Project no: 022936

Project acronym: Beneris

Project title: Benefit-risk assessment for food: an iterative value-of-information approach

Instrument: STP-Specific Targeted Project

Deliverable 47:

Scientific advisory panel

Due date of deliverable:	**1 Oct, 2009**
Actual submission date:	**15 Nov, 2009**
Dissemination level:	**PU**
Start date of project:	**April, 1st 2006**
Duration:	**3,5 years**

Organisation name of the lead contractor for this deliverable: **THL**

Scientific advisory panel (D47)

The documentation of this deliverable consists of the following parts:

- Table of the participants of the Scientific Advisory Panel (SAP)
- Feedback from the SAP presented in the Midterm meeting (Helsinki, 7-9 Nov 2007)
- Feedback from the SAP presented in the Final meeting (Budapest, 10-11 June 2009)

Table of the participants

Subgroup	Organization	Attended the Midterm meeting (Helsinki, 7-9 Nov 2007)	Attended the Final meeting (Budapest, 10-11 June 2009)	E-mail	Notes	Expertise and link to QALIBRA and BENERIS
PERMANENT MEMBERS						
Dr. Diane Benford	**Food Standards Agency**	yes	no	Diane.Benford@foodstandards.gsi.gov.uk	Head of the toxicology unit at the Food Standards Agency	Responsible for advice on possible adverse human health effects of chemicals in food, including food additives, contaminants, natural toxicants and dietary supplements. This advice is based on scientific risk assessments.
Prof. David Briggs	**Imperial College**	no	no	d.briggs@imperial.ac.uk	Professor from Imperial College, London	Has done extensive work on environmental health risks and modelling. Coordinating the EU project INTARESE.
Dr. Jan M. Gutteling	**University of Twente**	no	no	j.m.gutteling@utwente.nl		
Prof. Inga Thorsdottir	**Reykjavik University Hospital**	phone meeting only	no	ingathor@landspitali.is	Professor in human nutrition at the University of Iceland, and director of the Department of Clinical Nutrition, Landspitali-University Hospital	The science leader of the health benefits work in the Seafoodplus (IP). Chairman of the Icelandic Nutritional Council, Icelandic delegate in a specialist group for Nordic Nutritional Recommendations, chairman of the Nordic Nutrition Recommendations for Children. Participates in an on-going EU-project, ProChildren.
Dr. Hilko van der Voet	**Wageningen Univ. and Research Centre**	yes	yes	hilko.vandervoet@wur.nl		Methodology for model building and analysis, uncertainty analysis. Quantitative risk analysis for food safety, probabilistic modelling. Validation of measurement and detection methods, measurement uncertainty. Quality control systems, SPC.
AD HOC EXPERTS						
Prof. Alan Boobis	**Imperial College**	yes	yes	a.boobis@imperial.ac.uk		
Dr. David Carlander	**EFSA**	yes	no	David.CARLANDER@efsa.europa.eu	Substitutes for Juliane Kleiner in the Midterm	
Dr. Juliane Kleiner	**EFSA**	no	no	juliane.kleiner@efsa.europa.eu		
Prof. Ronald Mensink	**Maastricht University**	no	no	R.Mensink@HB.unimaas.nl	Will only contribute on functional foods.	Expert on phytosterols.
Prof. Charles R. Santerre	**Purdue University**	no	no	santerre@purdue.edu	Associate Professor Foods and Nutrition, Purdue University	Research in food safety and chemical contaminants in fish and aquaculture and involved in IFT communications in this area.

Feedback from the SAP to the Beneris project, as presented in the Midterm and Final meetings

The feedback is summarized below. PowerPoint handouts can be found in appendices of this deliverable.

SAP members commented on the presentations given by the BENERIS partners in the project meetings. Additionally, the panel inquired clarification on details. In both meetings, SAP had a separate meeting where they prepared concrete feedbacks for the projects. These were given in the end of the meetings by presenting the slides shown in the appendix. In both meetings in 2007 and 2009 all participating members of the SAP participated actively in the discussion about Beneris and Qalibra. In addition to official BENERIS meetings, Davig Briggs, a member of the SAP, has participated in several discussions about and commented Opasnet and open assessment in other scientific meetings.

The feedback contained comments both on the scientific content and management of the project. Details, scoping and use of the methods were actively discussed, giving the project guidelines to the future. The feedback was partly given in form of questions to raise discussion, and it was particularly valuable for scoping the project and focusing on relevant issues. The evaluation produced clear goals and demonstrated possible future improvements. Open Assessment method particularly raised many questions which have been valuable in developing the method. Underlining the importance of collaboration with QALIBRA project has provided co-operation between several research institutes and this will carry on after the end of the projects.

