



European Food Safety Authority

Scientific Cooperation Unit

Parma, 5 December 2008

Interim Review of the Strategy for Cooperation and Networking between EU Member States and EFSA

Interim Review of the Strategy for Cooperation and Networking between EU Member States and EFSA

Table of contents

| | | |
|-------|---|----|
| 1 | Background | 7 |
| 2 | Introduction..... | 8 |
| 3 | The consultation of Member States..... | 9 |
| 3.1 | The methodology of the consultation of Member States..... | 9 |
| 3.2 | The results from the consultation of Member States..... | 9 |
| 3.3 | Discussion of the results from the consultation with Member States | 10 |
| 4 | Review of the activities to “Strengthening Member States’ cooperation”..... | 11 |
| 4.1 | Advisory Forum..... | 11 |
| 4.2 | Establishment of Focal Points..... | 11 |
| 4.3 | The Steering Group Cooperation..... | 11 |
| 4.4 | Prioritisation and planning of cooperation activities | 12 |
| 4.5 | Managing and facilitating ad hoc liaison groups | 14 |
| 4.6 | Raising the profile of risk assessment institutes in the EU..... | 14 |
| | Feedback from the Advisory Forum Members on “Strengthening Member States’ cooperation” | 16 |
| 5 | Review of the chapter on specific cooperation projects..... | 17 |
| 5.1 | Priority area 1: Exchanging and collecting scientific data and information..... | 17 |
| 5.1.1 | Collect, collate, and analyse relevant data | 17 |
| 5.1.2 | Enhancing the exchange of information | 18 |
| 5.1.3 | Establishment of efficient systems for the active exchange of information..... | 19 |
| 5.2 | Priority area 2: Sharing risk assessment practices | 20 |
| 5.2.1 | Pilot projects..... | 20 |
| 5.2.2 | Programme of courses in risk assessment and of study tours | 20 |
| 5.2.3 | Response to urgent issues and crisis situations..... | 21 |
| 5.2.4 | Database of national scientific experts..... | 21 |
| 5.3 | Priority area 3: Contributing to the harmonisation of methodologies for risk assessment..... | 23 |
| 5.4 | Priority area 4: Communication Cooperation Projects | 24 |
| 6 | Additional initiatives | 25 |
| 7 | Discussion, Conclusion and Recommendation | 25 |
| 7.1 | Strengthening Member States’ cooperation..... | 25 |
| 7.2 | Priority areas..... | 26 |
| 7.3 | Possible additional initiatives and suggestions | 27 |
| 8 | Tables. Overview of cooperation activities with Member States following the priorities as identified in the Strategy for Cooperation and Networking | 28 |
| 9 | Appendix I. Mandates of the Scientific Panels and SCA units of EFSA | 48 |


Interim Review of the Strategy for Cooperation and Networking

In 2006, the Management Board endorsed the Strategy for Cooperation and Networking, thereby emphasizing cooperation and networking between EFSA and its counterparts in Member States to be a key priority. The overall objective of this Strategy is to strengthen cooperation between EFSA and Member States in order to support the development of risk assessments in all fields within EFSA's remit. The Management Board agreed, as laid down within the Strategy, that a review would take place within two years of its existence i.e. by the end of 2008.

Cooperation through the Advisory Forum in collaboration with the Scientific Committee.

The Strategy on Cooperation and Networking calls for strengthening Member States' cooperation through the Advisory Forum in collaboration with the Scientific Committee, which are both key in the strategic coordination of the cooperation (Figure 1). As foreseen in the Strategy, two new initiatives have been set up. First, since late 2007, Focal Points were established in all Member States. They support the Advisory Forum Members with their daily work related to networking and scientific cooperation. The Member States recommended that, based on the positive experience gained in the first year, the Focal Points network should be strengthened. Second, the Steering Group on Cooperation, in which both the Scientific Committee and the Advisory Forum are participating, was set up to provide oversight on joint projects (ESCO Working Groups).

Figure 1. Cooperation between Advisory Forum and Scientific Committee




The cooperation was strengthened at all levels at which it takes place (Figure 2):

- the Member State networks;
- the individual organisations in Member States, and
- individual experts who join the Scientific Panels and their working groups.

o

Figure 2. EFSA Processes and Elements of Cooperation with the Member States.



With the implementation of the Strategy, several dedicated scientific networks have been created or strengthened in the areas of data collection (food consumption, chemical occurrence) and risk assessment (animal health, plant health, GMO, BSE).

Since 2007, the competent organisations under Article 36 carry out a variety of scientific tasks, particularly the preparation of opinions or data collection, which are financed through grants. In addition, research organisations are commissioned to carry out scientific work through public procurement. The total amount spent on both activities was 2.9 million € in 2007, whereas in 2008 EFSA will have spent 5.8 million € on these activities, with a proposed further increase in 2009 for a total of 7.5 million €.

The original list of competent organisations adopted by the Management Board was updated with organisations from Bulgaria and Romania (Dec. 2007) and currently includes 243 organisations. The additional 128 institutions submitted for approval to the Management Board will broaden the coverage of competencies in the Member States. In addition to the more than 200 current Panel Members, some 1100 ad hoc experts have supported EFSA in its work. The upcoming renewal of the Scientific Committee and Scientific Panels, provides an opportunity to increase the number of experts from new Member States. To raise the profile of EFSA in newer Member States, two seminars, one in Budapest and one in Warsaw, were held in the fall of 2008. Also, in order to better support the work of the Scientific Panels, an expert database was created. The database holds information on external scientific experts capable of and willing to assist Member States and EFSA. The use of the database also enhances the transparency of the selection process. By mid November, more that 1000 applications have been received from over 40 countries. Member States will be invited to join by sharing their national databases.

The Strategy foresees activities to strengthen Member States' cooperation through the Advisory Forum in collaboration with the Scientific Committee. Furthermore, four priority areas were identified:

- Exchanging and collecting scientific data and information;
- Sharing risk assessment practices;
- Contributing to the harmonisation of methodologies for risk assessment;
- Promoting coherence in risk communications.

The four priority areas of the strategy

Priority area 1. The exchange of scientific data and information between and among Member States and EFSA has been intensified. To streamline data collection, exchange, and analysis a strategy has been developed by EFSA in the last year. As noted above, the data collection activities through various networks have increased considerably. Focal Points play a key role in the information exchange, including on numerous questionnaires. To foster the information exchange, an Information Exchange Platform has been set up between EFSA and the Member States.

Priority area 2. EFSA and Member States have taken several initiatives to share risk assessment practices through the establishment of (five) Working Groups on Scientific Cooperation Projects (ESCO), two of which have been completed successfully in 2008 and will feed in the work of EFSA's Panels and Scientific Committee. In this area, workshops have also been organised in pre-accession countries and with current Member States to raise awareness of EFSA's work. Bilateral meetings between EFSA and Member States took place, e.g. in areas where diverging opinions occurred or could have occurred. To be prepared for crises situations, exercises have been conducted with participation from Member States.

Priority area 3. The first initiative on harmonisation of risk assessment methodologies concerned an ESCO Working Group on harmonisation of existing guidance which has completed its first report. For new scientific areas, EFSA regularly organises scientific colloquia and other scientific events which give the opportunity for an open exchange of scientific views among experts. Finally, during the development of new guidance, consultation with Competent Authorities of Member States, stakeholders and the public on draft documents has become routine practice at EFSA.

Priority area 4. Cooperation and coherence in communications has been implemented through the Advisory Forum Communications Working Group (AFCWG). EFSA initiated a review of that group's Terms of Reference in 2007 which was endorsed by the Advisory Forum. The updates to the Terms of Reference focused on strengthening cooperation and coherence in practical ways. Pre-notification and sharing of communications between members, including early warning on emerging and topical issues, is consistently the highest priority. Strengthening that practical two-way, timely and responsive cooperation will continue to be a priority for EFSA. Three newsletters focused on scientific co-operation have been published, 13 joint events organised in 2007/08 with national food safety authorities, EFSA's website contains a dedicated area on cooperation with Member States, and links between EFSA's website and websites of organisations of Advisory Forum Members have been established.

Recommendations

For the interim review of the Strategy, an internal EFSA working group was established to carry out the review process. Feedback was sought from both the Member States and also the Scientific Committee through a questionnaire.

It should be recognised that the time for implementation of the Strategy has been limited and only an interim review of progress towards the Strategy is possible at this stage. Nevertheless, Member States' views on the implementation of the Strategy were very positive. There was a consensus that:

- the cooperation and networking between EFSA and Member States has been well developed and should be continued;
- there is no need to start new activities but there is a need to further strengthen some of the existing initiatives.

The Advisory Forum indicated the need to further strengthen the activities on harmonisation of risk assessment, data collection, and training.

With the first wave of Art. 36 projects to be finalised in 2009, EFSA will be able to assess and monitor the impact they have had on its work. For the competent organisations under Art. 36 to function optimally in all areas within EFSA's remit, it is essential that the list is regularly kept up to date, as described under the review of the activities carried out

Interim Review of the Strategy for Cooperation and Networking between EU Member States and EFSA

under Art. 36. Furthermore, it is proposed to further foster the networking of these organisations via additional initiatives i.e. to develop the Art. 36 list into a broadly available database with a dedicated extranet space.

The dedicated Member State networks that have been established could be further strengthened by giving them, where appropriate, a more permanent character. This includes the Focal Points.

The harmonization of risk assessment guidance is the activity identified by the Member States as having the highest priority. It is essential to foster good practices and enable mutual recognition of risk assessments among Member States. The efforts by the Scientific Committee and several organisations in the Member States provide a good basis for further development of this work both for general risk assessment approaches as well as for specific areas within EFSA's remit.

The request from newer Member States to further increase training activities is important to address. This can be resource-intensive though and hence needs to be well defined. EFSA could develop such training together with Member States that already have experience in this area and consider operating this through existing training programmes e.g. from the European Commission, thereby avoiding duplication of effort.

1 Background

EFSA was created in 2003, following a series of food scares in Europe. Earlier or at around the same time, many National Food Safety Authorities were created in Member States.

Scientific cooperation between Member States and EFSA is critical to:

- Identify priorities and co-ordinate work programmes, thereby avoiding duplication of activities;
- Appropriately allocate resources against those priorities by sharing the workload;
- Early identification and analysis of emerging risks;
- Increased coherence in scientific risk assessment through the sharing of data, scientific expertise, and risk assessment methods; and
- Coherence in risk communications.

EFSA is governed by a Management Board and cooperates closely with Member States via its Advisory Forum, where all national bodies with a comparable remit are represented.

The role of EFSA is to assess and communicate on risks associated with the food chain which are of relevance to EU citizens. Requests for scientific assessments are received from the European Commission, the European Parliament and EU Member States. EFSA also undertakes scientific work on its own initiative (self-tasking).

Scientific Opinions are produced by ten Scientific Panels, overseen by a Scientific Committee and a series of networks with representations of Member States. Other scientific outputs are produced through collaboration between external experts and EFSA staff.

In June 2006, EFSA's Management Board recommended that "furthering the development of active networking with Member States and strengthening the involvement/cooperation with national competent authorities should be high on EFSA's agenda. The Advisory Forum committed itself to further increasing scientific cooperation by formalising the exchange of scientific information. This agreement was formalised with the Declaration of Intent signed in Bern in 2006 between the Member States and EFSA.

2 Introduction

In 2006, the Management Board endorsed the Strategy for Networking and Cooperation. This Strategy sets out the framework for cooperation and networking between the EU Member States and EFSA in order to support the development of risk assessments in all fields within EFSA's remit: food and feed safety, nutrition; animal health and welfare, plant health and plant protection. The Strategy recognises four priority areas for the establishment of a common approach of risk assessments and communication outputs throughout Europe. The four priority areas are:

- Exchanging and collecting scientific data and information;
- Sharing risk assessment practices;
- Contributing to the harmonisation of methodologies for risk assessment; and
- Promoting coherence in risk communications.

In addition, the Strategy foresees activities to strengthen Member States' cooperation through the Advisory Forum in collaboration with the Scientific Committee. The Management Board agreed, as laid down within the Strategy, that a review should take place within two years of its existence, *i.e.* by the end of 2008.

In 2008, the Advisory Forum agreed that as part of the review process a questionnaire should be distributed to all Member States via the Advisory Forum Members to review/collate their views on the Strategy. This report includes the findings of that questionnaire.

3 The consultation of Member States

3.1 *The methodology of the consultation of Member States*

An internal working group was established with representatives from each EFSA directorate. A questionnaire was developed to take stock of the activities that have happened, to review if new areas of priorities are needed and to identify how to address the challenges in the area of scientific cooperation between Member States and EFSA in the future.

The draft questionnaire was discussed and commented upon by the Advisory Forum in August 2008. In September 2008, the final questionnaire was sent to all 27 Member States and Norway, Switzerland and Iceland via Advisory Forum Members, together with a paper on "*Previous and Current Scientific Cooperation with Member States - State of Play July 2008*" describing the scientific cooperation projects and activities carried out to date. It was suggested to respondents to read the paper before answering the questionnaire, and to consult their Focal Point, Advisory Forum Communications Working Group Member (AFCWG), and Advisory Forum IT Working Group Member (AFITWG) when filling in the questionnaire.

The first part of the questionnaire (*Implementation of the existing Strategy*) asked for views on the different activities highlighted in the Strategy. Following each paragraph of the Strategy, the respondent was asked to mark whether the activity(ies) in that paragraph was considered (still) important and, if so, whether they should be continued at the same activity level, at increased or decreased activity levels and/or whether new activities should be initiated. In addition, in part b of each question, the respondents were asked whether they considered activities done so far to be 'well done' or if the activities 'need improvement'. At the end of each question, a comments section was provided where respondents could give further comments. Respondents who replied that new activities should be started or felt that activity(ies) needed improvement were asked to specify this in the comments section.

