



**INTER-COMMITTEE CO-ORDINATION GROUP
(ICCG)**

**Meeting date: 8 October 2012, starting at 10:00
B232 room 02/17 (Rue Belliard, 2nd floor), Brussels**

DRAFT MINUTES

1. WELCOME AND APOLOGIES

Dr. Tapani welcomed the participants and announced the two apologies (JB and PhH).

2. ADOPTION OF THE DRAFT AGENDA

The agenda was adopted. TS asked to move point 7 forward due to his need to leave a bit early.

3. DECLARATION OF INTEREST ON MATTERS ON THE AGENDA

No new declarations were made.

4. INFORMATION EXCHANGE

4.1. Administrative, procedural, methodological and general matters, horizontal activities and issues.

(a) Selection of external experts

TD reiterated the need to conduct the selection in a structured, systematic manner: the chair of the WG is to be an SC member and the selection is to follow the usual steps (pool of scientific advisors, database of experts, call for experts). The selection of experts should be documented in the Minutes. The commission asked the SCs chairs to apply and maintain the stipulated procedure of creation a WG.

The issue of when it is appropriate to revise an opinion if/when new data comes up was revisited. The rules of procedure state the way to proceed in such cases, which should be followed.

(b) Issues relating to independence

Commission to the accusations levelled by some NGOs.

Previous accusations to SCs Opinions on certain delicate issues were discussed. These attacks to the independence of the experts opened a discussion on the validity and/or appropriateness of the system established for the SCs. The view of the SCs is that the present system is a valid way and should continue to be applicable.

In this sense, the expertise of industry is not seeing as a conflict of interest (when participating in WG meetings) as long as it is balanced with experts which are independent scientist (do not belong to industry). This opinion is shared by the participants of the meeting.

It was suggested that in the case that a member of any of the SCs has anything to do with any of the issues dealt within the other 2 Scientific committees, or has been contacted /lobbied by industry, should also declare it to the Commission. In the same line, any contacts by stakeholders with the members of the SCs on their function of member of the SC should be declared.

The possibility to develop criteria to declare possible conflicts of interest was suggested. A proposal for the rules of procedure could be done with the future renewal of the SCs. The final objective is to ensure transparency.

(c) Invitations and contacts for members of the SC

The policy in terms of contacts with outside partners was also highlighted.

(d) SCENIHR proposal: Definition of independence, categorization of interests and experts' involvement in Working Groups.

The SCENIHR document on independence of the experts and the selection of WG members was presented as a way to document properly the work of the SCs in terms of independence. IW made a comment on the discussions outside the formal meetings.

4.2. Information from/to Chairs on the Committees' activities

4.2.1. Joint activities

(a) New challenges

The different options on how to proceed were presented. The ICCG decided that the opinion will be re-named as a "discussion paper/working document" and sent for public consultation.

(b) Improvements in risk assessment

The SCCS cannot agree to the Opinion, as regards some parts of the content, and would not like to call it an opinion. SCHER also supports the change on the name

of the document to “interface between socio-economic analysis and risk assessment” or “use of risk assessment and socio-economic analysis for risk management” (*I would not elaborate on which committee said what because then we have to include all the comments of all three SCs, which is redundant. The plenary minutes of each respective committee already contain this information.*)

It was agreed that the opinion will be re-named as a "discussion paper/working document", the title changed and the text edited (in terms of clarity of the messages) before it goes back to the SCs for further consideration and adoption. It was agreed to circulate the working document for written procedure. (*Is this what you heard? I thought that the idea is to present it to the full plenaries.*) Out of this discussion, it came out the issue that alternatives should be regarded for risk management decisions. Element to introduce in the future mandates, consider the potential risk of the alternatives and compare with the substance being under assessment. (*I am not sure if this is needed because the issue is discussed in the text of the opinion.*)

4.2.2. SCCS

(a) Summary of on-going activities

The chair of SCCS informed the ICCG about the on-going activities, which were discussed briefly. (*the activities were discussed, not the WGs - ☺*)

4.2.3. SCHER

(a) Summary of on-going activities

The chair of SCHER informed the ICCG about the on-going activities and new mandates which were discussed briefly.

4.2.4. SCENIHR

(a) Summary of on-going activities

The vice-chair of SCENIHR informed the ICCG about the on-going activities which were discussed briefly. The emission of EMF in electric cars was mentioned as a possible source of concern.

5. NEW REQUESTS

a) Synthetic Biology (SCENIHR (lead), SCCS, SCHER)

The mandate was briefly discussed. The SCs will be asked to identify experts for this WG. (*SCHER and SCENIHR already did that, so I would not put this sentence. In general, do we proceed with the mandate?*)

b) Implementation of Article 16 Cosmetic Regulation EC1223/2009 on the notification of cosmetic products containing nanomaterials.

The commission informed the participants on the duties/obligations of the SCs as per the implementation of Article 16 of the Cosmetic Regulation.

Outsourcing to government risk-assessment institutions like RIVM or BfR may be an option for this rather complex task.

6. COLLABORATION WITH OTHER COMMUNITY BODIES

6.1. SCENIHR : Bisphenol A in medical devices and EFSA assessment of BPA in food – Development of rules for collaboration/joint opinions

TD informed the ICCG about the current state of collaboration between the SCs and EFSA's working group.

6.2 SCCS-SCHER-SCENIHR: Mandate to EFSA on the development of criteria for the identification of Endocrine Disruptors

TD informed the ICCG about the involvement of experts from the 3 SCs in the work including the development of rules/approach for the development and adoption of the opinion by the SCs.

7. THE FUTURE STRUCTURE AND FUNCTIONING OF THE COMMISSION SCIENTIFIC COMMITTEES

Information on the on-going thinking was presented by TP.

Commission informed the participants about the status of the proposal on merging the committees into one. For a final answer on this proposal some more time is needed.

Further issues which were discussed are: the mandate of the present committee; the location of the future committee; the increase on the number of members and the validity of the past call of interest for the renewal of the committees.

8. ANY OTHER BUSINESS

There was none.