

Report of the Second Consensus Workshop on Novel Food¹

1. Conclusions and Recommendations

- There was keen interest in this type of workshop as a forum for discussion and dialogue between all stakeholders. Participants expressed support for the workshop and would be interested to participate in similar future workshops.
- Discussion of novel food was particularly timely given the current revision of the EU novel food legislation and discussions on legislation for the fortification of food, and for claims. These topics were of particular importance and relevance for consumer representatives and other participants such as industry.
- Discussions emphasised that, at the moment, there are many questions that could not be answered by the participants. Further research needs were identified. It should be noted that some of these research needs were already being addressed through DG Research projects currently underway. Details of such projects can be found on the project website² and through links to the DG Research website³. There were many differing opinions about research needs and future DG Research projects. However, within this workshop there was little time to explore these aspects in depth, or to specify the precise details of what would be needed to answer the outstanding consumer questions. This is an area for further detailed exploration.
- The workshop agenda was very ambitious, taking advantage of contributions from the top EU experts in the field. There were perhaps too many issues to be discussed under the time constraints and therefore discussions at some times lacked pointed conclusion.
- Feedback from participants supported the idea of more workshops (like this one) to focus in depth on some of the unresolved issues and emerging problems for European R&D on novel food and processes.
- The discussions on novel foods emphasised that clear, objective, impartial information is needed to counter 'marketing hype' about novel foods and processes. How, when and by

¹ Second Consensus Workshop on Novel Food, 5 - 7 February 2003, International Association Centre, (MAI), rue Washington 40, B-1050 Brussels
<http://www.consensusworkshops.org/ws02main.html>

² Consensus workshops: <http://www.consensusworkshops.org>

³ <http://www.europa.eu.int/comm/research/quality-of-life/ka1-leaflet.html>

whom this should be provided needs further exploration, acknowledging resource implications for the provision of generic information or concrete health related information about novel foods.

- Focusing on GMOs as part of the novel food legislation, it was interesting to note discussions about post-launch monitoring and co-existence, which presumes that at some point there might indeed be a 'launch'. Discussions about GMOs have moved on; previous discussions would have inevitably focussed on labelling issues.
- There was a knowledge gap about new food technologies between consumer representatives and industry practitioners, one that would be even wider for the general public. Bridging this gap, especially where the application of new technology has implications for consumers, such as about the way new foods are marketed, sold, selected, stored and cooked is vital. This area could possibly be the topic of a future consumer workshop.
- Consumers are clearly willing to embrace novel foods and processes when products fulfil a need and meet their criteria for acceptance. However, where consumers do not perceive there to be any real benefits, new technologies can be rejected subsequently wasting R&D effort. The need to address consumer concerns and acceptability of novel foods and processes, at the onset of the R&D process is crucial.
- Communication and education were key to the introduction of novel foods and processes yet they are often inadequate; they need much more attention to ensure that consistent, clear messages are promoted to consumers by all stakeholders, throughout the food and feed chain and related professional organisations.
- Focussed consumer research is needed to ensure that consumers are able to understand and interpret information and labelling accurately, especially regarding implied claims. Regulatory intentions are not always delivered in practice for consumers. Problems should therefore be identified and addressed by the appropriate control authorities;

Differing points of view

- There were differing views about scientific risk assessment and how this could be achieved in a transparent and trustworthy manner. Rebuilding consumer trust is key and needs to be demonstrated in open and transparent regulatory procedures.
- The extent to which 'traditional products' should be able to make claims was discussed. There was no consensus on this point - it needed further exploration and discussion since it appeared to be such a contentious and important issue for many stakeholders.

Further research needs

General

- The issue of efficacy and risk benefit of novel foods needs further elaboration and discussion particularly on what level of scientific evidence is necessary to demonstrate the efficacy for claims. This could be included as a future EU RTD research need.

Labelling/Claims

- Further research is needed into consumers' understanding and perception of words and logos used to communicate claimed benefits for novel foods and processes and any associated claims.

GMOs

- Co-existence of GM, non-GM and organic systems is essential. More research is essential to determine what is feasible and achievable, with confidence and security on a crop by crop basis to ensure that all three systems maintain their integrity long-term.
- Further research is needed into the long-term impact of GM technologies on the environment, plants and micro-organisms especially those in the soil.
- Obtaining data from long-term monitoring is essential yet how this should be achieved in practice is not clear. There was no disagreement but rather a lack of knowledge about how this essential element could be instituted; more research is needed to solve this dilemma.