The format of the questionnaire was different for priority area 4: Promoting coherence in risk communication, because the corresponding text in the Strategy has been further developed through the revision of the Terms of Reference discussed by and agreed on by both the AFCWG and the Advisory Forum in 2007. Respondents were provided with the new Terms of Reference of the AFCWG. They were asked whether they were aware of the group's work and to specify on what areas the AFCWG should focus on in the next few years by indicating a level of priority on a scale of 1-4 for a number of items listed.

The second part of the questionnaire (*Additional initiatives*) asked for views on additional initiatives that could not sufficiently be addressed in part 1.

3.2 *The results from the consultation of Member States*

This section provides an oversight on the views from Member States on the Strategy for Cooperation and Networking. The specific comments and views regarding the different activities are given in the respective sections (4. "Strengthening Member States' cooperation" and 5. "Specific cooperation projects") as well as in section 7. "Conclusions and recommendations".

Overall, eighteen countries replied. Responses were generally received from countries with a high level of participation in the scientific cooperation activities.

The EFSA Secretariat also sought the views of the Scientific Committee and EFSA's scientific units. All comments received are also summarised in sections 4 and 5, but not in the statistical analysis.

Figure 3. below illustrates (as stacked bars) the number of Member States stating, for each activity in the different priority areas (excluding priority area 4 on Communication), to continue activity(ies) at an decreased, same or increased activity level. The majority of Member States indicated that, overall, most activities should be continued at their current level, but indicated mainly three activities for which to increase the level of activity, namely data collection, harmonisation of risk assessment methodologies and the Focal Points.




Figure 3. Prioritisation among different activities.

3.3 Discussion of the results from the consultation with Member States

Figure 4 illustrates (as stacked bars), for each activity described within the priority areas (excluding priority area 4 on Communication), the number of Member States who replied well done, or need improvement on the activities carried out so far. On average, 75 % of the respondents rated the activities as well done, indicating a good level of satisfaction with the cooperation activities initiated so far. The main three areas, however, where further improvement is welcomed are training, data collection and harmonisation of risk assessment methodologies.




Figure 4. Appreciation of the different areas/activities (replies to part b. of the questionnaire).

4 Review of the activities to “Strengthening Member States’ cooperation”

This section summarises the main cooperation projects and activities to strengthen Member States’ cooperation,

This takes place at:

- Member State level (Advisory Forum and Focal Point and their respective Working Groups);
- The level of networks of Member States as well as through joint Working Groups (ESCO) in which both Member States and the Scientific Committee are present;
- The level of organisations in Member States. This is supported through contracts and grants;
- The level of individual experts participating in the work of Panels and working groups.

Scientific cooperation with third countries and international organisations is addressed separately in EFSA’s International Strategy.

Cooperation at Member State level

4.1 Advisory Forum

EFSA’s Founding Regulation specifies clearly that EFSA shall cooperate with competent bodies in Member States and establish the Advisory Forum to constitute a mechanism of information and to ensure a close cooperation. This forum is the principal network for cooperation between EFSA and National Food Safety Authorities. Its Members represent each national body responsible for risk assessment in the EU, with observers from EFTA/EEA/pre-accessing countries as well as the European Commission and the European Parliament.

It meets around 5 times per year and discusses topics of common interest. As foreseen in EFSA’s Founding Regulation, the Advisory Forum regularly provides advice to EFSA’s Executive Director on EFSA’s work programme and, upon request, on the prioritisation of requests for scientific opinions.

It is also the body where the scientific cooperation projects are presented and discussed; yearly and strategic national programmes are exchanged and EFSA’s strategic programme is discussed.

Besides this advisory role, it is also foreseen that the Advisory Forum constitutes a mechanism to exchange information, to pool knowledge to avoid duplication of scientific studies, to cooperate on clarifying and resolving diverging opinions and to promote European networking.

4.2 Establishment of Focal Points

In order to support the concrete implementation of their tasks, the Advisory Forum Members are assisted through a network of Focal Points. This network is now established in all Member States. In this frame, EFSA has provided financial support of a total of 610,000 €. Focal Points have submitted reports on their activities carried out during their first year. Based on this, a consolidated report has been prepared by the EFSA Secretariat (Report on Focal Point Activities 2008¹).

4.3 The Steering Group Cooperation

The Steering Group on Cooperation comprises a membership from the Committee and the Advisory Forum. Its role is to provide an oversight on the implementation of cooperation activities, particularly the activities and progress of the ESCO Working Groups.

¹ Ref. EFSA/FP/2008/026/RES

Cooperation with organisations in Member States

4.4 Prioritisation and planning of cooperation activities

Scientific cooperation projects carried out by organisations in Member States have been initiated on data collection, preparatory work for opinions and guidance documents, and other scientific or technical support. The proposed areas for scientific cooperation projects are included in the annual Work Programme and reviewed by the Advisory Forum and the Scientific Committee.

Since 2007, EFSA has substantially expanded the number of contracts and grants with organisations in Member States. Whereas 2.9 million € was spent in 2007, in 2008 EFSA will have been spent 5.8 million € for such projects. In preparation of the 2009 programme, proposals provided by EFSA have been submitted to the Advisory Forum and Scientific Committee in September 2008. As a result, EFSA proposes to spend 7.5 million € in 2009.

Both the amounts spent and the number of grants have increased

- for grants under Article 36: from 8 calls with a budget of 1.7 million in € 2007 to a November 08 estimate of 18 calls with a budget of 2.0 million € in 2008) as well as
- for contracts and agreements: from 1.2 million € in 2007 to a November 08 estimate of 3.8 million € in 2008.

Table 1 and Figure 5 show a breakdown of the amounts spent by activity area. The data show an important increase in activities relating to the area of scientific data and information exchange, particularly in 2008.

Figure 6 shows a breakdown, by Member States, of organisations that applied and organisations that were awarded a contract or a grant. When considering all grants awarded to date and the contracts that are still "active" to date, out of a total of 162, 94 applications were successful and 70 unsuccessful. In the case of grants, organisations from 17 MS have submitted applications, with 37 organisations from 17 MS being successful in participating in at least one grant. In procurement, organisations from 13 Member States have submitted applications, with 30 organisations from 10 Member States have been successful. Two international organisations, the OIE and the FAO, have also collaborated with EFSA in one of the above contracts as part of a consortium.

Table 1. Overview of grants, contracts and agreements with organisations in Member States (2003 – 2008).

| | | Number of agreements/grants/contracts | Total value (million €) |
|--|--------------|--|----------------------------|
| Scientific data and information ² | Agreements | 21 | 0.9 |
| | Grants | 19 | 2.4 |
| | Contracts | 20 | 2.7 |
| | Total | 60 | 6.0 |
| Risk Assessment ³ | Agreements | 3 | 0.4 |
| | Grants | 7 | 1.4 |
| | Contracts | 25 | 2.4 |
| | Total | 38 | 4.2 |
| Focal Point agreements | Total | 27 | 0.6 |

² Includes activities falling in Priority area 1: Exchanging and collecting scientific data and information

³ Includes activities falling in Priority area 2: sharing risk assessment practices and Priority area 3: harmonisation of methodologies for risk assessment




Figure 5. Budget allocated to grants, contracts and agreements for the period 2003-2008




Figure 6. Applications for grants and procurement – breakdown by Member States

The work under Article 36 is carried out by competent organisations from the Article 36 list, which was adopted by the EFSA Management Board. The original list of competent organisations adopted by the Management Board was updated with organisations from Bulgaria and Romania (Dec. 2007) and currently includes 243 organisations. The additional 128 institutions submitted for approval to the Management Board will broaden the coverage of competencies in the Member States.

Interim Review of the Strategy for Cooperation and Networking between EU Member States and EFSA

The regular updating of this list – and if necessary on an *ad hoc* basis if needs for specific new areas are identified - is important to ensure that (1) the list is functional, and (2) that all scientific aspects within EFSA's remit are covered to the best possible extent. The Focal Points are providing support in this area with the continuous update of the existing list, with the recent procedure to update the list, and by assisting the organisations in their Member States in case they have specific questions.

In 2009, after the first wave of Article 36 projects have been finalised, EFSA will be able to assess the outcome of these projects and to which extent they have indeed supported the work of the Scientific Committee and Panels.

The further development of the Article 36 network could include (1) collaborative scientific activities under Article 36 beyond the scope of the grants tool, *e.g.* for activities not financially supported by EFSA, (2) a dedicated extranet space for these organisations to exchange information, (3) the establishment of a broader database of the listed organisations, and (4) further activities, guidance and initiative to strengthen the network.

More information on the cooperation between EFSA and scientific organisations in Member States are included in the report "Review of the Work under Article 36"⁴. That report also contains the Work Programme for 2009.

Creation of Member State networks

4.5 Managing and facilitating ad hoc liaison groups

Besides the Advisory Forum and Focal Points network, there are various other European networks and expert groups in place covering:

1. Data collection (Table 1A) on zoonoses but now also on food consumption, chemical occurrence, and pesticide residues;
2. Risk assessment (Table 2A) on GMO, microbiological hazards (BIOHAZ) such as TSE and microbiological risk assessment, pesticide authorisations (PRAPeR), and nutrient claims (NDA);
3. Harmonisation of methodologies for risk assessment (Table 3A); and
4. Risk communication (Table 4A).

Furthermore, special Advisory Forum meetings on animal health and plant health took place in 2008.

4.6 Raising the profile of risk assessment institutes in the EU

The tasks of Focal Points include activities on raising the visibility of EFSA in the Member States. Focal Points in several Member States have initiated kick-off meetings and seminars/workshops to raise both their own visibility and the visibility of EFSA. EFSA staff has participated in these meetings and explained EFSA's working procedures and cooperation projects.

Cooperation through experts

Another critical aspect of scientific cooperation between EFSA and Member States concerns the scientific experts supporting EFSA's or Member States' Scientific Panels and Scientific Committee, the networks and the various Working Groups. The experts are affiliated with a variety of institutes and organisations, and are essential contributors to assist EFSA and Member States in the conduct of risk assessments.

In Figures 7 and 8, the total number of experts involved in the Scientific Committee, Panels and EFSA Working Group is shown by nationality, resp. Figure 7 shows that the current 206 Panel Members originate from eighteen Member States (plus Norway, Switzerland and the USA) with the U.K., France, Germany, Italy, and the Netherlands contributing the majority of the members and few experts from newer Member States. The latter issue is addressed

⁴ To be added once the document on Article 36 is final

Interim Review of the Strategy for Cooperation and Networking between EU Member States and EFSA

by EFSA, among others, via the organisation of special seminars in new Member States to stimulate application of potential experts as Panel Members.




Figure 7. Countries of origin of the Members of EFSA's Scientific Committee and Scientific Panels: numbers of members per country⁵.




Figure 8. Countries of origin of *ad hoc* experts (not Panel Members) having supported EFSA in its work.

⁵ Numbers taken from the Annual Report 2006, updated for the Scientific Committee and the new Panels (ANS and CEF).

Interim Review of the Strategy for Cooperation and Networking between EU Member States and EFSA

Figure 8 demonstrates that more than 1100 experts from 43 countries supported EFSA in its work as experts for Working Groups since EFSA's establishment. The participation of *ad hoc* experts in working groups provides an opportunity to familiarise them with EFSA's work in general and the work of the Scientific Committee and the Scientific Panels in particular.

To facilitate the sharing of the workload among a large group of experts, to maximise access to available scientific expertise, and to make more transparent the process of selection of these experts, an ESCO Working Group has been set up with the aim of creating a database of national scientific experts. This further discussed in section 5.2.4 below.

Feedback from the Advisory Forum Members on "Strengthening Member States' cooperation"

This section summarises the replies received from Advisory Forum Members and observers to the questionnaire. Overall, eighteen countries replied.

Establishment of Focal Points

All eighteen countries indicated this to be an important activity. Eight respondents indicated that they should be increased, whereas nine respondents said that they should continue at the same level as in the first year. One respondent suggested starting new activities. Sixteen respondents considered activities have been well done, and two respondents indicated that they see a need for improvement, namely that the Focal Points are still developing and that there is more work than foreseen at the beginning.

Eleven comments were received, recognising very positively that Focal Points have now been established and work well. It was stated that Focal Points are considered very important for the cooperation between EFSA and Member States, despite the fact that Focal Points have only recently been established and their tasks are still evolving. Many countries commented on the substantial workload of Focal Points and indicated the need for increased resources and an adequate time-span for the Focal Points to be able to have a medium time planning. One comment highlighted the benefit in cooperation of Focal Points and Advisory Forum Members being employed by the same organisation and the importance of Focal Points to interact among them.

Identify joint working activities (Article 36)

Seventeen respondents indicated this to be an important activity, whereas one respondent said that it is not important anymore. Four respondents recommended increasing activity levels, nine responses said to continue at the same level, whereas two responses suggested to decrease activity levels. One respondent proposed to starting new activities. Two respondents did not answer that part of the question. Twelve respondents considered activities to have been well done, whereas three indicated a need for improvement. Three respondents did not rate these activities.

Seven comments were received. The main comments stated that it is important to avoid duplication of activities through Article 36 and ESCO Working Groups. Co-funding through Article 36 was another issue raised. One suggestion was made for new Member States, in the first five post-accession years, to participate in such projects without national financial contribution. One comment suggested a need to define common priorities at the European level and develop joint activities.

Managing and facilitating *ad hoc* liaison groups (ESCO's)

All eighteen countries replying to this question indicated this to be an important activity. Two countries recommended increasing activity levels, twelve respondents said to continue at the same level, whereas one country asked to decrease activities. One respondent suggested starting new activities: to involve the Focal Points to ensure dialogue between EFSA's Scientific Committee/Panels and national scientific advisory bodies. Twelve respondents considered activities to have been well done, whereas three respondents indicated a need for improvement, namely to intensify information and data exchange in this area. One comment emphasised the importance of cooperation between EFSA's Secretariat and secretariats of the scientific advisory bodies in Member States.

