



# **Maximising the Contribution of Science to European Health and Safety**

A DG SANCO consultation paper - July 05

Meeting of Chairs of Scientific Committees and Panels of Community bodies involved in Risk Assessment

CCAB, Brussels

7/8 December 2005



## Context

- ✓ ***EU policies on health, food chain safety, consumer protection and animal health are science based.***
- ✓ ***In our knowledge based society, there is a need for more accurate understanding of limitations of scientific certainty and the role of judgement.***
- ✓ ***Better communication helps achieve clearer risk perceptions and better integration of risk into EU policy debates.***
- ✓ ***The ability to highlight and communicate uncertainties is of paramount importance.***
- ✓ ***The pace of science can critically affect SANCO's delivery of its missions.***



## ***Content of the paper***

***The paper sets out a series of actions which SANCO wishes to pursue under 4 areas:***

- ***Section B: Risk Assessment Capacity***
- ***Section C: Risk Assessment Data***
- ***Section D: Risk Assessment Mandates***
- ***Section E: Content of assessment***



## **B) Risk Assessment Capacity**

- 1. Promote increased post graduate training of risk assessors.***
- 2. Promote on-the- job training for risk assessors.***
- 3. Promote greater use of external experts in scientific committees and panels***
- 4. Expand principle of SCENIHR's "Associated Members" with full rights of participation for a specific question to the other 2 non-food SCs.***



## **C) Risk Assessment Data**

- 5. *Encourage SCs to make ex-ante calls for available data at outset of the work not applicable to authorisations where petitioner provides a dossier)***
- 6. *Explore with EFSA how it could develop data gathering networks rather than depend on panel members***
- 7. *Explore with Committees their interest in using contracted support for gathering data. Encourage networking with other organisations and bodies (EFSA, non-food SCs, WHO, FAO...)***
- 8. *Establish group of officials to explore better use of RTD and JRC capacity to support data needs for SCs***

## D) Content of Risk Assessment mandates

9.
  - i) ***Require risk managers to draft mandates which are limited to issues that science can address and are sufficiently broad to cover - possible unintended effects, the aspect of “alternatives” where a substance may be banned, risk-benefit and all sources of exposure.***
  - ii) ***Emphasise need for improved risk assessor / manager communication during preparation of mandates and draft reports. Greater involvement of stakeholders when drafting mandates.***
  - iii) ***Suggest systematic networking between risk assessors and other agencies, 3rd countries; take into account international scientific opinions.***
  - iv) ***Ask risk assessors to define research needs to fill data gaps (not for petitioners)***
  - v) ***Ask for inclusion of a period for public comment on “draft final opinions ” whenever useful; address points raised by other scientific bodies; document minority/dissenting views.***

## **D) Content of Risk Assessment mandates** (continued)

**9.**

***vi) Ask for assessment of data quality***

- Peer reviewed data ?***
- Degrees of uncertainty (qualitative more often than quantitative)***
- Weight of evidence***

**10. *Monitor quality of mandate drafting: assess how far the opinion meets the manager's needs – SANCO officials to make systematic assessment covering time-lines, quality of peer review, nature of data gaps, research needs .....***



## **E) Content of assessments**

- 11. *Launch a pilot “lay language summary” based on the complex opinion on tooth whiteners. Possible development of guidelines for presentation of scientific advice to decision makers and stakeholders.***
- 12. *Explore with the chairs of the non-food SCs the completion of the former SSC work on a common thesaurus for authors of risk assessments.***
- 13. *Explore interests of SC chairs in better networking, enhanced inter-committee cooperation, coherence in similar cases and harmonisation.***
- 14. *Encourage EFSA led review on genotoxic carcinogens; Consider non-food SC comparative review of approaches to non-thresholded effects in cooperation with EFSA and other interested bodies.***
- 15. *Develop a feed back mechanism for learning for learning from e.g. international differences to specific substances (example of phthalates with the US CPSC)***





## ***Consultation***

*Comments on this paper or ON the presentation are most welcome and can also be given in writing via the following address:*

**[Sanco-science-discussion-paper-comments@cec.eu.int](mailto:Sanco-science-discussion-paper-comments@cec.eu.int)**

***Closing date: 31 December 2005***

**This paper was produced for a meeting organized by Health & Consumer Protection DG and represents the views of its author on the subject. These views have not been adopted or in any way approved by the Commission and should not be relied upon as a statement of the Commission's or Health & Consumer Protection DG's views. The European Commission does not guarantee the accuracy of the data included in this paper, nor does it accept responsibility for any use made thereof.**