Areas for further discussion

- The evaluation of health claims approved elsewhere (for example in the US) and the subsequent level of EU evidence needs further exploration and discussion.
- The use of agriculture for non-food materials such as biopharmaceuticals and fuel was not explored yet the potential in these areas was recognised. These areas should be explored with consumers, through further discussion in another forum.
- Given the number of foods eaten each day should consumers have an upper intake limit according to their age etc. to avoid excess intakes? Reference levels could be put on the label to enable the consumer to judge their intakes of certain nutrients, where there could be a risk of over-consumption. However, few consumers know the daily quantities of nutrients that they should consume.
- The most effective means to communicate with consumers needs further exploration. Labelling is one aspect of communication, which should be supplemented.

Throughout the report additional points to note (over and above these conclusions and recommendations) are underlined in the text.

2. Introduction to the workshop

A three-day workshop to discuss novel food was organised on 5 - 7 February 2003 in Brussels (see Appendix 1 for Agenda).

The workshop brought together consumer representatives, scientists and other stakeholders to discuss novel food and processes, from a consumer and scientific point of view. Other stakeholders including primary food producers, food and feed manufacturers, retailers, policymakers and legislators in the food and feed chain actively participated in the discussions (see Appendix 2 for list of participants). The overall aim was to try to define areas of consensus and to identify areas where there were differing views, and where there was a need for more research or further discussion.

Workshop presentations

The main topics for the agenda were defined by BEUC's members and were elaborated by the project steering committee.

Each day focussed on a different aspect of the topic:

- Day 1 - Novel Food
- Day 2 - Genetically Modified Organisms
- Day 3 - Novel Processes

The plenary sessions followed the same format each day with presentations from regulators, the food industry, scientists and consumer representatives. Discussion sessions followed the presentations in the plenary, where all stakeholders actively participated. Details of all presentations and the discussion group topics can be found on the project's website⁴.

This report presents details of the discussions for each day. Common themes are identified along with overall conclusions and recommendations. Areas of consensus are noted along with those areas where it was considered that further research or discussion was needed.

⁴ Proceedings and details of all papers for this workshop can be found on the website at <http://www.consensusworkshops.org/ws02paper.html>

3. Discussion groups - points of consensus

Discussion groups followed the formal plenary sessions each day. Each group was presented with a series of questions to structure the initial discussions. Common themes emerged and were discussed further in the final reporting back plenary session.

DAY 1 - NOVEL FOOD FOCUSING ON CLAIMS

The first day of the workshop was devoted to novel food. However, the emphasis of the discussions focussed on claims, rather than novel food. From this it was concluded that at this juncture the most controversial aspect of novel food was their associated claims.

- **Definitions**

Novel food has many meanings - to consumers and to legislators, but whatever their definition the functional properties have been the issue of most discussion.

What exactly is 'functional food'? This term has been used widely, but it lacks an appropriate definition for consumers. Consumer representatives agreed that the hype about functional food is really about the ability to make 'functional' claims for these foods.

It should be appreciated that there are functional foods that are not novel, and there are novel foods that are not functional.

- **Regulation of claims**

All claims should be regulated, be they for novel, functional, exotic or traditional foods. The issue is to what extent claims are valid and useful for consumers' needs, and how any claim can help consumers make appropriate food choices.

There was a clear consensus that claims for novel food should be regulated, scientifically substantiated, and approved so that consumers are not misled. However, these claims should not be regulated under novel food regulations; the issue of regulating claims is wider than applies to novel food alone. Separate regulation for claims is required, beyond the novel food regulation.

There is a need to legislate for both novel food and claims. Consensus was reached that there should be a novel food approval procedure under the novel food legislation and a separate approval procedure for claims. The approval procedure for claims should be for the food, as it is consumed, taking into consideration the whole context of the food and its active ingredients.

- **Conditions for claims**

The substance on which the claim is being made must be present in sufficient quantities to provide the benefit, and it must be bio-available in the form the food is sold. This could lead to a positive list giving approval for a group of foodstuffs to use a specific claim. This would facilitate better guidance to consumers and ensure that they are not misled, and could facilitate exposure assessment and surveillance at a later date.

Regarding foods that were generally recognised to be 'unhealthy' by consumers and, where there is great potential for confusion with claims on such foods, criteria should be developed and included in legislation to deal with such inappropriate claims. This was the opinion of the overwhelming majority of consumer representatives, which was however not shared by all participants.

- **Exotic foods**

New or exotic foods are being imported and marketed in the EU - these may or may not have beneficial health properties. The case study of noni juice raised many issues (see Day 1 workshop 3).

For example: its use as a food in the EU compared with its traditional use (in a different cultural situation, in a different portion size) which is more akin to that of a medicine. The question was raised whether it would then be possible to make any claims for its 'therapeutic' properties. The answer to this question was 'no' since the traditions of use are very much dependant on cultural situations, which are not necessarily the same in Europe. Exotic foods must be safe in any new situation and use and claims must not be misleading; any beneficial properties would need to be proven in the new situation.

