vienna that would be discussed with the group during the day.



4. KEY POINTS ARISING FROM THE ADVISORY FORUM MEETING (15-16 MARCH, PARMA)

- 4.1. Torben Nilsson summarised the outcome of the Advisory Forum meeting in Parma, mentioning among other items the discussion on the medium-term planning for scientific cooperation between EFSA and Member States. He pointed out that the Advisory Forum commented on the draft summary brochure targeting a broader audience; the final version of the document will soon be available. It has been agreed that the AFCWG members should liaise with the AF members on the promotion of the document in their Member State. The Advisory Forum also discussed possible future topics for strategic discussion which will include amongst others, risk perception and risk communications. It has been agreed that the AF discussion will be prepared with AFCWG members; making use of the Eurobarometer 2010 survey findings that provided interesting data from both EU and national perspectives. For the rest of the topics, small AF preparatory working groups will be established.
- 4.2. Regarding food safety research funding, Torben Nilsson informed the group that a new cycle of work on research priorities had been initiated. The AFCWG was asked to provide input by 31 May 2011. Communications related research proposals will be discussed at the AFCWG meeting in June 2011 and EFSA's proposal on research priorities will be tabled at the AF meeting in September 2011.
- 4.3. He also presented new topics for strategic discussion and the tentative planning of the discussions, ranging from May 2011-2012 and including topics such as EFSA's science strategy; Data collection; Risk assessment of novel foods; Risk ranking – burden of disease; Hazard databases; and Alternative risk assessment approaches.
- 4.4. In addition, Torben Nilsson updated the group on the new organisational structure of EFSA and on the cooperation in the area of plant health. He also mentioned the Annual Focal Point Report 2010 and priorities for 2011 as well as the results of the evaluation of the Information Exchange Platform (IEP) and recommendations, including extending the access to the IEP and increasing awareness of this source of information.
- 4.5. Then, he reported on the issues raised by Member States, focusing on those issues which were not tabled at the AFCWG meeting: the Netherlands provided an update on Q-Fever, saying that the epidemic had subsided; Finland reported on "cocktail" effects of food additives; and France presented the new governance setup of ANSES, including a committee for ethical standards and prevention of conflicts of interests, and explained the difficulties in finding experts who are perceived to be independent.
- 4.6. Lastly, Torben Nilsson briefly updated the group on the outcome of the joint Management Board and Advisory Forum meeting. Both bodies acknowledged positive achievements and commitment to further strengthen cooperation in Risk Assessment and Risk Communications with Member States. Among the topics discussed were: the importance of



Risk Assessment-Risk Management dialogue to set priorities; the best use of experts as well as existing cooperation tools, and reinforcement of data collection activities. Both bodies appreciated EFSA's new communications strategy and new thematic approach as well as the pre-notification process and highlighted the use of social media. They pointed out that outreach of EFSA communications in Member States should be enhanced and risk perception can be explored further, encouraging further research in this area. EFSA should continue to build its international reputation as the European reference on risk assessment matters and source of advice on urgent/crisis issues.

- 4.7. Norway positively commented on extending access to the IEP and increasing awareness of this information source. Upon request from the UK, Torben Nilsson further elaborated on EFSA providing a "European voice" in crisis situations by explaining that although a crisis in the outset usually occurs in one Member State, it is often seen as a European Union issue making the enhanced cooperation and rapid sharing and exchange of information very important.

Action 1: Medium term planning brochure – AFCWG members to liaise with AF members regarding promotion of this document in their Member State.