Raising the profile of risk assessment institutes in the EU

Seventeen respondents replying to this question indicated this to be an important activity, whereas one respondent indicated it not to be important anymore. Five respondents recommended increasing activity levels, ten respondents said to continue at the same level, whereas one respondent asked to decrease activity levels. One respondent did not rate these activities.

Four respondents did not rate these activities. Eleven countries considered activities to have been well done. Three countries indicated a need for improvement remarking that this activity had just started and needs to be intensified. Three comments underlined the importance of raising profiles, indicating that this concerns a multi-year activity which should be seen in combination with the communication part of the Strategy, and that encouragement of risk harmonisation will increase confidence between national organisations. One comment emphasised that the profile of widely recognised organisations should be raised.

5 Review of the chapter on specific cooperation projects

This section reviews the specific cooperation projects carried out between Member States and EFSA in the four priority areas, following the structure of the Strategy on Cooperation and Networking. For details of activities and projects, please see at the end of this document the Tables regarding data collection and information exchange (Table 1A); sharing risk assessment practices (Table 2A), harmonisation of methodologies for risk assessment (Table 3A) and coherence in risk communication (Table 4A).

5.1 *Priority area 1: Exchanging and collecting scientific data and information*

In the area of collection of scientific data and information, the following main activities and projects have been carried out and are listed in Table 1A.

5.1.1 **Collect, collate, and analyse relevant data**

A strategy has been developed for Member States and EFSA to streamline collection and exchange of data. It emphasises the necessity of up-to-date data to permit the conduct of risk assessment, in particular exposure assessment, and the need to prioritise the data collection activities in the area of food consumption.

Data have been requested from and provided by the Member States, as needed, on:

- animal diseases (Avian Influenza, Classical Swine Fever) and plant health;
- microbiological issues (BSE, antimicrobial resistance, salmonella in poultry), and
- occurrence of various contaminants (e.g. acrylamide, furan, PAH) and additives (phytosterol) in food and feed, feed additives.

Networks with representatives from Member States have been set up to collect and store data on zoonoses, food consumption, chemical occurrence, and pesticide residues monitoring. Through these networks EFSA compiles data from Member States and prepares reports:

- on an annual basis for the Commission and the Member States on zoonoses and pesticide residues (Table 1A);
- on topics where data are regularly needed either for risk assessment activities or for monitoring purposes e.g. on food consumption and zoonoses (antimicrobial resistance, *Campylobacter*, *Salmonella*, and *Listeria*) (Table 1A);

This has also led to an effort to collaborate with Member States on projects for standardization of various aspects of data collection, such as food classification, monitoring schemes, data collation, data storage, statistical analysis, and reporting.

This type of activity will now also be initiated for data collection on emerging risks (Table 1A). In particular, specific databases e.g. on bioactive compounds, pesticides, botanicals, relevant chemical mixtures etc. are being developed or planned with the help of organisations in Member States (Table 1A).

Interim Review of the Strategy for Cooperation and Networking between EU Member States and EFSA

Where appropriate, this data collection is supported financially by contracts with designated organisations in Member States who own or who are in a position to generate this data. The financial support is provided where the data collection and collation by EFSA is not already mandatory through specific Community legislation.

Feedback from the Advisory Forum

All eighteen countries replying to the questionnaire indicated this to be an important activity. Seven respondents to the questionnaire proposed to continue activities at the same level and ten suggested to increase activity levels. One country did not specify this further. Eleven countries felt the activities done so far had been done well, whereas seven indicated a need for improvement.

In total, eight comments were received from Member States. The majority of respondents acknowledged that data collection activities were currently at different stages in the various areas, therefore making it difficult to assess the success of this activity. However, it was noted that data collection was an important activity. The majority of comments stated the need to strengthen data collection and update databases. One comment specifically highlighted the need to update data from new Member States. Some respondents also felt that access to databases needs to be improved and Focal Points should/could be involved in the collection of data. One comment stated that the involvement of DG SANCO could enhance the willingness of data provision and another that this activity should be carried out jointly with national food authorities.

One additional comment received from the Panels/Units suggested to provide for a mechanism whereby data from post-market surveillance at the EU-wide commercial/retail level can be made available in confidence to EFSA for risk assessment.

5.1.2 Enhancing the exchange of information

The EFSA register of questions is operational and publicly accessible via EFSA's website. Member States and EFSA have also started to share their national and EFSA annual and strategic work plans.

In 2005, the Advisory Forum created an *ad hoc* Working Group in order to prepare recommendations on how to improve the exchange of scientific information between the national agencies and EFSA. It discussed what information would be of interest to be exchanged, when in the risk assessment process this optimally should be done and finally, by whom (or which means) this would be most appropriate. The Working Group finished its work mid 2006.

As shown in Table 1A, as well as in Tables 2A-4A, there have also been a variety of information exchanges on various specific topics. As indicated previously, this exchange takes place through the general support networks (Advisory Forum, Focal Points) or through the dedicated networks that have been established for the exchange of information on risk assessment and risk communication.

These activities may include grants or contracts

- for scientific reviews and epidemiological studies on animal diseases (particularly emerging diseases), microbiological food safety, and feed additives; and
- chemical exposure assessment to contaminants.
- collaborations for data analysis and information exchange are being established on emerging risks with organisations in Member States and beyond.

To further foster the timely exchange of information, an Information Exchange Platform has been developed for secure distribution and easy access of relevant information. It will improve the exchange of scientific information on activities carried out by Member States and EFSA.

Feedback from the Advisory Forum

Thirteen respondents to the questionnaire replied to continue at the same activity level and four wanted to increase activity levels, one country responded to start new activities. Eleven countries felt the activities done so far had been done well whereas five indicated a need for improvement. Two respondents did not rate these activities.

In total eight comments were received from Member States. The majority of them highlighted two main issues: national work/activity plans and sharing of scientific and non scientific information. Some respondents felt that little activity had been done in this area and sharing of work plans and scientific information needs to be developed further. Some respondents suggested that activity plans need to be translated in English to make them more accessible to Member States as well as encouraging Member States to share their plans more widely.

5.1.3 Establishment of efficient systems for the active exchange of information

An Advisory Forum IT Working Group has been set up. It is responsible for the creation of electronic tools to facilitate the exchange of documents, messages on emergencies, meeting registrations, etc.

The EFSA Extranet, known as ScienceNet, was created in 2005 to exchange information with and among Advisory Forum Members. Access to the ScienceNet has been opened to Focal Points and experts. It provides a secure site to access documents, provides event registration and facilitates in the collaboration on urgent food issues. Training to the users has been provided by EFSA.

Videoconference equipment is available in 22 Member States. Audio and web conference services are also available.

The current ScienceNet hosts the Information Exchange Platform (see above).

Feedback from the Advisory Forum

All eighteen countries replying to the questionnaire said that this activity was still important. Eleven responded to continue at the same activity level and five to increase activity levels, one respondent proposed to decrease activity levels, and one did not specify this further. One country also suggested to start new activities in this area. Sixteen countries felt that activities done so far had been done well, whereas two indicated a need for improvement.

Seven comments were received from Member States. There was widespread recognition that the extranet was a good tool and should be further developed. However one comment suggested that the speed of the extranet needs improving. It was suggested that information should be shared on analytical methods and methodological experience in Member States. One comment highlighted the need to rationalise work between all those using the extranet/involved in developing the practical infrastructure *e.g.* Focal Points, National food authorities etc.

Additional comments received from the Panels/Units indicated that the ScienceNet may not be the best tool for all purposes of information exchange and that further development and/or additional tools may be needed. It was also commented that Member States should be more motivated to share information via the Information Exchange Platform.

5.2 Priority area 2: Sharing risk assessment practices

The list of activities in Table 2A covers risk assessment practices, as defined in the cooperation Strategy, but also activities conducted in the framework of risk assessments. The latter includes:

- carrying out analysis of data and information in preparation of a risk assessment
- reviews in support for authorisation procedures such as toxicology of fod or feed additives.
- drafting of evaluation reports for inclusion in an opinion (flavorings, food contact materials, and food colours),

In addition, bilateral meetings with Member States took place, *e.g.* in areas where opinions were potentially diverging.

EFSA has responsibilities for the safety evaluation prior to authorisation of different types of substances that may be used in the food chain,. These include genetically modified organisms, feed additives, food additives, flavours, food contact materials as well as various claims related to food-composition and also pesticides. Each of these has its own specific legislative framework, often defining the role of the EFSA panels and of the Member States risk assessment organisations. The nature of the cooperation is thus influenced by the specific legislation in place. For example, whereas the evaluations of the aforementioned substances are within the remit of the EFSA Panels, for pesticides the Member States' risk assessment institutes provide the draft risk assessment reports.

5.2.1 Pilot projects

Both the EFSA Scientific Committee and the Advisory Forum have supported the possibility to set up joint scientific projects (ESCO projects). ESCO projects have already been initiated on botanicals, emerging risks, folic acid, the expert database and harmonisation of risk assessment methodologies (Table 2A).

The discussion of new ideas for such ESCO Working Groups takes place through the Steering Group on Cooperation and the ESCO mandates are subsequently submitted to the Scientific Committee and the Advisory Forum for endorsement. The Steering Group on Cooperation oversees the work of the ESCO Working Groups on a regular basis. The ESCO Working Groups report to the Executive Director of EFSA upon completion of their tasks and through regular feedback at the Scientific Committee and the Advisory Forum meetings. The Executive Director decides how to make further use of the outcomes of the ESCO projects in EFSA's scientific work.

Feedback from the Advisory Forum

All eighteen countries replying to the questionnaire indicated that this activity is still important. Nine countries responded to continue at the same activity level, seven to increase activity levels and one to decrease activity levels. One respondent did not specify this further. Twelve countries felt the activities done so far had been done well whereas four indicated a need for improvement. Two respondents did not rate these activities.

Nine comments were received in total. Some respondents specifically highlighted the need to involve new and small Member States in pilot projects. It was acknowledged that ESCO Working Groups were working well and provided good results/outcomes. In addition, respondents felt involvement in pilot projects was time consuming and adjustment of original time limits were needed.

5.2.2 Programme of courses in risk assessment and of study tours

Over previous years, workshops and seminars with pre-accession countries have taken place first in Bulgaria and Romania, and later in Croatia, Turkey and the Former Yugoslavic Republic of Macedonia.

The EFSA Management Board has emphasised the need to secure adequate involvement of experts from newer Member States. At the end of 2008, two workshops, one in Poland (Warsaw) and one in Hungary (Budapest), are taking place in response to the Management Board observation. Scientists who could potentially become Panel Members are invited. Experienced Panel Members as well as representatives from Member States and EFSA staff explain EFSA's work in general along with particular scientific issues of interest to these experts.

Feedback from the Advisory Forum

Seventeen respondents to the questionnaire indicated this activity was still important, with one stating it was not important anymore. Seven countries responded to continue at the same activity level, six to increase activity levels and two to decrease activity levels. One respondent suggested starting new activities. One respondent did not answer this part of the question. Seven countries felt the activities done so far had been done well and seven indicated a need for improvement. Four respondents did not rate the activities.

In total, nine comments were received. A minority of respondents were unaware of activities within this area and therefore unable to fully answer the question. The majority of respondents welcomed the idea of courses on risk assessment and one comment suggested an EU accredited programme of risk assessment courses. New Member States were particularly interested in the realisation of this activity. One comment suggested that study tours should involve agents from other agencies as well as EFSA staff, as well as exchanging experts from EFSA and national food safety authorities.

This point was further elaborated at the Advisory Forum meeting whereby it was concluded that this activity is important but needs to be well defined and that EFSA should develop this with Member States that already have experience in this area and consider operating this through existing training programmes from the European Commission, thereby avoiding having to set up its own programme.

5.2.3 Response to urgent issues and crisis situations

Regarding emerging risks, an ESCO WG has been created (Table 2A). The Emerging Risks unit has been established within EFSA in 2008 and is initiating several collaboration activities (Table1A).

Standard operation procedures (SOPs) on how to deal with urgent questions have been developed. EFSA – together with Member States in the Advisory Forum - has updated and tested its crisis handling manual in 2008. Based on the suggestions from the Advisory Forum, EFSA intends to pursue these efforts through a dedicated Working Group.

Feedback from the Advisory Forum

All eighteen countries replying to the questionnaire replied that this activity was still important. Nine responded to continue at the same activity level, four to increase activity levels and two to decrease activity levels. Three respondents did not answer this part of the question. Eleven countries felt the activities done so far had been done well whereas five indicated a need for improvement. Two respondents did not rate the activities.


In total nine comments were received. Some respondents felt that urgent issues were addressed without consultation of national experts and suggested more communication was needed during an urgent issue or crisis. In addition one comment felt that national food safety authorities should be closely involved. One respondent felt this activity had really improved.

5.2.4 Database of national scientific experts

To facilitate the sharing of the workload among a large group of experts, to maximise access to available scientific expertise, and to make more transparent the process of selection of these experts, an ESCO Working Group has been set up with the aim of creating a database of national scientific experts (Table 2A).

The database was launched on 5 June 2008. Promotion activities were initiated by EFSA at the EU level and Focal Points have supported the launch at the national level inviting experts to apply *e.g.* by placing the necessary information on their websites, press announcements, use of standard PowerPoint slides, web texts, frequently asked questions, posters, leaflets etc. The number of applications submitted has steadily increased (Figure 9). In October, experts that have previously supported EFSA were invited to join, after their previously manually-completed Declarations of Interest were made available to them electronically.

Figure 9. Number of applications submitted to the EFSA expert database.