When noni fruit juice was first introduced to the EU there were differing views about whether it was a novel food or not, and about its previous history of safe use elsewhere in the world. It has since become rather a controversial case. An application as a novel food was made in Belgium, even though its marketing company said it was a fruit juice and that no claims for its special health properties were made on the product.

However, many messages are promoted in the media and advertising about the strongly held belief in the extra health benefits of noni fruit juice. The Scientific Committee on Food (SCF) opinion was that this was a fruit juice, with no additional benefits other than those of other fruit juices. There was no demonstrable evidence to support any specific health benefits for noni juice.

It was suggested that perhaps the authorities are too demanding on exotic products which come from another part of the world and, are not supported by a large company that can invest in obtaining the scientific data.

When are foods defined as novel or exotic foods? There appeared to be some confusion over this yet it is clear that exotic foods should undertake a safety assessment since this is already required in the regulation. There could be a simplified procedure, which could take into account existing studies to speed up, but not replace the assessment.

- **Assessment of novel food**

Evidence of consumption from countries outside of the EU requires a judgement as to which countries produce good scientific evidence. For example, with the ngali nut, to say that it has been consumed in its native region for several hundred years is not helpful to the regulator; nothing has actually been demonstrated about the nut and its allergenicity. The native population may be resistance to the allergenic properties of the nut, or at least, those who were not resistant would have died.

In the assessment process, is it satisfactory for a history of safe use in a third country to be accepted, or is it necessary to go beyond that with clinical trials, trials in animals? There was general consensus that approvals could be fast-tracked if there was robust data available from risk assessments existing in third countries. However, it would be legitimate for the scientific committee to take a view and carry out an investigation if this was thought necessary.

Furthermore, in the future evaluations might be carried out more effectively at a global level and there would need to be an understanding of the assessments made in other countries. However, information should not be accepted at face value. It was highlighted that US consumer groups are concerned that the level of evidence required to substantiate claims is being reduced, with fewer opportunities for public comment. Further discussion was needed on the level and type of evidence that would be acceptable in the EU for a food in use and accepted in a third country.

- **Generic claims**

It was agreed that generic claims should only be made on products that are important sources of the nutrient in question. Criteria on composition and reasonable consumption patterns would also need to be established.

If it is established that a certain ingredient has the same effect whether in milk, bread or in a range of other products, a situation could arise where there is evidence for a generic claim for that ingredient, regardless of the food vehicle.

Given the number of foods eaten each day should consumers have an upper intake limit according to their age etc. to avoid excess intakes? Reference levels could be put on the label to enable the consumer to judge their intakes of certain nutrients, where there could be a risk of over-consumption. However, few consumers know the daily quantities of nutrients that they should consume.

- **Medicinal claims v. health claims**

The official definition for a medicinal claim is that it can prevent, treat or cure a disease. A disease risk reduction claim is not considered to be a medicinal claim. But for consumers there are problems in understanding the subtle differences between health claims and medicinal claims. If a claim aims to prevent, mitigate or cure a disease it is a medicinal claim and should not be allowed.

The EU proposal is to allow, when they can be substantiated, disease risk reduction claims, and to maintain the prohibition on medicinal claims in respect of prevention, treating and curing disease; which would remain the distinguishing factor between foods and medicines.

Whatever claim is used it is clear that it should be scientifically established. Maintaining the difference between a medicinal claim and a health claim doesn't make the situation any more transparent or useful for consumers. Therefore scientific evidence is very important. Consumer organisations stated that more information should be made available as to how any of these claims influence the food choice for consumers.

It was explained that disease risk reduction claims will undergo an authorisation procedure by the Community, and only the Community will be allowed to authorise the claim. The company/petitioner will have to submit a dossier of two parts, one would be the scientific substantiation, and secondly on communication, to explain how this message would be communicated to consumers. How consumers will understand and view this information will be looked at by EFSA, by the Commission, and standing committee. It will be incorporated in the authorisation (approval procedure). Public consultations will allow those who believe that consumers won't understand the claim to make a challenge.

- **Communication and education**

Communication was highlighted as a very important factor regarding novel food and claims. Claims need to be clear and precise and must be clearly understood and be a benefit for consumers throughout the EU. The question was raised whether the legislator should demand or specify general information to be communicated about a particular health claim for a novel food.

There were many differing views on the words and form of the claim on the product label. Further research is required into consumers' understanding and perception of words or logos used to communicate any claimed benefits. While it is recognised that there has been research in this area⁵, it is evident from the recurring problems for consumers that these problems have not been solved; a more consumer-focused approach to this research is needed.

There is a need to inform and educate about novel food and claims. This is important for consumers and also for others in the food chain, especially in retailing and marketing. But who should provide this objective education?