5. NANOTECHNOLOGY

- 5.1. David Carlander presented the work of EFSA in the field of nanotechnologies, starting with brief background information on the use and presence of nanomaterials, addressing safety and risk assessment issues and highlighting the main uncertainties and challenges. Then he reported on the public consultation on the *draft EFSA guidance on risk assessment concerning potential risk arising from applications of nanoscience and nanotechnologies to food and feed* aimed at both applicants and risk assessors. He pointed out that the comments received during the public consultation will help to enhance the scientific quality and clarity of this practical guidance document. He informed the group that the adoption of the final guidance document is scheduled for early April and will be published shortly afterwards.
- 5.2. Germany asked what was the situation regarding the presence of nanomaterials in food. David Carlander responded that consumers can purchase foods containing nano-sized particles via the internet but that these are not manufactured within the EU. There are however, products available on the EU market with nano-sized particles e.g. nanosilver is used in food contact materials, silicon dioxide products, titanium nitride nanoparticles are allowed in PET used to make plastic containers, etc. He pointed out that this is a difficult area of science which is compounded by a lack of an internationally agreed definition of what is meant by nano-sized particles (number of nanometers). He also mentioned that there is an ongoing discussion about a regulatory definition for nanomaterials within the European Commission.



- 5.3. Laura Smillie then updated the members on the work carried out to date by the AFCWG task force on nanotechnology consisting of members from Austria, Germany, France, the Netherlands and EFSA. The taskforce organised a conference call during which they exchanged information on the nanotechnology debate and shared different initiatives taking place at Member State level. The group has created a list of topics to be raised at the AFCWG plenary discussions, i.e. existing national communication strategies on nanotechnology; the role of third parties, perception of nanotechnology in food sector vs. other sectors, is there a need for an EU communications strategy on nanotechnology and lastly, what is the role of the AFCWG?
- 5.4. Members agreed that due to its topicality, nanotechnology should become a standing agenda item at the AFCWG meetings. Based on the proposed topics, members were asked to provide feedback on what they would like to discuss in future meetings.
- 5.5. The UK pointed out that nanotechnology is either seen as an exciting development with enormous potential benefits or something we need to worry about when buying food and it was in the UK's interest to avoid the GMO situation. David Carlander mentioned that also EFSA Scientific Network for Risk Assessment of Nanotechnologies in Food and Feed (consisting of experts from Member States) picked up on the issue at its last meeting and will further discuss it. Anne-Laure Gassin suggested drafting a common FAQ on nanotechnology to help to develop common lines. It has been agreed that that the taskforce will prepare questions to be presented at the next AFCWG meeting in June.

***Action 2:** Nanotechnology - a standing agenda item at the AFCWG meetings. Taskforce would continue its work.*

***Action 3:** Taskforce to prepare a common FAQ on nanotechnology.*

6. UPDATE ON EFSA'S RISK COMMUNICATIONS STRATEGY AND RELATED ACTIVITIES

- 6.1. Anne-Laure Gassin briefly outlined EFSA's core achievements and future objectives. Then she explained EFSA's ongoing work on effectiveness and efficiency and organisational structure of EFSA, which would be implemented on 1 January 2012 (this will be done gradually with a first step starting on 1 May 2011).
- 6.2. Poland asked whether there will be any changes in the procedures for the health claim evaluation. Croatia was interested whether EFSA would get more involved in social media. Regarding the changes in the Communications Directorate, Germany asked which one of the two units (Editorial and Communication Channels) will be liaising with scientists. France was interested to know who will be in charge of the relations with stakeholders. Greece asked whether the merge of Advisory Forum and Scientific Cooperation Units will have an impact on the work of the Focal Points. Anne-Laure Gassin explained that re-organisation will have no impact on the evaluation of health claims; EFSA will continue working



according to the EU Regulation. Regarding social media, again re-organisation has no impact on EFSA's approach of getting more involved in social media over time; this will not change. Then Anne-Laure Gassin pointed out the Editorial unit (whose core activity will be drafting communications material) will be the primary point of contact with EFSA's scientists, liaise with them and monitor the scientific issues. The Channels Unit will be in touch with the scientists when preparing interviews, briefings, replying to media requests, etc. Stakeholders' relations will be covered by the Scientific Strategy and Coordination Directorate that is in charge also of cooperation with Member States, aiming at strengthening scientific cooperation with both the Member States (including Focal Points) and stakeholders. The Communications Directorate will work closely with the Scientific Strategy and Coordination Directorate. Torben Nilsson added that Advisory Forum and Scientific Cooperation unit will assume also the cooperation with pre-accession countries and related activities. He added that regarding the tasks of the Focal Points, these will not change; the re-organisations should help to improve cooperation.