Appendix (1/4)

9th November 2007

Open Risk Assessment
- What, in your opinion, are the main methodological, technical, or practical reasons that are likely to slow down or prevent the use of Open Risk Assessment? ORA can be operated in different ways
- Fully shared ORA, continuous assessment, with no one in charge
- Fully shared ORA, with a moderator and timetable
- Structured, guided RA, with open stakeholder input
- Restricted participation, fully shared outcome
- Common platform for risk assessment team

Address the intended use of the ORA in the context of a given assessment

Advantages with ORA
- Promoting the acceptance of RA because of stakeholder involvement
- Transparency way of working is good
- Potential efficient in mobilizing a large workforce, and multiple inputs
- Data and model exchange platform

Comments on ORA
- Who is setting the scene - scoping
- Data availability is a problem
- Mechanism needed to ensure relevant data are available, and used
- Access, use of data, data comparability/linking data sets, and data protection are issues that need to be
- Science based inputs, who will verify
- Impartiality and conflict of interest of contributors
- How to handle divergent scientific viewpoints?
- The RA should be citable
- Suitable for all questions? Consequences of difference scenarios
- All scientific input should be adequately referenced

General Comments
QALIBRA and Beneris
- Communication to consumers is not an integral part of a RBA

- **Communication to consumers after the finalization of the RBA model**
- **Communication to consumers have to be very clear**
- **Usability and transportability of the tool after the completion of the project**
- **Prepare for interaction with other tools and platforms**
- **Interaction with other projects e.g. Beneris, BRAFO, SAFEFOODS…**

General Comments
Beneris
- **Choice and interpretation of analytes in placenta study**

Appendix (2/4)

- Improved integration in the project can be achieved by greater focus on the case studies
- Development of BBN is dependent on analysis of real data, including interactions between variables
- In Case 2, consider the relevance of supplements and fortification

Concluding Remarks
QALIBRA/Beneris
- Approaches and tools under development in the projects have high potential uses in RBA
- The emphasis on quantifying uncertainties and their communication is very useful
- The attempt of transparency in the assessments is welcomed
- There is potential for great synergy between the projects and interactions between them need to be increased
- The mathematical approaches are innovative but the models are only as good as the underlying biology

Appendix (3/4)

11th June 2009

Questions asked
- critical review of the Qalibra and Beneris projects
- limited input:
- only 2 draft papers provided
- presentations this meeting
- software demonstrations

Beneris Presentations: Fish case study and BBN
- Illustrative of implementation of BBN software
- Quality of data used was not so clear, same as described in OPASNET?
- Correlations in consumption patterns not yet included in model
- Uninet software for BBN is a very promising research tool for studying conditional distributions
- Application to risk assessment still to be developed further (e.g. uncertainty of percentiles, 2D Monte Carlo, multilevel model)
- Consider to provide a link to output from other programs not to have to do everything inside the tool

Vegetable case study
- Limited information provided
- Is there sufficient time to complete this case study?

Exposure-response functions
- Good overview of all potential relations
- However, criteria for using the information in RBA case study were not apparent

OPASNET
- Approach to catching and sharing as much high-quality information as possible
- "BRA should help to improve mental model of decision makers"
- Possible functions of OPASNET:
- data repository
- discussion site
- open assessment

OPASNET
- Difficult to judge the quality of data in the repository.

⚲   **Example: concentrations omega-3 in fish: 3 data tables, not clear which one to use or if they can be combined**
⚲   **How much of the discussion on OPASNET were used in producing the final output of Beneris case studies?**
⚲   **At what point it is possible to provide advice to risk managers from an OA?**

Appendix (4/4)

⚲   **e.g. Duscussion page states not enough data on omega-3, resolution: more data needed**

General Comments
QALIBRA and Beneris
⚲   **Projects have made good progress**
⚲   **Developed useful frameworks for BRA**
⚲   **However, not much integration between frameworks**
⚲   **In the future, many other projects will do similar things**
⚲   **Big challenge: how to get it all together?**
⚲   **Would be helpful if a global overview was produced**
⚲   **Potentially useful sofware is being developed, but use by others than the developers is currently very limited**
⚲   **Dissemination of software availability**
⚲   **User feedback?, Follow up?**