Feedback from the Advisory Forum

Fifteen respondents to the questionnaire indicated this activity was still important and two stated it was not important. Eleven countries responded to continue at the same activity level, one to increase activity levels and two to decrease activity levels. Three respondents did not answer this part of the question. One respondent suggested starting new activities. Thirteen respondents felt the activities done so far had been done well whereas one indicated a need for improvement. Three respondents did not rate these activities.

Eight Member States provided comments. It was widely acknowledged that the Expert Database has now been established. The majority of comments related to strengthening and updating the Expert Database and to encourage national experts to join. It was suggested to develop specific search possibilities within the Expert Database. One comment questioned the criteria for inclusion, validation and actualisation of the database.

5.3 *Priority area 3: Contributing to the harmonisation of methodologies for risk assessment*

Various cooperation activities have been initiated to prepare guidance documents and guidelines and models to be used by EFSA and Member States in their risk assessment activities.

- With regard to the development of guidance in new scientific areas experts from Member States being invited to participate in scientific conferences, EFSA colloquia, and workshops to discuss new developments in risk assessment methodologies. Examples include cumulative risk assessment of pesticide residues to human health, risk benefit analysis of foods, pest risk assessment (Table 3A).
- Furthermore, scientific projects have been launched on the development of new risk assessment approaches e.g. on quantitative microbiological risk assessment (QMRA) and plant health (Table 3A).
- Many draft guidance documents have been consulted in writing with Member States or opened for public consultation via EFSA's website prior to their adoption as a scientific opinion (Table 3A).
- An ESCO Working Group on harmonising risk assessment methodologies has been created and met at several occasions (Table 2A). Based on a questionnaire to the Member States on general approaches to risk assessment, a report was submitted in November 2008.
- Finally, activities on monitoring and reporting of occurrence of microbiological and chemical agents that are gradually being harmonised (Table 1A);

Feedback from the Advisory Forum

All eighteen countries replying to the questionnaire indicated this to be an important activity. Eleven respondents suggested to increase activity levels, whereas seven respondents said to continue at the same level of activity. Nine respondents felt the activities carried out so far had been well done, whereas seven indicated a need for improvement. Two respondents did not rate these activities.

Overall, there was widespread recognition that harmonisation of risk assessment is important and will help to increase confidence in risk assessment. It was suggested to provide an overview of risk assessment guidance documents in scientific areas and to work with international organisations on harmonisation. It was also suggested to communicate existing risk assessment methodologies through workshops and brochures. Many comments made explicit reference to the output of the ESCO Working Group on harmonising risk assessment methodologies to provide further guidance. One comment suggested the need to redefine the Terms of Reference of the ESCO Working Group to incorporate the implementation of harmonisation.


5.4 Priority area 4: Communication Cooperation Projects

Cooperation in communications has been led by the Advisory Forum Communications Working Group (AFCWG). Strengthening that cooperation was a key driver behind reviewing the Terms of Reference of the group in 2007 and developing its ways of working. Main activities have included (for details please see Table 4A):

- A series of joint events with Member States to give visibility to and build understanding of the role of EFSA, Member States and the wider European food safety system, as well as focussing on specific themes.
- The development of networks and cooperation outside meetings within the AFCWG between Members and their wider teams focused on communication themes *e.g.* press or web work or issue-based *e.g.* nanotechnology.
- Supporting learning and skill sharing at AFCWG meetings through sharing best practices, presentation of case studies, etc.
- Joint publications with Member States, notably the new newsletter, "Moving Together" with editorial board involving AFCWG and Member States participation.
- On-going efforts to ensure coherence in communication including pre-notification of major communications; *ad hoc* liaison on issues of importance in specific Member States; building synergies and cross-linking between EFSA and MS websites etc.

Feedback from the Advisory Forum

The graph below illustrates the priority given to different areas of cooperation and work undertaken by EFSA and the AFCWG (Advisory Forum Communications Working Group). Respondents were asked to rate each with a score of 1-4, with 4 being the highest priority. The graph indicates the total scores for each area.



With only one exception Advisory Forum Members are sufficiently aware of the AFCWG's work, the exception being linked to the Members being in different organisations. No Advisory Forum Members believe that work should stop on priority 4 of the Strategy on communications. Almost all believe that work should continue along the same lines that it has been. Suggestions for new activities were not major surprises and fitted into the existing framework.

Responses on prioritisation of work for the AFCWG would suggest that effective ways of pro-active engagement on key upcoming and on-going high profile issues are very important. Linked to this, a group and network that offers

Interim Review of the Strategy for Cooperation and Networking between EU Member States and EFSA

training and skill sharing opportunities, support for developing both coherence and best practice, is clearly also highly valued.

A number of comments focus on relationships at a national level: between Advisory Forum Members and AFCWG Members, and also on building relationships between AFCWG Members and Focal Points. We will carry out further analysis of the responses at MS level to understand better the differing responses of individual MS in more detail. There appear to be differences, notably in relation to joint events and publications, that would suggest tailored approaches to cooperation are required based on the needs of individual MS.

6 Additional initiatives

The questionnaire also asked for views on additional initiatives not covered in part one of the questionnaire. Only 7 comments were received, two comments read: '*The questionnaire is well done and covers all priority areas*', and '*We do not have the resources to embark on more activities than what is included in part 1*'. Indeed, the overall impression from the comments clearly conveys the message that: '*The many initiatives that have been taken should be consolidated and taken forward*'.

7 Discussion, Conclusion and Recommendation

This interim review demonstrates the significant progress that has been made in the cooperation between Member States and EFSA. The original plan to come to a common approach of risk assessments within ten years throughout Europe, aiming at reinforcing credibility and coherence was ambitious, but experience to date shows this original target remains realistic.

Member States, via their Advisory Forum Members, appreciated how activities generally have been conducted. On average, 75 % of the respondents rated the activities as well done, indicating a high level of satisfaction with the cooperation. The majority of Member States indicated that overall the activities should continue as to date. The three main areas where further improvement is welcomed are training, data collection and harmonisation of risk assessment methodologies and the three areas highlighted most often for which more activities should be carried out are data collection, harmonisation of risk assessment methodologies and Focal Points. Regarding training, one should take into account ongoing activities by Member States and the European Commission, thus a careful planning of such activities is necessary.

7.1 Strengthening Member States' cooperation

At Member State level: networks

Scientific cooperation and networking between EFSA and Member States is considered highly important. The Advisory Forum, its two Working Groups (on communication and information technology) and the Focal Points have different tasks: The Advisory Forum deals with strategic issues; its two Working Groups have competences in specific subjects; and Focal Points support the Advisory Forum Members in the practical implementation of cooperation activities. However, on a day-to-day basis, the separation of these tasks remains challenging. Both EFSA and Member States have high expectations in the Focal Point network. Consequently their workload is very high. An excellent cooperation between the Advisory Forum Member and the Focal Point is crucial, in particular in those countries where both Advisory Forum Member and Focal Point are not employed by the same organisation/institution. The dedicated Member State networks which have been established in various areas (e.g. GMOs) have been proven valuable and should be strengthened.

At the level of individual organisations

The Article 36 network, *i.e.* competent organisations designated by Member States, efficiently supports EFSA in its tasks. For some projects it has been necessary to seek support also outside this network. In these cases, the common procurement procedure is applied. It is crucial to keep a comprehensive list of organisations, which cover the areas of competence required. Regular updating of the Article 36 list will therefore be beneficial for optimising the necessary expertise on the list, taking into account the changing scientific needs and demands as well as changes

Interim Review of the Strategy for Cooperation and Networking between EU Member States and EFSA

occurring in research organisations in Member States. The network of Article 36 organisations is successfully established. Networking among and with Article 36 organisations could be strengthened.

At expert level

To deliver high quality scientific advice, EFSA needs scientists with a broad range of expertise and experience for the Scientific Committee and Panels. These experts come from Member States and are the cornerstones for EFSA's scientific output. EFSA is aware that acknowledgement of their scientific contribution to EFSA's work is important. Renewing the Scientific Committee and Panels is both an opportunity and a challenge as EFSA needs to identify the most competent experts in the fields who also meet the requirement of being independent. Beside scientific excellence, the geographical distribution of the scientific experts in the Panels is also considered. Until now, there have been fewer scientists from the newer Member States in the Panels and Working Groups. EFSA aims to achieving a balance of nationalities of its scientific experts.

7.2 Priority areas

Priority area 1: Exchange of scientific data and information

A strategy is required to streamline data collection and data exchange. This has been developed by EFSA in the last year. In this context, the networks play a pivotal role.

It is also important to provide the scientific experts and risk managers with relevant scientific information that may not (or not yet) be available through scientific literature. Such information exchange, which complements the scientific knowledge which is publicly available, enables the Scientific Panels to build their work on the state-of-the-art information.

Priority area 2: Sharing risk assessment practices

ESCO Working Groups have been established to carry out scientific cooperation projects on issues of interest to both EFSA and the Member States. Participants in the ESCO projects include national experts proposed by the Member States, Members of the Scientific Panels or Scientific Committee and EFSA scientific staff.

A review of the experience of the groups so far has been overall positive, with a high level of interest and involvement from the Member State experts. It has been identified that for maximum efficiency there is a need for clear, concise mandates which can deliver an outcome in the allocated time.

The Advisory Forum expressed a need to further develop a long-term training programme on risk assessment for experts working in different fields of food safety, especially for new Member States.

The database of national experts was the output of an ESCO Working Group which had such a mandate, a small number of experts and a highly efficient work programme. In seeking nominations for ESCO Working Groups it must be made clear, either through the mandate or at the time of request, the type and number of experts required in order to maintain an efficient balance between the size of the group and its performance. While not all established ESCO Working Groups have completed their tasks, all are expected to do so and have reported that the time allocated for completion has been appropriate.

The harmonisation of risk assessment approaches between Member States is a critical area in which work is progressing. The ESCO Working Group working in this area faced a difficult challenge because of an ambitious mandate which required revision in order to complete some tasks in the given time.

Priority area 3: Harmonisation of risk assessment methodologies

EFSA and Member States give priority to the harmonisation of risk assessment methodologies across Europe because it is essential to build confidence and trust in each others risk assessment. A harmonised approach will help avoiding duplication of work and at the same time ensure the best use of resources. Risk assessment approaches are differently organised in Europe. Furthermore, the legal situation in Member States may vary.

Priority area 4: Risk communication

The communications element of the Cooperation Strategy will continue to have a high priority. The importance of ensuring coherence in risk communication is recognised by all. There is agreement that the current ways of working of the main cooperation vehicle, the AFCWG, are still appropriate and relevant. However, the detailed data in questionnaires from Advisory Forum Members will allow for a consideration of possible tailored approaches based on specific Member State needs. Strengthening that practical two-way, timely and responsive cooperation will (continue to) be a priority for EFSA, building on existing good practice and networks.

7.3 Possible additional initiatives and suggestions

The Advisory Forum Members also highlighted the following, which may merit further consideration:

- The importance of the cooperation with other relevant international organisations like WHO, FAO, OECD *etc*⁶;
- The need to strengthen the cooperation between Panels to assess risk-benefits from consumption of specific food products (*e.g.* consumption of farmed fish); and

The importance to develop procedures to share workload resulting from new legislation (*e.g.* new Novel Food Regulation) for example through collaboration with the Member States before new legislation comes in force.

⁶ This will be addressed in EFSA's International Strategy.

Interim Review of the Strategy for Cooperation and Networking between EU Member States and EFSA

8 Tables. Overview of cooperation activities with Member States following the priorities as identified in the Strategy for Cooperation and Networking⁷

| Table 1A. Exchanging and collecting scientific data and information | | | |
|---|--------------------|---|---|
| Description | Dates | Level and kind of cooperation | Legal basis |
| AHAW Panel | | | |
| AI vaccines data collection | 2007 | Questionnaire distributed to <u>MS</u> (Member States) on available AI vaccines, experimental and field experience data and new AI vaccine developments | <i>Reg. (EC) No. 178/2002</i> |
| Zoo birds AI vaccination | 2007 | Data supplied by <u>MS</u> during the SCOFCAH WG meeting on AI vaccination and information exchange with MS | <i>Reg. (EC) No. 178/2002</i> |
| Scientific reviews on the three specific animal diseases and an evaluation of the distribution of arthropod vectors and their potential for transmitting exotic or emerging vector-borne animal diseases and zoonoses | 2007 – ongoing | Article 36 grant for a value of €150,000 awarded to a consortium consisting of the following MS organisations: <u>Coordinator:</u> <u>Instituto Zooprofilattico Sperimentale dell’Abruzzo e del Molise “G. Caporale” (Italy),</u> <u>Partners:</u> <u>Centre de Recerca en Sanitat Animal (Spain)</u> <u>Centre de Cooperation Internationale en Recherche Agronomique pour le Développement (France)</u> <u>Friedrich-Loeffler-Institut (Germany)</u> <u>Universidad Complutense de Madrid, (Spain)</u> <u>Centre d’Etude et de Recherches Veterinaires et Agrochimiques (Belgium)</u> <u>Agence Française de la Sécurité Sanitaire des Aliments (France)</u> <u>Universidade Técnica de Lisboa (Portugal)</u> | <i>Reg. (EC) No. 178/2002</i> |
| Blue tongue data collection | Feb – Mar 2007 | Questionnaire distributed to <u>MS</u> (CVOS) on BT vaccination | <i>Reg. (EC) No. 178/2002</i> |
| Dairy cows farming types data collection | Dec 2007 | Questionnaire and close involvement and information exchange through meeting with <u>MS</u> representatives designated by Advisory Forum | <i>Reg. (EC) No. 178/2002</i> , following a request from the Danish Dairy Board |
| Fish welfare - <i>data collection</i> | Mar 2008 | Questionnaire and close involvement and information exchange through meeting with <u>MS</u> representatives designated by Advisory Forum | <i>Reg. (EC) No. 178/2002</i> |
| Classical Swine Fever - <i>data collection</i> | May-Jun 2008 | Questionnaires distributed to <u>MS</u> on surveillance, hunting and vaccination measures against CSF | <i>Reg. (EC) No. 178/2002</i> |
| Classical Swine Fever data collection | Jun 2008 - ongoing | Data extraction from EU CSF Database on wild boars (<u>BE, DE, FR, LU, NL</u>) | <i>Reg. (EC) No. 178/2002</i> |
| Epidemiology of different agents causing | 2008 | Article 36 grant for a value of €104,001 awarded to a consortium consisting of the | <i>Reg. (EC) No. 178/2002</i> |

