



Scientific Committees' activities 2009-2012

Achievements and lessons learnt

Takis Daskaleros
Risk assessment Unit

SCENIHR: advice (opinions)

Total: 14 opinions and 1 position paper

- **Antimicrobial resistance** (2 opinions, one of them joint with EFSA/EMA/ECDC)
- **Nanotechnologies** (1 opinion)
- **Physical hazards** (3: EMF, security scanners, artificial light)
- **Medical devices** (3: breast implants/PIP, sphygmomanometers, single use)
- **Tobacco additives** (1)
- 4 joint opinions with SCHER and SCCS:
 - **Threshold of Toxicological Concern (TTC)**
 - **Risk Assessment of Mixtures**
 - **New Challenges in Risk Assessment**
 - **Improvements on Risk Assessment**
- position paper on **evaluating evidence/weight of evidence**
- + involvement of members in other WGs

Characteristics of SCENIHR opinions

Large in Volume (up to 150 pages)

Review-type opinions

Not based on a dossier

Long time frame (up to 2 years)

Some topics assessed periodically

Calls for information (almost always)

Public consultation (almost always) usually triggers many responses

SCENIHR: Follow-up of opinions

Policy and legislation

- **Adopt new or adapt existing or legislation (e.g. Tobacco, EMF)**
- **Policy options (e.g. Commission recommendation on nano-definition)**

Presentation / Discussion of opinions and possible follow-up

- **Stakeholder meetings (e.g. Antimicrobial Resistance)**
- **Member States committees (e.g. Tobacco, Breast Implants)**
- **Debate at EU-level and international**

Organisation of dedicated events and activities

- **Nanotechnology**
- **EMF**

Research Agenda

Future of SCENIHR

Activities expected to continue in line with current mandate and scope

Increased emphasis on

- **Medical devices (proposal for a revision of the current legislation)**
- **New technologies (e.g. synthetic biology)**
- **Emerging issues**

SCHER: advice (opinions)

Total: 41 opinions and 1 position paper

- **Water Framework Directive Environmental Quality Standards** (26 opinions)
- **Risk Assessment** (5 opinions: Mercury in energy saving lamps (2), fluoride, depleted uranium, lead in jewellery)
- **Chemicals in toys** (6)
- **Specific environmental issues** (Cadmium in fertilisers (2), detergents (2))
- 4 joint opinions with SCENIHR and SCCS:
 - **Threshold of Toxicological Concern (TTC)**
 - **Risk Assessment of Mixtures**
 - **New Challenges in Risk Assessment**
 - **Improvements on Risk Assessment**
- position paper on **mercury in energy saving lamps**
- + involvement of members in other WGs



Characteristics of SCHER opinions

Varying in size (few pages to over 100 pages)

Review-type opinions

Sometimes based on a dossier

Short to medium time frame (few months)

Calls for information (often)

Public consultation (selective)



SCHER: Follow-up of opinions

Policy and legislation

- **Adopt new or adapt existing or legislation (e.g. Toys, Detergents)**
- **Setting standards (e.g. Water Framework Directive)**

Presentation / Discussion of opinions and possible follow-up

- **Stakeholder meetings (e.g. Mixtures)**
- **Member States committees (e.g. lead in jewellery)**
- **Debate at EU-level and international**

Organisation of dedicated events and activities

- **Fluoride**
- **Chemical mixtures**

Research Agenda

Future of SCHER

Activities expected to continue in line with current mandate and scope but with increased emphasis on

- **Environmental issues**
- **Health threats and risks to human health via the environment**

SCCS : advice (opinions)

Total: 113 opinions and 7 position papers

- **Hair dyes** (72 opinions)
- **Fragrances** (4)
- **Consumer Products** (1)
- **Preservatives** (11)
- **UV filters** (5 including one nanomaterial)
- Other Cosmetic substances (20)
- 4 joint opinions with SCHER and SCENIHR:
 - **Threshold of Toxicological Concern (TTC)**
 - **Risk Assessment of Mixtures**
 - **New Challenges in Risk Assessment**
 - **Improvements on Risk Assessment**
- 7 position papers (notes of guidance, hair dye allergies, etc.)
- + involvement of members in other WGs



Characteristics of SCCS opinions

Varying in size

Mostly based on a dossier

Short to medium time frame (few months)

Calls for information (often)

Targeted consultation aimed mainly to dossier submitters

Public consultation (selective)

Frequent stakeholder interactions

SCCS: Follow-up of opinions

Policy and legislation

- **Adapt existing or legislation** (e.g. Cosmetics)
- **Member States committees** (e.g. consumer products, GPSD)
- **Stakeholder meetings**
- **Alternative methods research and validation**
- **Debate at EU-level and international**

Organisation of dedicated events and activities

- **Fragrances**

Future of SCCS

Activities expected to continue in line with current mandate and scope

Continued heavy workload on cosmetics

Increased work on nanomaterials in cosmetics (notification)

Alternative methods/risk assessment approaches in light of animal test ban



Issues: 1. Organisation of Scientific Advice

Availability of competent and independent experts

Independence of experts

Selection of external experts

Quality of process versus timeliness of opinions

Peer review and quality control

Access to data and confidentiality

Collaboration between EU, National, International and non-EU country bodies

Stakeholder participation/dialogue



Issues: 2. Interface between Science and Policy Making

**Quality of mandates given to Scientific
Committees**

**Respective roles of scientists and policy
makers**

Transparency and clarity of scientific advice

**Communication between risk assessors and
risk managers**

Interpretation of scientific advice



Issues: 3. Some of the current methodological aspects

Animal models and their limitations (e.g. low bioavailability)

Ban on animal testing (cosmetics)

New methods to identify hazards and exposure (in silico tox, -omics)

RA terminology, expression of uncertainties, weighing of evidence

Risk/benefit assessment

Issues: 4. Communicating Science

Communication adapted to audience

Two ways process

Balance between transparency/completeness and readability

Expression of risks, uncertainty, confidence: qualitative or quantitative approach

Pollution of communication by “junk” science

Perception of risk

Acceptability of risk – level

Notion of zero risk

Voluntary versus non voluntary risks



European
Commission

THANK YOU!!!

Health and
Consumers