- 6.3. Anne-Laure Gassin then updated the group on the latest developments regarding EFSA's integrated policy on independence (a reflection paper on the Review of EFSA's Policy on Declarations of Interest that was tabled at the Management Board meeting of 17 March was distributed to the AFCWG members).
- 6.4. France presented the new governance setup of ANSES, highlighting the creation of a committee for ethical standards and prevention of conflicts of interests, and explained the difficulties in finding experts who are perceived to be independent.
- 6.5. Laura Smillie asked who funds the Ethical Committee and who selects the members. France replied that ANSES funds the Committee and the members are selected by the Board of Directors and Minister of food, agriculture and fisheries. Germany pointed out receiving many media requests regarding EFSA's and BfR's scientific independence. Anne-Laure Gassin suggested EFSA's press office should get in touch with the BfR to exchange information and develop coherent lines. Steve Pagani mentioned that EFSA is questioned not only about its DoIs policy but also the selection procedures of the experts. Anne-Laure Gassin then proposed to create a small group to help inform EFSA's communication on independence and in particular to look at how EFSA can tailor its independence messages to specific national context/criticism. Members from Norway, Germany, France and Austria volunteered to be part of the group.

Action 4: *Transparency/Independence of science - a standing agenda item at the AFCWG meetings.*

Action 5: *EFSA's Press Office to liaise with the members from BfR regarding the questions from German media on EFSA's independence.*



***Action 6:** Taskforce consisting of members from NO, DE, AT and FR to help inform EFSA's communication on independence and to look at how EFSA can adapt its independence messages to specific national context/criticism.*

7. CO-OPERATION IN COMMUNICATIONS

- 7.1. Christoph Buller presented the EFSA's integrated communications approach in the area of Zoonoses, whose aim is to help target audiences become aware, understand, appreciate and advocate EFSA's work and cooperation in the area of Zoonoses.
- 7.2. Norway welcomed the integrated approach, highlighting that the cooperation with Member States should become easier and this should also lead to better overall understanding and communications on the topic. The UK asked whether EFSA identified any barriers and/or challenges to succeed in this work. Anne-Laure Gassin pointed out that the integrated approach should provide more opportunities than challenges as it enables a creation of a more integrated plan with the Member States, i.e. Member States can provide a national context to the bigger picture and asked the group if they could provide EFSA with information on national programmes/campaigns currently in place and/or planned in MS in the area of Zoonoses.

***Action 7:** Zoonoses - members to provide information on their existing and/or planned national programmes/campaigns in the area of Zoonoses.*

- 7.3. Hugues Kenigswald, the Head of Food Additives and Nutrient Sources added to food (ANS) Unit presented EFSA's scientific work on Aspartame. He provided an overview of previous European scientific evaluations and of recent and ongoing activities of EFSA as well as Member States and other international bodies. He informed the group that the ANS Panel will undertake further work on aspartame to issue an opinion on the recent results reported by Soffritti *et al.*
- 7.4. France and Lucia de Luca reported on the cooperation between France and EFSA on recent scientific studies on aspartame, with specific reference to the communications aspects.
- 7.5. Hugues Kenigswald pointed out that ANSES' conclusions were similar to those of the EFSA statement made on 28 February 2011. He also highlighted that EFSA continuously monitors scientific literature and liaises with both the national risk assessors in the Member States through its Advisory Forum and with food safety agencies in USA, Canada, Australia, New Zealand and Japan.



DAY 2 – 24TH MARCH 2011 – 09H00 - 13H00

8. “KEY TOPICS”