⁷ The mandates of the Panels and units are described in Appendix I

Interim Review of the Strategy for Cooperation and Networking between EU Member States and EFSA

| | | | |
|--|-------------|--|--|
| disease in aquatic animals: scientific review and database development | | following MS organisations: Coordinator: Centre for Environment , Fisheries and Aquaculture Science- Cefas (UK); Partners: Istituto Zooprofilattico Sperimentale dell'Abruzzo e del Molise (IT); The Central Veterinary Institute of Wageningen UR (NL) | |
| Scientific reviews on Crimean-Congo hemorrhagic fever and epizootic hemorrhagic disease | 2008 | Article 36 grant for a maximum value of €90,000 <u>to be awarded</u> in 2008 | Reg. (EC) No. 178/2002 |
| Scientific review on tuberculosis in wildlife in the EU | 2008 | Article 36 grant for a value of €59,968 awarded to the Central Science Laboratory (UK) | Reg. (EC) No. 178/2002 |
| AMU Unit | | | |
| Bee Mortality and Bee Surveillance in Europe | 2008 | Article 36 grant for a value of €100,000 awarded to a consortium consisting of the following MS organisations: Coordinator: <u>Agence Française de la Sécurité Sanitaire des Aliments</u> (FR); Partners: Central Science Laboratory (UK); Institut National de la Recherche Agronomique (FR) | Reg. (EC) No. 178/2002 following a request from the European Commission and AFSSA (France) |
| BIOHAZ Panel | | | |
| Quantitative Risk Assessment for BSE in goats | 2005 | Request for data from <u>MS</u> – for goats, not done for sheep | Reg. (EC) No. 178/2002 |
| Update methodology for GBR assessment | 2006 - 2007 | Request for surveillance data from <u>MS</u> | Reg. (EC) No. 178/2002 |
| Antimicrobial resistance in food | 2008 | Call for scientific data on the prevalence of antimicrobial resistant <i>Salmonella</i> , <i>Campylobacter</i> and of MRSA in foods | Reg. (EC) No. 178/2002 |
| <i>Salmonella</i> in poultry | 2008 | Call for scientific data on <i>Salmonella</i> in poultry | Reg. (EC) No. 178/2002 |
| Fate of <i>Salmonella</i> spp. on broiler carcasses before and after cutting and/or deboning – data collection and reporting | 2008 | Contract for a maximum of €240,000 with expert organisation(s) "" <u>to be awarded</u> in 2008 | Reg. (EC) No. 178/2002 |
| CONTAM Panel | | | |
| Assessment of the risks for human and animal health of contaminants in food and feed | 2003 | Requests for occurrence data (e.g. PCDD/F, PCB, BFR, Cd, As, Pb) on contaminants in food and feed from <u>MS</u> through Expert Committees on (1) Industrial and environmental contaminants, (2) Agricultural contaminants (3) PoPs, of the SCFCAH | Reg. (EC) No. 178/2002 |
| Scientific information on mycotoxins and natural plant toxicants | 2008 | Article 36 grant for a value of €140,000 awarded to a consortium of the following MS organisations: <u>Coordinator: Università Cattolica del Sacro Cuore (IT);</u> <u>Partners:</u> <u>AGROINNOVA (IT),</u> <u>University of Parma – Department of Organic and Industrial Chemistry (IT)</u> | Reg. (EC) No. 178/2002 |

Interim Review of the Strategy for Cooperation and Networking between EU Member States and EFSA

| | | | |
|--|---------------------|--|--|
| Survey on use of veterinary medicinal products in third countries | 2008 | Article 36 grant <u>for a value of €100,000 awarded to the Central Science Laboratory</u> | <i>Reg. (EC) No. 178/2002</i> |
| DATEX Unit | | | |
| Food consumption data collection | 2005 - ongoing | Cooperation with <u>MS</u> on the collection of food consumption data from MS for a concise food consumption database. Network of food consumption database managers established | <i>Reg. (EC) No. 178/2002</i> |
| Support to complete EFSA's food consumption concise database | 2007 - ongoing | Article 36 grant for a value of €190,300 awarded to <u>Bundesinstitut für Risikobewertung (Germany)</u> | <i>Reg. (EC) No. 178/2002</i> |
| Polycyclic aromatic hydrocarbons (PAH's) data collection | Mar 2005 - Oct 2006 | Request for occurrence data from <u>MS</u> | <i>Reg. (EC) No. 178/2002 and Rec. 2005/108/EC (on the further investigation into the levels of PAH's in certain foods)</i> |
| Establishment of a framework for data collection application | Aug 2006 – Dec 2006 | Project steered by a group composed of representatives of <u>DG SANCO, Ireland, Latvia, and Sweden</u> . Application tested by representative of <u>MS</u> | <i>Reg. (EC) No. 178/2002</i> |
| Phytosterol Market Research | 2007 | Contract with <u>Frost & Sullivan Ltd (United Kingdom)</u> for €6,000 | <i>Reg. (EC) No. 178/2002</i> |
| Development of a standard food classification and sample description system for chemical occurrence data storage | 2007 - ongoing | Article 36 grant for a value of €145,000 awarded to <u>Bundesamt für Verbraucherschutz und Lebensmittelsicherheit (Germany)</u> | <i>Reg. (EC) No. 178/2002</i> |
| Furan data collection | May 2007 - Dec 2009 | Request for occurrence data from <u>MS</u> | <i>Reg. (EC) No. 178/2002 and Rec. 2007/196/EC (Commission Recommendation on the monitoring of the presence of furan in food, which is based on the EFSA CONTAM report on provisional findings of furan in food)</i> |
| Acrylamide data collection | Oct 2007 - Jul 2010 | Request for occurrence data from <u>MS</u> | <i>Rec. 2007/331/EC (Commission Recommendation on the monitoring of acrylamide levels in food)</i> |
| Small research projects on furan in food | 2008 – ongoing | Article 36 grant for a value of €133,333 awarded to the <u>National Food Institute, Technical University of Denmark (Denmark)</u> | <i>Reg. (EC) No. 178/2002 and Rec. 2007/196/EC (Commission Recommendation on the monitoring of the presence of furan in food, which is</i> |

Interim Review of the Strategy for Cooperation and Networking between EU Member States and EFSA

| | | | |
|--|---------------------|--|--|
| | | | based on the EFSA CONTAM report on provisional findings of furan in food) |
| Research project on exposure to furan during food preparation | 2008 | Article 36 grant <u>for a value of €137,626 awarded to the</u> Central Science Laboratory (UK) | <i>Reg. (EC) No. 178/2002 and Rec. 2007/196/EC</i> (Commission Recommendation on the monitoring of the presence of furan in food, which is based on the EFSA CONTAM report on provisional findings of furan in food) |
| Individual food consumption data and exposure assessment studies for children | 2008 | Article 36 grant for a value of €300,000 awarded to a consortium consisting of the following MS organisations: Coordinator: Ghent Univeristy (BE); Partners: Stichting Dienst Landbouwkundig Onderzoek (NL), RIKILT Institute of Food Safety (NL), Agence Française de Sécurité Sanitaire des Aliments (FR), Istituto Nazionale di Ricerca per gli Alimenti e la Nutrizione (IT), National Food Institute, Technical University of Denmark (DK), Finnish Food Safety Authority (FI), University of Crete (GR), Livsmedelsverket - National Food Administration (SE), Státní zdravotní ústav – National Institute of Public Health (CZ), Fundación para la Investigación Nutricional (Nutrition Research Foundation) (ES), Public Health Division of Gipuzkoa (ES), National Food and Nutrition Institute (PL); Research and Education Institute of Child Health (CY), Research Institute of Child Nutrition (DE) | <i>Reg. (EC) No. 178/2002</i> |
| Food consumption data collection | 2008 | Collaboration Agreements for the provision and processing of food consumption data with MS competent organisations (21), with a total budget of approximately €900,000 | <i>Reg. (EC) No. 178/2002</i> |
| Population and market research | 2008 | Contract for a maximum of €80,000 with expert organisation(s) to be awarded in 2008 | <i>Reg. (EC) No. 178/2002</i> |
| EMRISK Unit | | | |
| Identify and create a network of key sources (e.g. networks, university groups, research institutes, national food authorities, consumer organisations, industry associations) and procedures for transmission of information on emerging food-related risks to support EFSA | Nov 2004 – Apr 2006 | Contract for € 322,000 with a consortium of organisations: <u>Coordinator: Food and Consumer Product Safety Authority (The Netherlands)</u> <u>Partners</u> <u>Bundesinstitut für Risikobewertung (Germany),</u> <u>Bundesamt für Verbraucherschutz und Lebensmittelsicherheit (Germany),</u> <u>Federal Agency for the Safety of the Food Chain (Belgium),</u> | <i>Reg. (EC) No. 178/2002</i> |

Interim Review of the Strategy for Cooperation and Networking between EU Member States and EFSA

| | | | |
|--|---------------------|---|---|
| in the identification of emerging risks within the limits of <i>Reg. (EC) No. 178/2002</i> . | | <u>Food Standards Agency (UK)</u> , <u>Food and Agricultural Organisation of the United Nations</u> , <u>Central Science Laboratory (UK)</u> , <u>World Organisation for Animal Health (OIE)</u> , <u>RIKILT-Institute of Food Safety (The Netherlands)</u> <u>RIVM-National Institute for Public Health and the Environment (The Netherlands)</u> . | |
| Emerging risks | 2007 – ongoing | Contacts have been established with principal investigators of international initiatives on Emerging Risks involving <u>several MS bodies</u> . In particular with scientists from the <u>SAFEFOODS, SAFEFOODERA, GO-Global projects</u> , and the <u>International Food Chemical Safety Liaison Group</u> , which includes European as well as non-EU Members. | <i>Reg. (EC) No. 178/2002</i> Article 34 |
| Database of bioactive compounds in plants with beneficial and toxicological properties | 2008 | Contract for a maximum of €100,000 with expert organisation(s) <u>to be awarded</u> in 2008 | <i>Reg. (EC) No. 178/2002</i> |
| Development of a SAS Macro to import, analyse and visualise data from the DG-SANCO Rapid Alert System for Food and Feed Safety as a tool for “early warning” | 2008 | Contract for €76,722 with the Center for Statistics - <u>Hasselt University (Belgium)</u> | <i>Reg. (EC) No. 178/2002</i> |
| FEEDAP Panel | | | |
| Identification of new data on the effects of the use of a feed additive - <i>iodine</i> | Dec 2005 – May 2006 | Bilateral cooperation with the <u>Food Standards Agency (UK)</u> | <i>Reg. (EC) No. 178 /2002</i> |
| Selected trace and ultratrace elements: Biological role, content in feed and requirements in animal nutrition - Elements for risk assessment | 2008 | Article 36 grant <u>for a value of €93,500</u> awarded to the <u>University of Ghent (Belgium)</u> | <i>Reg. (EC) No. 178/2002</i> |
| PLH Panel | | | |
| Collection and availability of data on organisms harmful to plants and plant products | early 2007 | Seminar with representatives of <u>MS</u> competent services | <i>Reg. (EC) No. 178/2002</i> |
| Inventory of data sources for phytosanitary pest risk assessment in the European Community | 2008 | Article 36 grant for a value of €100,000 awarded to <u>Universita' Cattolica del Sacro Cuore (Italy)</u> | <i>Reg. (EC) No. 178/2002</i> |
| PPR Panel | | | |
| Literature reviews on ecotoxicology of chemicals with a special focus on plant protection products | 2008 | Contract for a maximum of €150,000with expert organisation(s) <u>to be awarded</u> in 2008 | <i>Reg. (EC) No. 178/2002</i> |
| PRAPeR unit | | | |
| Collection of Codex Maximum Residue Limits and related information for active substances to be evaluated under Article 12(2) of | 2008 | Article 36 grant <u>for a value of €20,000</u> awarded to the <u>Pesticide Safety Directorate (UK)</u> | <i>Reg. (EC) No. 178/2002</i> <i>Reg. (EC) No. 396/2005</i> , Article 12(2) |

