Parallel Session 1: Risk Assessment Terminology

Briefing and discussion points

The aim of this Parallel Session is to review the terminology used in risk assessment, review the results of collaborative projects in the area and identify and areas where possible future work should focus.

Points for discussion

- What is the context of the risk assessment and the different sectoral legislative constraints (wording) that frame the questions/mandates?
- How to improve the clarity of the language to express levels of risk and uncertainty?
- How to improve the continuity of the message through the risk assessment?
- How to avoid changing the message through unintentional drafting variations through the opinion?
- How to avoid terms that imply risk management judgements?
- Should uncertainties be described in quantitative terms rather than qualitative? Is this possible in all sectors?
- Recognise that in some risk assessments it may be especially difficult to define quantitative metrics (e.g. pain and suffering)?
- Uncertainties should be dealt with in separate section?
- How to present conflicting or contrasting evidences clearly?
- Expressions should be accompanied by clear statement or summary of the evidences on which they are based?
- To what extent is harmonisation desirable and/or achievable?

Questions to participants

- Where are the successes, gaps, barriers (real/perceived)?
- What are the priorities for future work?
- How we may collegiately do the work and utilize the products?
- When do we start?
- Who should be involved?

This paper was produced for a meeting organized by Health & Consumers 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 & Consumers 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.