- 8.1. Anne-Laure Gassin extended her thanks and informed the group that Austria, Bulgaria, Germany, Greece, Hungary and the UK had sent their key country issues (all available on the Extranet). She reminded the members to regularly upload information on the Extranet calendar created specifically for sharing information on EFSA’s and Member States’ upcoming scientific issues/events and related communication activities relevant for the group.
- 8.2. Germany briefed the members on a recent case of dioxins in animal feed in Germany, which triggered a major public concern, although it did not pose any risk for consumers. The handling of the crisis highlighted the importance and challenges of risk communications. The topic was widely covered by media and the early communication to press agencies proved to be crucial.
- 8.3. Sweden was interested to know whether public understood BfR’s explanation of the risk. Laura Smillie asked how the BfR managed to explain the complicated notion of “body burden of dioxins.” Germany replied that they used a calculation of dioxin intake via consumption of eggs over a period of time and also pointed out that the press was more interested in understanding and knowing more about the issue than the public. The UK was interested in how BfR handled the situation when Foodwatch accused the government of playing the dioxin scandal down. Ireland asked whether the BfR had to deal at all with the economic issues. Germany replied that BfR were in contact with the Ministry and advised the Federal Minister for Consumer Protection to present an action plan. BfR did not need to deal with the economic issues, which fall under the remit of the Ministry. Laura Smillie then asked whether BfR carried out any joint communications activities with other Member States. Germany responded that they informed EFSA and since it was primarily a German issue there was no need to coordinate communication with other MS. Moreover, there was neither time nor resources to translate the communication material.
- 8.4. Laura Smillie thanked Germany for very interesting presentation and suggested to include this case study in the risk communications guidelines. She also reminded the group to complete the questionnaire on German dioxin contamination in order to help the DG Research project FoodRisC consortium establish what sort of communications were carried out for across the EU in relation to this particular incident.
- 8.5. Sweden reported on the metal contamination of baby food and outlined communications activities carried out by the Swedish National Food Administration (NFA). Early communication and providing balanced information helped to avoid panic and alarming media coverage.



8.6. Anne-Laure Gassin briefly updated the group on EFSA's work on manganese, arsenic and cadmium in food, pointing out that the Authority has ongoing monitoring in place. Hungary asked whether the NFA used social media, in particular facebook. Cyprus was interested to know whether the NFA's communications activities would differ if the producer of the baby food was from Sweden or abroad. Sweden responded that all information was published on the NFA website, facebook was not used. The nationality of the producer would have no impact on NFA's communications activities. Laura Smillie asked about the profiles of the two spokespeople and whether, in retrospect, NFA would pre-notify health care specialists. Sweden replied that the two spokespeople were both toxicologists and NFA would not pre-notify health care specialists but keep them informed of developments.

***Action 8:** Forward planning calendar: EFSA and members to regularly upload information on their communications activities relevant for the group. EFSA's uploading time – every Friday early afternoon.*

***Action 9:** DG Research - FoodRisC project - learning from this project, i.e. use of social media in food safety and risk communications guidelines will be shared with the AFCWG as soon as available (most likely at the October meeting).*

***Action 10:** Members to complete the Questionnaire on communication on dioxin contamination in Germany for input for the FoodRisC project.*

9. EFSA'S WORK ON EMERGING RISKS

9.1. Tobin Robinson, the Head of EFSA's Emerging Risks Unit presented EFSA's work in the field of emerging risks. He explained the development of a process for the identification of emerging risks in the food chain; provided a definition of an emerging risk, then explained an emerging risk identification system and concluded with feedback from EFSA's 15th Colloquium on Emerging Risks in Food.

9.2. Laura Smillie addressed the issue of communicating on emerging risks. She pointed out that at present there is no dedicated communications strategy to guide work on emerging issues but that this can be achieved in the future in cooperation with experts. She also highlighted that when communicating on risk we need to consider more holistic approach. Anne-Laure Gassin added that communicating on emerging risk means communicating on uncertainty and avoiding creating panic.

9.3. Germany asked whether EFSA was involved in the risk assessment of radiation contamination from the nuclear power plant in Japan. Anne-Laure Gassin responded that EFSA has received several media queries, prepared media lines and will shortly publish on its website information explaining EFSA's role (i.e. not directly involved due to its mandate) and providing information on relevant bodies dealing with the issue.