Interim Review of the Strategy for Cooperation and Networking between EU Member States and EFSA

| | | | |
|--|---------------------------------|---|--|
| Regulation (EC) No 396/2005 | | | |
| Annual Report on Pesticide Residues | Feb 2009 – ongoing (annually) | On the basis of the submitted results of the MS control activities for pesticide residues EFSA has to prepare an Annual Report, analysing the results, including a consumer risk assessment. | <i>Reg. (EC) No. 396/2005, Article 32</i> |
| Scientific Committee | | | |
| Safety assessment of botanicals and botanical preparations | Oct 2004- Dec 2005 | Preparation of a questionnaire to obtain from MS a clear picture of the national concerns, current regulatory approach, and the extent of the issue in Europe. The MS expressed the need for science-based guidance for assessing the safety of botanicals. EFSA requested the Scientific Committee to prepare a guidance document for the safety assessment of botanicals and botanical preparations | <i>Reg. (EC) No. 178/2002</i> |
| Development of a framework for the risk assessment of chemical mixtures– Setting up a database on relevant chemical mixtures to food safety | 2008 | Article 36 grant for a maximum value of 200,000 <u>to be awarded</u> in 2008 | <i>Reg. (EC) No. 178/2002</i> |
| Zoonoses Unit | | | |
| Annual data collection on Zoonoses, antimicrobial resistance and food-borne outbreaks and preparation of Community Summary Report on Zoonoses | Mar-Nov (annually) | Reporting of national data to EFSA (Mar-May) Validation and reporting on the data (Jun-Nov) Consultation of MS in October Coordination by MS representation in Zoonoses Task Force (2 meetings /year) and <i>ad hoc</i> Working Groups (4 meetings/year) | <i>Dir. 2003/99/EC</i> |
| Harmonisation of monitoring and reporting schemes for Zoonoses, antimicrobial resistance and food-borne outbreaks | Continuous | Working Groups comprised from MS experts (20 meetings/year) and MS' representation in Zoonoses Task Force | <i>Dir. 2003/99/EC Reg. (EC) No. 2160/2003</i> |
| Scientific and technical assistance relating to the collation, examination of data on the trends and sources of zoonoses, zoonotic agents and antimicrobial resistance | 2004 | Contract with <u>Danish Institute for Food and Veterinary Research (Denmark)</u> for €153,863 | <i>Reg. (EC) No. 2160/2003</i> |
| Improvement of the Annual Zoonoses Report | 2004 - 2005 | 2 Working Groups comprised by MS experts (10 meetings) and MS representation in Zoonosis Task Force; 1 meeting | <i>Dir. 2003/99/EC</i> |
| <i>Salmonella/Campylobacter/Listeria</i> Baseline Surveys | 2005 until at least 2012 | Analyses and reporting of data collected from the MS, consultation of MS on the report Working Groups comprised from MS experts to support the analyses (10 meetings /year) MS presentation in Zoonoses Task Force | <i>Reg. 2160/2003 Dir. 2003/99/EC</i> |
| Provision of scientific and technical assistance relating to the collation reporting and analysis of data on food-borne outbreaks | 2005 - 2007 | Contract for €239,000 with <u>Bundesinstitut fuer Risikobewertung (Germany)</u> 3 coordination meetings | <i>Reg. (EC) No. 178/2002</i> |
| Support the drafting of the Community Summary Reports | 2006 - 2010 (annually: Jun-Nov) | Contract with the <u>Danish Technical University</u> (€217,000 annually) 3 coordination meetings/ year | <i>Reg. (EC) No. 178/2002</i> |

Interim Review of the Strategy for Cooperation and Networking between EU Member States and EFSA

| | | | |
|---|----------------|--|-------------------------------|
| Assistance in statistical analysis of baseline surveys on prevalence and risk factors of <i>Salmonella</i> in slaughter pigs and in turkeys | 2007 | Contract with <u>Hasselt University (Belgium)</u> for €59,700 | <i>Reg. (EC) No. 178/2002</i> |
| Analysis of the serovar and phage typing data of the EU <i>Salmonella</i> baseline survey in turkeys (lot 1) and in slaughter pig (lot 2) | 2007 | Contract with the <u>Danish Zoonoses Centre (Denmark)</u> for €16,000 | <i>Reg. (EC) No. 178/2002</i> |
| Assistance in data management on zoonoses application testing and IT helpdesk activities | 2007 | Contract with <u>Elsag Datamat/Net Service (Italy)</u> for €59,500 | <i>Reg. (EC) No. 178/2002</i> |
| Development of harmonised schemes for monitoring and reporting of <i>Echinococcus</i> , <i>Trichinella</i> , <i>Cysticercus</i> and <i>Sarcocystis</i> in animals and foodstuffs in the EU | 2007 – ongoing | Article 36 grant for a value of €180,000 awarded to a consortium consisting of the following MS organisations: <u>Central Science Laboratory, Department for Environment, Food and Rural Affairs, (UK)</u> <u>National Diagnostic Centre of the Food and Veterinary Service (Latvia)</u> <u>Veterinary Laboratories Agency of New Haw, DEFFRA (UK)</u> <u>Agence Française de la Sécurité Sanitaire des Aliments (France)</u> <u>Instituto Superiore di Sanita (Italy)</u> <u>National Institute of Public Health and the Environment (The Netherlands)</u> <u>Bundesinstitut für Risikobewertung (Germany)</u> 4 coordination meetings /year and attendance in the Zoonoses Task Force meetings | <i>Reg. (EC) No. 178/2002</i> |
| Development of harmonised schemes for monitoring and reporting of rabies and Q fever in animals in EU | 2008 | Article 36 grant for a value of €47,184 awarded to a consortium consisting of the following MS organisations: <u>Coordinator: Agence Francaise de Securité Sanitaire des Aliments (FR):</u> <u>Partners:</u> <u>Federal Research Institute for Animal Health (DE), National Veterinary Research Institute (PL):</u> <u>Central Veterinary Institute (NL):</u> <u>Veterinary Laboratories Agency (UK)</u> 4 coordination meetings /year and attendance in the Zoonoses Task Force meetings | <i>Reg. (EC) No. 178/2002</i> |
| Development of harmonised survey methods for food-borne pathogens in foodstuffs in the European Union | 2008 | Article 36 grant for a value of €99,383 awarded to <u>Bundesinstitut fur Risikobewertung (DE)</u> 4 coordination meetings /year and attendance in the Zoonoses Task Force meetings | <i>Reg. (EC) No. 178/2002</i> |
| Assistance in analyses of <i>Campylobacter</i> data in the baseline survey | 2008 | Contract for a maximum of €16,000 with expert organisation(s) <u>to be awarded in 2008</u> | <i>Reg. (EC) No. 178/2002</i> |
| Analysis of the within-holding prevalence study of the EU <i>Salmonella</i> baseline survey in breeding pigs | 2008 | Contract for a maximum of €25,000 with expert organisation(s) <u>to be awarded in 2008</u> | <i>Reg. (EC) No. 178/2002</i> |
| Analyses of data on antimicrobial resistance in certain zoonotic agents and indicator organisms as well as data on <i>Salmonella</i> serovars and phage types derived from animals and food in the European Union | 2008 | Contract for €198,814 with the National Food Institute, Technical University of Denmark (DK) | <i>Reg. (EC) No. 178/2002</i> |
| Assistance in statistical analyses of the 2008 baseline surveys | 2008 | Contract for a maximum of €150,000 with expert organisation(s) <u>to be awarded in 2008</u> | <i>Reg. (EC) No. 178/2002</i> |

Interim Review of the Strategy for Cooperation and Networking between EU Member States and EFSA

| | | | |
|--|------|---|-------------------------------|
| Assistance in analyses of the Salmonella baseline surveys regarding the serovar and phagetype distribution | 2008 | Contract for a maximum of 20,000 with expert organisation(s) <u>to be awarded</u> in 2008 | <i>Reg. (EC) No. 178/2002</i> |
| Assistance in analyses of the MRSA baseline survey | 2008 | Contract for a maximum of 20,000 with expert organisation(s) <u>to be awarded</u> in 2008 | <i>Reg. (EC) No. 178/2002</i> |
| Assistance in data management on zoonoses application testing and IT helpdesk activities | 2008 | Contract with Elsig Datamat/Net Service <u>(Italy)</u> for €80,400 | <i>Reg. (EC) No. 178/2002</i> |

Interim Review of the Strategy for Cooperation and Networking between EU Member States and EFSA

| Table 2A. Sharing risk assessment practices | | | |
|--|--------------------|---|--|
| Description | Dates | Level and kind of cooperation | Legal basis |
| AFC and ANS Panel | | | |
| Review of toxicological data available on Para Red and other similar dyes | 2005 | Contract with <u>Brantom Risk Assessment Ltd. (United Kingdom)</u> for €7,800 | <i>Reg. (EC) No 1565/2000</i> |
| Preparation of pre-evaluations documents for the re-evaluation of food colours | 2006 - ongoing | Contract for €296,700 with <u>Rijksinstituut voor Volksgezondheid & Milieu (The Netherlands)</u> . | <i>Reg. (EC) No. 178/2002</i> |
| Preparation of pre-evaluation on orotates | 2008 | Contract for 5,000 with the Technical University of Denmark | <i>Reg. (EC) No. 178/2002</i> |
| Preparation of pre-evaluation on yeasts | 2008 | Contract for 10,000 with Brantom Risk Assessment (UK) | <i>Reg. (EC) No. 178/2002</i> |
| AFC Panel and CEF Panel | | | |
| Testing of genotoxicity of semicarbazide (SEM) | 2003 | Contract for €31,000 with <u>TNO (The Netherlands)</u> | <i>Reg. (EC) No. 178/2002</i> |
| Evaluation of chemically defined substances | 2003 | Contract for €124,930 with the <u>Danish Veterinary and Food Administration (Denmark)</u> | <i>Reg. (EC) No. 178/2002</i> |
| 1 st Flavis work and contract to prepare the evaluation of flavouring substances, assisted by a Working Group | 2003 - 2006 | Contract with <u>Technical University of Denmark (Denmark)</u> for €408,845. Some <u>MS</u> have provided expert assistance to the Working Group | <i>Reg. (EC) No. 1565/2000</i> |
| Preparation of evaluation reports on data other than toxicity (mainly migration into food) on FCM substances for the Panel | Feb 2004 – ongoing | Contract with <u>TNO (The Netherlands)</u> for €173,595. | <i>Dir. 89/109/EEC</i> <i>Reg. (EC) No. 1935/2004</i> |
| Preparation of evaluation reports on toxicity data on FCM substances for the Panel. | Feb 2004 – ongoing | Contract for €231,310 with the following MS organisations: <u>Technical University of Denmark (Denmark)</u> , <u>University of Würzburg (Germany)</u> , <u>Instituto Superiore di Sanita (Italy)</u> | <i>Dir. 89/109/EEC</i> <i>Reg. (EC) No. 1935/2004</i> |
| 2 nd Flavis work and contract to prepare the evaluation of flavouring substances, assisted by a Working Group | Apr 2006 - ongoing | Contract with the <u>Technical University of Denmark (Denmark)</u> for €588,000. Some <u>MS</u> have offered expert assistance to the working group | <i>Reg. (EC) No. 178/2002</i> |
| Additional work on flavourings | 2008 - ongoing | Contract with the <u>Technical University of Denmark (Denmark)</u> for €48,000. | <i>Reg. (EC) No 1565/2000</i> |
| Complementary services for compiling | 2008-ongoing | Contract with the <u>Technical University of Denmark (Denmark)</u> for €10,000 | <i>Reg. (EC) No 1565/2000</i> |

Interim Review of the Strategy for Cooperation and Networking between EU Member States and EFSA

| | | | |
|--|----------------|--|---------------------------------|
| information and working out proposals for the safety evaluation of flavouring substances | | | |
| Literature review for the preparation of an opinion on food irradiation | Sep – Dec 2008 | Contract with the <u>Max Rübner Institut (Germany)</u> for a value of €5,000 | <i>Reg. (EC) No. 178/2002</i> |
| AHAW Panel | | | |
| Risk assessment on animal health - <i>data collection</i> | May 2008 | Questionnaire through the <u>Advisory Forum contact persons</u> for animal health, animal diseases and welfare, and risk assessment | <i>Reg. (EC) No. 178/2002</i> |
| AMU Unit | | | |
| Epidemiological analysis of 2006 outbreak of bluetongue virus serotype 8 in Belgium, France, Germany and the Netherlands | 2007 | Contract with expert organisation(s) for a value of €272,816 awarded to a consortium of: <u>Centre de Coopération National en Recherche Agronomique pour le Développement (France)</u> <u>Friedrich-Loeffler-Institut (Germany)</u> <u>Veterinary & Agrochemical Research Centre (Belgium)</u> <u>Stichting Dienst Landbouwkundig Onderzoek (The Netherlands)</u> | <i>Reg. (EC) No. 178/2002</i> |
| BIOHAZ Panel | | | |
| Establishing network of national contacts points of MS involved in BSE/TSE risk assessment. | 2006 - ongoing | A total of 22 MS are currently represented in the Network, which also counts with a number of observer Members (<i>i.e.</i> EFTA countries, EU pre-adhesion countries and international organisations – OIE, FAO, WHO). Annual meetings held since 2006. | <i>Reg. (EC) No. 178/2002</i> |
| Revision of the model supporting the Quantitative Risk Assessment for Tallow | 2007 | Contract with <u>Det Norske Veritas Ltd (United Kingdom)</u> for €3,400 | <i>Reg. (EC) No. 178/2002</i> |
| Establishing a network of national contacts points of MS involved in microbiological risk assessment. | 2007- ongoing | Contacts in <u>MS</u> are currently been nominated (1 meetings/year) | <i>Reg. (EC) No. 178/2002</i> |
| Quantitative microbiological risk assessment on <i>Salmonella</i> in slaughter and breeder pigs | 2007- ongoing | Article 36 grant for a value of €797,532 awarded to a consortium of the following MS organisations: Coordinator: <u>Veterinary Laboratories Agency of New Haw, DEFFRA (UK)</u> Partners: <u>National Institute for Public Health and the Environment (The Netherlands)</u> <u>National Veterinary Institute, Technical University of Denmark (Denmark)</u> | <i>Reg. (EC) No. 178/2002</i> |
| FEEDAP Panel | | | |
| Authorisation process for placing on the | 3-month- | Request for comments from <u>MS</u> on dossiers aimed to feed additives | In relation to <i>Reg. (EC)</i> |

