

EFSA Stakeholder Consultative Platform

Christine Majewski

**Director of International and
Institutional Relations
EFSA**

Parma 9th and 10th March 2006

Article 61 - Regulation 178/2002

1. Before 1 January 2005 and every six years thereafter, the Authority, in collaboration with the Commission, shall commission an independent external evaluation of its achievements on the basis of the terms of reference issued by the Management Board in agreement with the Commission. The evaluation will assess the working practices and the impact of the Authority. The evaluation will take into account the views of the stakeholders, at both Community and national level.

Article 61 - Regulation 178/2002

- 1 (cont) The Management Board of the Authority shall examine the conclusions of the evaluation and issue to the Commission such recommendations as may be necessary regarding changes in the Authority and its working practices. The evaluation and the recommendations shall be made public.
- (2. Commission report on General Food law)
3. The reports and recommendations referred to in paragraphs 1 (and 2) shall be forwarded to the Council and the European Parliament.

How we got here

1. Terms of Reference adopted by Board following September 2004 meeting – written procedure
2. Management Board establishes a steering Committee of its members with the assistance of EFSA staff
3. External evaluators appointed January 05
4. Interim report June 05
5. Final report – 5 December 05
6. Web consultation December - 28th February 06

Next steps

1. Management Board - 28/29th March 06 and will look at comments on the evaluation report from the web-consultation, the Advisory Forum, Stakeholder Consultative Platform, EFSA staff.
2. Invited to their discussion will be representatives from the scientific committee, Stakeholder Consultative Platform, AF, EFSA management team.
3. Recommendations from the Board to the Commission expected for the June 06 meeting

Overall

- positive
- EFSA - doing well considering its budget, move to Parma only operational 2 years
- Still in learning process
- Structures in place / functioning
- Scientific work – added value
- Risk communication better than pre-EFSA

Overall

- Good relations with stakeholders
- Largely completed installing its legal competences
- Some weak spots
- AF and Scientific Committee/Panels - Work in progress
- Overworked staff - Better tools for priority setting/better management generally

Overall

- Changing policy environment – nutrition
- Fees - - but no political support
- Better networking with the Member States
- Consumer confidence neither increased nor decreased
- Crisis prevention ?
- Scientific excellence independence

Overall

- Need more diversity of scientific expertise in Panels
- Industry experts
- Communications of risk – insufficient co-ordination – lacks clarity
- Could generate cost savings across the EU if duplication avoided in MSs
- Parma
- Fuzzy regulation

Recommendations in the Evaluation report

1. Develop cooperation between EFSA and MSs
2. Expand staffing for support to the Panels and scientific expert services
3. Relocation to Parma - successful
4. Improve communications
5. Consolidate EFSA organisation at general and scientific level

Recommendations in the Evaluation report

6. Seamless adequacy between resources and activities

7. Pay attention to good relationships with stakeholders and EU institutions

Recommendations in the Evaluation report EFSA and Commission

1. Stimulate good practices between EFSA and the Commission and MSs eg– crisis exercise
2. Improve interactions with Commission, harmonised and realistic timeframes in legislation and in practice for scientific opinions

Recommendations EFSA and MS

Avoid duplication of work

Recommendations

Four strategic planning topics for MB

- 3 year plan
- Nutrition
- 10 year vision and road map
- Relationship between science and policy

Consultation highlights

More work on nutrition !!!

Consultation highlights - interactions

- **Better risk communication co-ordinated with risk managers (the MS and the Commission)**
- **More independence of industry / more use of industry expertise**
- **Stakeholders would like more input (data etc) into work of Panels**
- **Stakeholders able to suggest topics for self tasking**
- **More opportunities to comment on draft reports and risk assessments**
- **Better - user friendly website**

Consultation highlights - science

- EFSA risk assessments are prepared on a very high level

Looking Forward:

- Better descriptions of uncertainty and assumptions
- Develop procedures so that the best possible risk assessment quality can be assured - review
- Development of risk-benefit-assessment-methodology
- Better/earlier identification of emerging risks
- EFSA to work more on standardization of risk assessment processes across the MSs and applicable in MSs – EFSA THE REFERENCE on RA

Consultation highlights - Resources

- **EFSA needs proper resources and good management practices**
- **Generally against fees for EFSA work (except one interested company)**
- **EFSA's priorities should be worked out with the budgetary authorities**
- **Higher indemnities for scientific experts on Panels**

Consultation highlights

- **Develop cooperation/active networking with MS bodies e.g. annual AF meeting discussing the mandate, purpose, expectations, and forward plans for the Advisory Forum**
- **More scientific colloquia on different subjects, either held by EFSA alone, or in cooperation with national or international risk assessment bodies**
- **Increase active and frequent exchange of information with MSs on science, emerging issues**
- **Better networking with International bodies**

Consultation highlights

- **More transparency in the risk assessment process**
- **Uniformity and transparency in the method of consultation on draft reports / opinions i.e. Criteria for consultation and longer consultation periods**
- **Better transparency on scientific work and management of this – eg in relation to declarations of interest**

EFSA in Parma



Parma 9th and 10th March 2006

21