10. JOINT ACTIVITIES - RISK COMMUNICATIONS GUIDELINES & GLOSSARY OF FOOD AND FEED SAFETY RELATED TERMS

- 10.1. Laura Smillie apologised for not providing the draft risk communications guidelines to the members before the meeting as agreed. She pointed out that objective of the discussion was to finalise the guidelines and present them to the group at the next meeting in June. She proposed creating a taskforce to help to finalise the document. Members from Norway, Portugal and the UK volunteered to be part of the small group.
- 10.2. Following the changes suggested at the last meeting, which were all taken into consideration, members went through the guidelines document and further commented on the draft. It has been agreed that:
- more relevant case studies should be included in the guidelines
 - tools and channels chapter should contain an introduction to better explain these tools and put them in context and add in the channels “newsletter” and “digitals”
 - review the case study on animal health and welfare
 - ensure that the classification of risks from a communications point of view (to support the development of appropriate communications approaches) is not perceived as a scientific quantification of the level of risk
 - guidelines will be periodically updated – standing agenda item 1-2 times per year
 - guidelines regularly updated with new case studies, valuable lessons are learnt from case studies
 - replace “big” and “small” with “high” and “low” when communicating on risk (in the check list)
 - explain clearly in the guidelines that risk assessment and risk management interface
- 10.3. Laura Smillie thanked the members for their contribution and moved on to the next topic - common project to strengthen relations with media; creation of a shared glossary. She updated the group on the progress made to date. EFSA has been liaising with proofreaders and scientific colleagues to gather further information on existing glossaries and mainly with the internal EFSA’s taskforce dealing with harmonisation of scientific terms. In order to centralise the processes, Laura Smillie suggested postponing the AFCWG work on the glossary of food safety related terms until the end of the 2011 when results of EFSA’s Scientific Committee’s Working Group will be available. All members agreed with the proposal.

Action 11: *Risk Communication guidelines - Taskforce created to finalise the Risk Communications Guidelines to be presented at the next AFCWG meeting in June. Members include: Laura Smillie, Norway, Portugal and the UK.*

Action 12: *Common project to strengthen relations with media - Glossary of food safety terms – project postponed till the end of the 2011 when results of the internal EFSA’s taskforce dealing with harmonisation of scientific terms will be available.*



11. RESULTS OF 2010 EUROBAROMETER ON FOOD-RELATED

- 11.1. Laura Smillie reiterated the Advisory Forum's request for the AFCWG to draft a report analysing the national data based on the Eurobarometer findings. She explained the importance of the analysis of national data (that can only be interpreted by the Member State that has the knowledge of the local market) for further strategic discussions and for better understanding how the national data impacts on communications work.
- 11.2. Laura Smillie thanked members who have submitted their national report to EFSA and invited the remaining members to provide EFSA with their analysis of national data at their earliest convenience. Hungary mentioned that EFSA's feedback on the questionnaire on dioxin contamination in Germany as well as on the Eurobarometer findings would be appreciated. Laura Smillie suggested that rather than providing individual feedback, Member States' feedback on both questionnaires can be discussed at the June meeting when information from all members will be available.
- 11.3. Lastly, Laura Smillie thanked the members for revising their national media lists and reminded the remaining members if they could provide EFSA with their national media lists at their earliest convenience.

***Action 13:** Members to complete the questionnaire drafted by EFSA to help them prepare analysis of their national data (based on Eurobarometer findings).*

***Action 14:** Revised national media lists: Members from the Netherlands, the UK and Turkey to provide EFSA with their revised national media lists.*

12. EFSA SCIENTIFIC COOPERATION

- 12.1. Kerstin Gross-Helmert presented the Annual Focal Point Report 2010 and the proposed priorities for the work of the Focal Points in 2011.
- 12.2. Anne-Laure Gassin complimented the work and achievements of the Focal Point network. Norway was interested to know how AFCWG members can better cooperate with the national Focal Points, considering that the priority of the Focal Points was to further increase the outreach in the Member States. Kerstin Gross-Helmert pointed out that Focal Points' priorities vary from one Member State to another. She also mentioned that cooperation between the AFCWG and Focal Points vary from close to distant and highlighted the importance of further discussing enhanced cooperation of these two networks. Members agreed with Anne-Laure Gassin's suggestion to organise a joint AFCWG/Focal Points meeting in 2012.