Interim Review of the Strategy for Cooperation and Networking between EU Member States and EFSA

| | | | |
|---|--|---|------------------------------------|
| market and use of feed additives | commenting period with MS for each valid application | <u>authorisation</u> , within the authorisation process of feed additives (about 30 applications/year). | <i>No. 1831/2003</i> |
| Study on the assessment of plants/herbs extracts and their naturally or synthetically produced components | 2005-2007 | Contract for 28,800 € with <u>Veterinärmedizinische Universität Wien (Austria)</u> | Reg. (EC) No. 178/2002 |
| Safety assessment of high levels of vitamin A in products of animal origin | 2007 | Request for data from <u>MS</u> on vitamin A supplementation in animal feed and human intake of different food categories | <i>Reg. (EC) No. 178/2002</i> |
| Pre-assessment of environmental impact of zinc and copper used in animal nutrition | 2008 | Contract for €48,208 with the Central Science Laboratory | <i>Reg. (EC) No. 178/2002</i> |
| GMO Panel | | | |
| Assessment process for placing on the market and use of GMOs | 3 months consultation MS's for each application | Formal consultation of the <u>MS</u> as part of the assessment process (35 applications thus far) | <i>Reg. (EC) No. 178/2002</i> |
| Provide opinion on MS assessment of GMO application dossier, addressing scientific divergence between MS (12 questions received from DG ENV) | Jul 2004 End 2004- early 2005 – Dec 2005 | Bilateral meeting with national <u>experts of France</u> on scientific divergence Communication exchange with <u>national experts of the Netherlands</u> | <i>Dir. 2001/18/EC</i> |
| Provide scientific opinion on the safeguard clause invoked by: =(1) Austria =(2) Hungary =(3) Greece =(4) Hungary | =(1) Mar 2004 =(2) 2005 =(3) Jul 2006 =(4) Jul 2008 | =(1) bilateral meeting with <u>national experts of Austria</u> =(2) exchange of views between Panel Members and <u>national experts of Hungary</u> =(3) bilateral meeting with <u>national experts of Greece</u> =(4) exchange of views between <u>Panel Members and national experts of Hungary</u> | <i>Dir. 2001/18/EC, Article 23</i> |

Interim Review of the Strategy for Cooperation and Networking between EU Member States and EFSA

| | | | |
|--|---|---|--|
| GMO EFSA net launch | Mar 2005 | Full access to technical GMO application dossiers, permanent protocol for <u>MS</u> scientific comments, weekly updates on GMO application status and new information received. Workshops were organised | <i>Reg. (EC) No. 178/2002</i> |
| Initial environmental risk assessment of new application including cultivation: =(1) Spain (2 appl.) =(2) The Netherlands (2 appl.) =(3) Germany (1 appl.) =(4) France (1 appl.) =(5) Belgium (1 appl.) = (6) UK (1 appl.) | =(1) Nov 2005; May 2006; April 2008 =(2) Jun 2006; May 2008 =(3) Jun 2006 =(4-6) not yet fixed | In accordance with the Regulation, MS competent authorities carry out the environmental Risk Assessments. EFSA organises meetings with <u>national experts of MS</u> involved (CA) to coordinate the work (3 meetings for each application) | <i>Reg. (EC) No. 1829/2003</i> |
| Advisory Forum written consultation on statistics MON863 feeding trial data | Mar 2007 | <u>MS</u> reports and opinions on the statistical approach as described in Seralini et al. were collected | <i>Reg. (EC) No. 178/2002</i> |
| EFSA GMO Panel and Member States advisory bodies held a joint meeting | May 2007 | Joint meeting between EFSA GMO Panel and <u>Member States advisory bodies</u> on the deliberate release of GMOs in the environment (<u>Slovenia</u>) | <i>Reg. (EC) No. 1829/2003</i> <i>Dir. 2001/18/EC</i> |
| Special Advisory Forum Meeting on GMOs | Nov 2007 | Meeting with <u>technical experts from MS</u> on particular risk assessment aspects raised by the Member States | <i>Reg. (EC) No. 178/2002</i> |
| Provide scientific opinion on the safeguard clause invoked by Greece | Jul 2008 | exchange of views between <u>Panel Members and national experts of Greece</u> | <i>Dir. 2001/18/EC, Article 23</i> <i>Dir. 2002/53/EC, Article 18</i> |

Interim Review of the Strategy for Cooperation and Networking between EU Member States and EFSA

| | | | |
|--|---------------------|---|--|
| Initial environmental risk assessment of renewal application including cultivation Spain (1 appl.) | not yet fixed | In accordance with the Regulation, MS competent authorities carry out the environmental RA. EFSA organises meetings with <u>national experts of MS</u> involved (CA) to coordinate the work (3 meetings for each application) | <i>Reg. (EC) No.1829/2003</i> |
| NDA Panel | | | |
| Set-up EFSA Extranet communication procedures | 2006- | Involvement and training of <u>MS</u> contact points; one meeting with technical experts from MS's; software instalment and IT support for training | <i>Reg. (EC) No. 178/2002</i> |
| Request for identification of experts in scientific substantiation of health claims | Jun 2007 - Mar 2008 | Call to EFSA <u>Advisory Forum and EFSA Focal Points</u> to receive names for experts | <i>Reg. (EC) No. 178/2002</i> |
| Population reference intakes of macronutrients | 2009 | <u>Public consultation</u> of draft opinions on fats, carbohydrates, protein and energy. In addition special meeting with <u>MS</u> foreseen | <i>Reg. (EC) No. 178/2002</i> |
| PLH Panel | | | |
| Meeting with MS Chief Officers of Plant Health Services | Nov – Dec 2006 | Representatives of <u>MS</u> COPHS | Council Working Party on Plant Health/EFSA |
| Special Advisory Forum meeting on Plant Health issues | Oct 2008 | Representatives from <u>MS</u> to attend | <i>Reg. (EC) No. 178/2002</i> |
| PPR Panel | | | |
| Cumulative exposure assessment of some triazole fungicides | 2007 | Contract for €54,000 awarded to <u>RIKILT-Institute for Food Safety (The Netherlands)</u> | Linked indirectly to <i>Dir. 91/414/EEC</i> |
| PRAPeR Unit | | | |
| Peer review of existing and new pesticides | 2003 - ongoing | Consultation of <u>MS</u> on the draft assessment report (DAR) (prepared by rapporteur MS) MS participate in <u>expert meetings</u> addressing outstanding issues (approx. 20 meetings/year) Pesticide Steering Committee with experts from all MSs and the Commission in order to plan and monitor the pesticide review process (approx. 6 meetings/year)" | <i>Reg. (EC) No. 1490/2002, Reg. (EC) No. 1095/2007, Reg. (EC) No. 33/2008 and Council Directive 91/414(EEC) for existing and new active substances.</i> |
| MRL risk assessment | 2006 - ongoing | Written consultations and expert meetings regarding the implementation of risk assessment procedures for MRL setting and the MRL review programme with <u>MS</u> | <i>Reg. (EC) No. 396/2005</i> |
| Working group on the efficiency of the EU pesticide safety review process | Dec 2007 – Jul 2008 | <u>Expert consultation</u> to explore the possibilities to make the peer review process in the framework of Dir. 91/414/EEC more efficient. | <i>Reg. (EC) No. 178/2002</i> |

Interim Review of the Strategy for Cooperation and Networking between EU Member States and EFSA

| ESCO Working Groups | | | |
|---|--|--|-------------------------------|
| ESCO WG on emerging risks to propose methodologies and procedures for EFSA and a network of MS bodies to exchange relevant information for the identification of emerging risks. | Aug 2007- Dec 2008 (expected end date) | This Working Group brings together Panel Members and <u>experts nominated by MS</u> that expressed the interest in the identification of emerging risks. | <i>Reg. (EC) No. 178/2002</i> |
| ESCO WG on risks and benefits from food fortification with folic acid to compile information on the fortification of food with Folic Acid in the different Member States and to assess a possible link of Folic Acid and cancer. | Dec 2007 – Jul 2008 | ESCO WG on <u>initiative from IRL, with participation from other MS.</u> | <i>Reg. (EC) No. 178/2002</i> |
| ESCO WG on fostering harmonised risk assessment approaches across Europe to prepare a report for the Executive Director that identifies similarities and discrepancies in the risk assessment approaches used by EFSA and the Member States in the areas within EFSA's remit. | Jan 2008 - ongoing | An ESCO WG with experts from <u>MS</u> and the Scientific Committee has been created. | <i>Reg. (EC) No. 178/2002</i> |
| ESCO WG on botanicals and botanical preparations to test the safety assessment approach and complete the compendia for botanicals and botanical preparations as proposed and endorsed by the Scientific Committee in April 2008. | Apr 2008 - ongoing | An ESCO WG with <u>experts from MS</u> and Members of the SC. | <i>Reg. (EC) No. 178/2002</i> |
| ESCO WG for establishing and maintaining a database of scientific experts that can be queried by EFSA and MS | Dec 2007- Jun 2008 | An ESCO WG with <u>experts from MS</u> | <i>Reg. (EC) No. 178/2002</i> |

Interim Review of the Strategy for Cooperation and Networking between EU Member States and EFSA

| Table 3A. Contributing to the harmonisation of methodologies for risk assessment | | | |
|--|---------------------|---|--------------------------------|
| Description | Dates | Level and kind of cooperation | Legal basis |
| AHAW Panel | | | |
| Basic information for the development of animal welfare risk assessment guidelines | 2006-2007 | Contract for €13,500 with <u>Centro di Referenza Nazionale per il Benessere Animale, Istituto Zooprofilattico Sperimentale della Lombardia e dell'Emilia-Romagna "Bruno Ubertini" (Italy)</u> | <i>Reg. (EC) No. 178/2002</i> |
| Project to develop animal welfare risk assessment guidelines on stunning and killing | 2007-ongoing | Article 36 grant for a value of €150,000 awarded to a consortium of organisations consisting of: Coordinator: Swedish University of Agricultural Science (Sweden) Partners: <u>Technical University of Lisbon (Portugal)</u> <u>Austrian Agency for Health and Food Safety (Austria)</u> | <i>Reg. (EC) No. 178/2002</i> |
| Animal welfare risk assessment guidelines on transport | 2008 | Article 36 grant for a value of €149,950 awarded to a consortium of the following MS organisations: Coordinator: Istituto Zooprofilattico sperimentale del Abruzzo e del Molise (Italy); Partners: Centre de Recerca en Sanitat Animal (Cresa)(Spain), Friedrich Loeffler Institut (FLI)(Germany) | <i>Reg. (EC) No. 178/2002</i> |
| AMU Unit | | | |
| Systematic review of pest risk models using climatic data and plant phenology | 2008 | Article 36 grant for a value of €75,000 awarded to <u>the Università Cattolica del Sacro Cuore (IT)</u> | <i>Reg. (EC) No. 178/2002</i> |
| BIOHAZ Panel | | | |
| Developing an approach for QMRA | 2005 - ongoing | Request for input from <u>MS</u> (questionnaire). | <i>Reg. (EC) No. 178/2002</i> |
| Foodborne antimicrobial resistance as a biological hazard | 2008 | Public consultation on a draft Opinion before adoption. | <i>Reg. (EC) No. 178/2002</i> |
| Microbiological testing, criteria and other objectives | 2006 | <u>Consultation with the MS, stakeholders etc on a draft opinion of the Scientific Panel on Biological Hazards on microbiological testing, criteria and other objectives</u> | <i>Reg. (EC) No. 178/2002</i> |
| Poultry decontamination | 2006 | Consultation on the joint AFC/BIOHAZ draft guidance document on the submission of data for the evaluation of the safety and the efficacy of substances other than potable water intended to be used to decontaminate the surfaces of foods of animal origin. | <i>Reg. (EC) No. 178/2002</i> |
| FEEDAP Panel | | | |
| Opinion on the updating of the criteria used in the assessment of bacteria for resistance of human and veterinary importance | Dec 2004 – Feb 2005 | <u>Public Consultation</u> on EFSA's website with stakeholders | <i>Reg. (EC) No. 178/2002</i> |
| Establishment on guidelines on safety and efficacy and of silage additives | Jun – Sep 2005 | <u>Public Consultation</u> on EFSA's website with stakeholders | <i>Reg. (EC) No. 1831/2003</i> |
| Development of Guidance documents on | Jul – Oct 2006 | Public Consultation on EFSA's website including stakeholders and MS | <i>Reg. (EC) No. 178/2002</i> |

Interim Review of the Strategy for Cooperation and Networking between EU Member States and EFSA

| | | | |
|---|-----------------------------|--|--------------------------------------|
| environmental risk assessment of Feed additives. | | | |
| Risk assessment of feed additives in the EU: Present and future | Oct 2007 | Conference addressed to various stakeholders with interest in the area of feed additives (European Commission, Community Reference Laboratory, Member States, Industry associations, Feed/Feed Additives companies, Consultants, Academic) | <i>Regulation (EC) No 1831/2003</i> |
| Assessment of silage additives in the EU | Apr 2008 | Conference addressed to various stakeholders with interest in silage feed additives (Community Reference Laboratory, Member States, Industry associations, Feed/Feed Additives companies, Consultants, Academic) | <i>Regulation (EC) No. 1831/2003</i> |
| Post-market monitoring of feed additives – preparatory work for the development of guidance | 2007 – ongoing | Article 36 grant for a value of €20,000 awarded to <u>Istituto Superiore di Sanità (Italy)</u> | <i>Reg. (EC) No. 178/2002</i> |
| GMO Panel | | | |
| Development of guidance on general surveillance of GM plants | Jan 2004 and Jul - Sep 2005 | Consultation meeting with <u>experts from MS</u> (1 day meeting). Public written consultation including Member States | <i>Reg. (EC) No. 1829/2003</i> |
| Development of guidance document on RA of GMO plants | Apr – May 2004 | Public written consultation including <u>MS</u> , Stakeholder consultation (1 day meeting) | <i>Reg. (EC) No. 1829/2003</i> |
| Development of guidance on GM micro-organisms | Jul – Sep 2005 | Public written consultation including <u>MS</u> | <i>Reg. (EC) No. 1829/2003</i> |
| Analyses scientific information | Dec 2005 | EFSA was in regular contact with the <u>UK FSA</u> to exchange information on findings published on the internet or scientific literature. EFSA reported its findings in the Plenary meeting Minutes in order to communicate on risk | <i>Reg. (EC) No. 178/2002</i> |
| Forum meeting with MS experts | May 2006 | Meeting with technical experts from <u>MS</u> on RA approaches, strength and weaknesses | <i>Reg. (EC) No. 178/2002</i> |
| Development of guidance on GM events combined by crossing | Jul - Sep 2006 | Public written consultation including <u>MS</u> | <i>Reg. (EC) No. 1829/2003</i> |
| Development of guidance for renewal applications | Nov - Dec 2006 | Public written consultation including <u>MS</u> | <i>Reg. (EC) No. 1829/2003</i> |
| Report on the safety and nutritional assessment of GM plant derived food/feed – the role of animal feeding trials | Dec 2006 - Jan 2007 | Public written consultation including <u>MS</u> | <i>Reg. (EC) No. 1829/2003</i> |
| NDA Panel | | | |
| Conference on Nutrition and Health Claims; Bologna | Nov 2006 | Consultation event with <u>invited stakeholders</u> to discuss Nutrient Profiles and Health Claims | <i>Reg. (EC) No. 178/2002</i> |
| Defining procedures for application of claim dossiers | 2006 - ongoing | Establish contact points with <u>MS</u> and arrange for at least one meeting with <u>MS</u> experts | <i>Reg. (EC) No 1924/2006</i> |
| Scientific and Technical Guidance for health claims application | Jun 2007 | Technical meeting with <u>stakeholders</u> to discuss draft guidance document, comments were taken into account in final version | <i>Reg. (EC) No. 178/2002e</i> |
| Scientific and technical guidance for health claims application | May 2007 – Jun 2007 | <u>Public consultation</u> of guidance document, comments were taken into account in final version | <i>Reg. (EC) No. 178/2002</i> |