***Action 15:** Joint AFCWG/FP meeting in 2012 - EFSA to identify a date in 2012 to organise a joint AFCWG/FP meeting to discuss cooperation in communications.*



13. COMMUNICATIONS: INFORMATION EXCHANGE AND FORWARD PLANNING

- 13.1. Yenny Gamming shared with the group EFSA's experience in dealing with biased articles about the Authority on Wikipedia. She talked about different processes for seeking changes to Wikipedia articles; explained Wikipedia's guidelines and rules on editing information when there are conflicts of interest; and stressed the importance of separating points of view from factual information. She invited members to share their experience with Wikipedia. Information on EFSA on Wikipedia can be found in many different languages, i.e. CZ, DE, ES, FI, FR, IT, LT, NL, PL, PT and SE. Yenny Gamming asked members from the relevant Member States whether they could review the accuracy of the text on EFSA and provide feedback.
- 13.2. Ireland presented the FSAI social media policy, drafted due to the high popularity and wide use of social media in Ireland. Other objectives included: to reach a wider audience; interact with and seek input from stakeholders; be proactive; improve customer service; build a greater online profile and a community around food safety. The FSAI has created a facebook page and is also present on YouTube (the second biggest search engine in the world). Ireland highlighted that being involved in social media is very resource intensive (IT and HR issues to consider) and concluded that having the social media policy in place facilitated not only the FSAI's involvement in social media but also protects FSAI and staff.
- 13.3. It has been agreed that Social media will become a standing agenda item at the AFCWG meetings. Members are welcome to share their experiences with social media and their social media policies. In this context, Norway proposed to present its social media strategy at the next AFCWG meeting in June and Sweden agreed to provide the group with their social media policy (presented at the meeting in Vienna in December 2010) and relevant staff guidelines.
- 13.4. EFSA's Press Officers provided an overview of upcoming scientific issues for which future communications are foreseen. These included: the development of guidance for the risk assessment of animal welfare; campylobacter in chicken meat; annual EU Report on antimicrobial resistance in zoonotic agents (2009); and public health impact of setting new target for Salmonella in broilers. Furthermore, they reported on the upcoming pest risk analysis on phytophthora ramorum (commonly known as "sudden oak death"); publications of 4th series of general function health claims, the safety of irradiation of food; bioavailability of aluminium; annual scientific report on acrylamide levels in food; and a revision of the guidance document on dermal absorption. Other topics for which communication is planned included: launch of new call for scientific experts to join EFSA Scientific Committee and Panels; increased levels of zearalenone (ZEA) in food; dioxins and dioxin-like PCBs in liver from sheep and venison; GM maize 1507 for cultivation; food and feed safety assessment of products derived from GM animals; selection of



comparators for GM plants; and food/feed guidance document for risk assessment of GM plants.

- 13.5. Monika Adamova briefed the members on a media visit from new Member States organised in Parma on 4 March. She pointed out that the aim of the media visit was to establish new contacts with key media in Member States where EFSA's work has been less covered as well as explain EFSA's work, clarify its role and provide an insight into the main scientific issues. Participants included 10 journalists from Bulgaria, Cyprus, the Czech Republic, Estonia, Hungary, Latvia, Lithuania, Poland, Romania and Slovakia. Monika Adamova thanked the members from Bulgaria, Cyprus, Estonia, Lithuania, and Romania for their cooperation and support with identifying the relevant journalists in their Member States covering food safety related issues.

Action 16: Social media - a standing agenda item at the AFCWG meetings.

Action 17: Members welcome to share their experiences with social media and their social media policies.

Action 18: Norway will present their social media strategy at the next AFCWG meeting.

Action 19: Sweden to provide EFSA + members with their social media policy and relevant staff guidelines.

Action 20: EFSA in Wikipedia – members from CZ, DE, ES, FI, FR, IT, LT, NL, PL, PT and SE to review the accuracy of the text on EFSA on Wikipedia.

14. ANY OTHER BUSINESS

- 14.1. Anne-Laure Gassin reminded the group that the next meeting will take place in Budapest on 21-22 June. Members were invited to propose agenda topics for the upcoming meetings. The Chair thanked the members for their presence as well as the EFSA staff and the interpreters for their work. As no other points were raised, Anne-Laure Gassin closed the meeting at 13h00.

Action 21: AFCWG meeting in October 2011 – volunteer to host the meeting.