Interim Review of the Strategy for Cooperation and Networking between EU Member States and EFSA

| | | | |
|---|--|---|---|
| Opinion on food based dietary guidelines | Jul 2008 | <u>Public consultation</u> of draft opinion | <i>Reg. (EC) No. 178/2002</i> |
| Opinion on general principles for setting population reference intakes | Jul 2008 | <u>Public consultation</u> of draft opinion | <i>Reg. (EC) No. 178/2002</i> |
| Opinion on population reference intakes for water | Jul 2008 | <u>Public consultation</u> of draft opinions | <i>Reg. (EC) No. 178/2002</i> |
| PLH Panel | | | |
| Development of guidance document on submission of pest risk assessments for evaluation by EFSA | 2008 - ongoing | Involvement in <u>stakeholder</u> consultation on the guidance document | <i>Reg. (EC) No. 178/2002</i> |
| PPR Panel | | | |
| Guidance document on risk assessment for birds & mammals | Jul – Sep 2006 Mar 2007 Oct 2006- Jul 2008 | Consultation of <u>MS</u> within the SCFCAH and designated national authorities (contact points for the evaluation of existing active substances under Dir. 91/414/EEC) <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • <u>Public consultations</u> on existing Guidance Documents and revised drafts including specific questions for MS • Consultation of <u>MS</u> (risk managers and risk assessors) with the help of questionnaires to seek views on the appropriate scope for a revised Guidance Document. • Cooperation with <u>MS</u> in specific workshops and WG meetings | Linked indirectly to <i>Dir. 91/414/EEC</i> |
| Prioritisation of the revision/development of guidance documents in the field of pesticide risk assessment | Summer/autumn 2006 | Consultation of <u>MS</u> within the SCFCAH | Linked indirectly to <i>Dir. 91/414/EEC</i> |
| Project to assess current approaches and knowledge with a view to develop a guidance document for pesticide exposure assessment for workers, operators, bystanders and residents | 2007 - ongoing | Article 36 grant for a value of €90,000 awarded to a consortium of the following MS organisations: Coordinator: <u>The Pesticides Safety Directorate (UK)</u> Partners: <u>Ghent University (Belgium)</u> | Linked indirectly to <i>Dir. 91/414/EEC; Reg. (EC) No. 178/2002</i> |
| Applicability of thresholds of toxicological concern in the dietary risk assessment of metabolites, degradation and reaction products of active substances of plant protection products | 2008 | Article 36 grant for a value of €68,347 awarded to the <u>Pesticide Safety Directorate (UK)</u> | Linked indirectly to <i>Dir. 91/414/EEC; Reg. (EC) No. 178/2002</i> |
| Participation in the WG on increasing efficiency of the PRAPeR peer review | 2008 | Drafting with <u>MS</u> a chapter on Guidance Documents in the text of the Opinion to be published in summer 2008 | Linked indirectly to <i>Dir. 91/414/EEC</i> |
| Development of biogeographical database and draft European ecoregion map | 2008 | Contract with <u>Instituto do Mar (Portugal)</u> for €5,000 | <i>Reg. (EC) No. 178/2002</i> |
| Advice on the treatment of ecotoxicity data | 2008 | Contract with <u>University of Durham (United Kingdom)</u> for €3,253 | |
| Revision of guidance document on persistence in soil | Nov 2007 - ongoing Jan 2008 - Mar 2008 | A number of <u>public consultations</u> and stakeholder meetings including <u>MS</u> are foreseen. <u>Public consultations</u> on existing guidance document | Linked indirectly to <i>Dir. 91/414/EEC</i> |

Interim Review of the Strategy for Cooperation and Networking between EU Member States and EFSA

| | | | |
|--|--------------------|--|---|
| New guidance document on emissions from protected crop systems - green-houses and covered crops | Apr 2008 - ongoing | A number of <u>public consultations</u> and stakeholder meetings including <u>MS</u> are foreseen. | Linked indirectly to <i>Dir. 91/414/EEC</i> |
| Revision of Terrestrial Ecotoxicology Guidance Document | Nov 2008 - ongoing | Public consultations on existing guidance | Linked indirectly to <i>Dir. 91/414/EEC</i> |
| Revision of Aquatic Ecotoxicology Guidance Document | Nov 2008 - ongoing | Public consultations on existing guidance | Linked indirectly to <i>Dir. 91/414/EEC</i> |
| Development of a position paper on emissions by air from protected crop systems (greenhouses and crops grown under cover) | 2008 | Contract with <u>Wageningen University (The Netherlands)</u> for €4,900 | <i>Reg. (EC) No. 178/2002</i> |
| Development of a position paper on emissions by "other routes than air" from protected crop systems (greenhouses and crops grown under cover) | 2008 | Contract with <u>Rijksinstituut voor Volksgezondheid & Milieu (The Netherlands)</u> for €4,919 | <i>Reg. (EC) No. 178/2002</i> |
| Developing a new EU guidance regarding emissions from protected crop systems <i>e.g.</i> greenhouses and cultivations grown under cover | 2008 | Contract for a maximum of €50,000 with expert organisations <u>to be awarded</u> in 2008 | Linked indirectly to <i>Dir. 91/414/EEC</i> |
| Support in systematic planning and structuring in the complexity of topics and levels of abstraction in relation to the revision of the SANCO/3268/2001 (aquatic ecotoxicology) and SANCO/10329/2002 (Terrestrial Exotoxicology) Guidance Documents | 2008 | Contract for €4,950 with Metaplan (DE) | <i>Reg. (EC) No. 178/2002</i> |
| Support in updating the existing EU Guidance Documents on persistence in soil: Integrating weather and soil data for environmental exposure scenario development. | 2008 | Cooperation with JRC Ispra via a Service Level Agreement (SLA) for €120,000 | <i>Reg. (EC) No. 178/2002</i> |
| Applicability of the QSAR methodology to the risk assessment of pesticide residues in food | 2008 | Cooperation with JRC Ispra via a Service Level Agreement (SLA) for €120,000 | <i>Reg. (EC) No. 178/2002</i> |
| SCO Unit | | | |
| Scientific colloquia on the following subjects were organised with the respective Panel units: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Dioxins • Micro-organisms in food and feed - qualified presumption of safety (QPS) • Consumption • Animal Diseases • Food-based dietary guidelines (FBDG) • Risk-benefit analysis of foods | 2-3 per year | Close involvement and information exchange with scientists on scientific topics of interest from <u>MS</u> . | <i>Reg. (EC) No. 178/2002</i> |

Interim Review of the Strategy for Cooperation and Networking between EU Member States and EFSA

| | | | |
|--|--|--|--|
| <ul style="list-style-type: none">• Risk assessment of pesticides to human health• Environmental Risk Assessment of Genetically Modified Plants - Challenges and Approaches• Pest risk assessment - Science in support of phytosanitary decision making in the European Community• Nutrient profiling for foods bearing health claims• Acrylamide carcinogenicity – new evidence in relation to dietary exposure | | | |
|--|--|--|--|

Interim Review of the Strategy for Cooperation and Networking between EU Member States and EFSA

| Table 4A. Promoting coherence in risk communications | | | |
|---|--|---|---|
| Description | Dates | Level and kind of cooperation | Legal basis |
| Workshop on relevant communications issues (Risk Communications 2005 / Crisis Communication 2006) | <i>Ad hoc</i> | Enhancing level of knowledge, ability to handle communications issues and co-operation <u>between EFSA and MS</u> | Reg. (EC) No. 178/2002 |
| <i>Ad hoc</i> liaison with national communications and science experts on scientific issues | Ongoing | Liaison <u>with countries concerned</u> and on case-specific scientific issues when impacting on communication, particularly when national angle, <i>e.g. Salmonella</i> , aspartame, AI, food colours... | Reg. (EC) No. 178/2002 |
| Online communication activities | Ongoing | Cross-linking between EFSA and <u>MS</u> to home pages and specific topics of interest pages (AGWGC) Guidelines for development of Focal Points websites/web pages (co-operation with Focal Points) | Reg. (EC) No. 178/2002 |
| Advisory Forum Communications Working Group (AFWGC) | Meetings four times per year | Regular discussion with <u>AFWGC Members</u> of forthcoming scientific issues of communications importance | Reg. (EC) No. 178/2002 + Advisory Forum decision. |
| Joint publications – “Moving Together” newsletter | Twice per year | Newsletter to promote scientific cooperation; Editorial Board involving <u>MS (Belgium, Germany, Greece, Ireland, the Netherlands and Norway volunteered to be Members)</u> | Reg. (EC) No. 178/2002 |
| Task Force on Crisis Communications Requirements (from AFWGC) | 2005 -2006 | Development of a proposal for information exchange (Extranet) | Reg. (EC) No. 178/2002 |
| Task Force on Collaboration in Communications (from AFWGC) | 2006 - 2007 | Development of joint communication activities | Reg. (EC) No. 178/2002 |
| Joint events | 2007 - 7 joint events 2008 - 6 joint events | Organisation and promotion of joint events with <u>national food safety authorities, relevant Ministries and local / regional authorities</u> , addressing risk assessment and risk communications | Reg. (EC) No. 178/2002 |

9 Appendix I. Mandates of the Scientific Panels and SCA units of EFSA

| PANEL | MANDATE |
|----------------------|---|
| Scientific Committee | The main task of the Scientific Committee is the preparation of scientific advice in the area of new and harmonised approaches for risk assessment of food and feed. It also provides strategic advice to EFSA's Executive Director. |
| AFC | The AFC Panel deals with questions of safety in the use of food additives, flavourings, processing aids and materials in contact with food; with associated subjects concerning the safety of other deliberately added substances to food and with questions related to the safety of processes. The AFC Panel has been replaced on 10 July 2008 by the new CEF and ANS Panels (see below). |
| CEF | The CEF Panel deals with questions on the safety of use of materials in contact with food, enzymes, flavourings and processing aids, and also with questions related to the safety of processes. |
| ANS | The ANS Panel deals with questions of safety in the use of food additives, nutrient sources and other substances deliberately added to food, excluding flavourings and enzymes. |
| AHAW | The AHAW Panel deals with animal health and welfare issues. |
| BIOHAZ | The BIOHAZ Panel deals with biological hazards in relations to food safety and food-borne diseases. |
| CONTAM | The CONTAM Panel deals with contaminants in the food chain. |
| FEEDAP | The FEEDAP Panel deals with additives and products or substances used in animal feed. |
| GMO | The GMO Panel deals with genetically modified organisms and genetically modified food and feed. |
| NDA | The NDA Panel deals with questions related to dietetic products, nutrition and food allergies as well as associated subjects such as novel foods. |
| PPR | The PPR Panel deals with plant protection products (commonly known as pesticides) and their residues. |
| PLH | The PLH Panel deals with organisms posing a risk to plant health. These include both plant pests which threaten crop production and species which threaten biodiversity. |

Interim Review of the Strategy for Cooperation and Networking between EU Member States and EFSA

| SCA units | MANDATE |
|-----------------|--|
| AMU | The Assessment Methodology Unit (AMU) provides technical support in the field of statistics, modelling, data management and risk assessment. It contributes in particular to the development and application of new or refined risk assessment approaches in the field of food and feed safety. |
| EMRISK | The Emerging Risks unit (EMRISK) is responsible for establishing procedures to monitor, collect and analyse information and data in order to identify emerging risks in the field of food and feed safety with a view to their prevention. |
| DATEX | The DATEX unit deals with the collection, collation and analysis of data on food consumption and chemical occurrence in food and feed for exposure assessments at European level. |
| PRAPER | The PRAPeR unit coordinates for the EU the peer review of active substances used in plant protection products in line with procedures and deadlines set out in European legislation and performs risk assessments in view of the setting of MRLs in the framework of Reg. (EC) 396/2005 on maximum residues levels of pesticides in or on food and feed of plant and animal origin |
| SCO | The objective of the "Scientific Co-operation" unit is to foster the scientific collaboration, projects and exchange of scientific information between EFSA and national food safety agencies in EU Member States. |
| ZOONOSES | The Zoonoses Unit analyses and reports data of zoonoses, antimicrobial resistance, microbiological contaminants and food-borne outbreaks. The data is submitted by the Member States and other reporting countries in accordance with Dir. 2003/99/EC. |