⁵ EC project QoL-KA1-Passclaim-Concerted Action deals with some of these issues but this was not raised in this context of this workshop (<http://europe.ilsi.org/passclaim/>)

It was agreed that there needs to be some counter weight to marketing and advertising emphases, with objective clear information and education for consumers; this could be the subject of further research.

There was discussion that it is obvious that the food industry has different views from consumers about the relevant information to communicate on food labels. Consumer organisations obviously have a role to play in communicating and educating consumers , but so do others, such as the national food agencies and regulators. The area of communication and education is under-explored and needs more attention, with concerted action from all stakeholders, promoting the same messages.

This issue needs further attention to ensure that whatever is agreed within the regulations for novel foods and claims, when applied on labels claims are communicated effectively to consumers ensuring that they are not misled or confused.

- **Risk benefit analysis**

Currently in assessing claims the safety of products has been paramount. However, in the future risk benefit analysis might be considered, while recognising the difficulty in getting the right parameters for balancing the risks and benefits.

The risk manager would balance the risks and benefit. However, it is up to the risk assessor and scientists to provide the tools to make a decision, which must be done in a transparent way.

At the moment assessing risks and benefits is not an issue in novel food but it is for example, in relation to contaminants in fish – other (nutritional) benefits outweighs the risk from the contaminant. Assessing this type of risk-benefit issue causes confusion for consumers attempting to make appropriate food choices against a background of apparently contradictory advice; overall this is an issue which needs to be explored further, to ensure clear unambiguous information is given to consumers.

- **Marketing**

Consumer representatives were of the opinion that the food industry will only invest in products that they can put a claim on, to add value and show a benefit. It is obvious that claims play an important role. However the extent to which these claims affect consumers' purchasing and what impact could claims have on the overall diet is unknown.

There was consensus that consumer organisations and legislators can have a facilitator's role to play between the producers and consumers.

- **Enforcement and controls**

There was consensus on the issue of enforcement and control, especially since it was not clear if products can always prove what they claim. During the assessment process the evaluation is currently on the safety rather than the alleged benefit. Efficacy of claims was an important issue for consumers. This led onto a discussion about food supplements, fortification and possible over-consumption. Current legislation lags behind what is happening in the marketplace; consequently this legislation may not be enforced effectively since before too long it will be superseded. This area will need to be explored further as new legislation is developed, and explored in the context of current and future research projects that relate to new product development and any potential claims.

It is therefore very important to ensure that new regulations address the problems apparent in the old regulation, from a consumer perspective. Once claims and advertising is in the public domain it is very difficult to redress any problems encountered. For example, with 'advertorials' for noni juice's supposedly 'therapeutic' properties or indeed with definitions such as for yoghurt - where sterilised products are allowed to be called yoghurt in direct contradiction to the original meaning and function of yoghurt.

Issues for further discussion on novel food

- **Efficacy**

The extent to which efficacy should be proven was discussed. Currently in the approval process there is no requirement for an assessment of efficacy or risk benefit. This matter needed further discussion, both from the consumer perspective and from all other views: how would efficacy be assessed? What levels would be appropriate? Consequently, this is an area of future research (RTD).⁶

- **Claims for traditional products**

The extent to which 'traditional products' that consumers were familiar with, should also be able to make claims in the future, was discussed. There was no consensus on this point - it needed further exploration and discussion since it appeared to be such a contentious and important issue for many stakeholders.

- **Healthy and unhealthy food**

This is a question often raised by consumers. It was not discussed in any detail in this forum, yet it is a highly controversial and confusing topic for consumers, and one which could fruitfully be discussed in another forum. This will no doubt be explored within the Third Consensus Workshop on Nutrition in Budapest, July '03. Criteria could perhaps be established.

- **Prior approval elsewhere**

Many health claims have been approved elsewhere, for example in the US by the FDA. Would it be acceptable in the EU to adopt the US assessment or would it be necessary to have further research? This was a matter for further discussion.

Further research needs on novel food

- **Criteria for approval of claims**

It was obvious from the discussions that further research is needed to define the situations and conditions for the approval of claims and all the associated issues, particularly consumers' needs and interpretation of such claims. There was a recurrent need expressed for more consumer research but the detail of this was not explored within this workshop due to time pressures.

- **Post-launch monitoring**

It was agreed that post-launch monitoring on a case-by-case basis should be done, yet there is a real need for further research about post-launch monitoring for novel foods. This was agreed by a clear consensus, however, at this stage there was no clarity about how this should be done.

- **Consumer perception of words and logos**

Further research is needed into consumer perceptions about the use of words or logos for claims - what actually conveys the right message to consumers? A consumer focussed approach should be adopted - labelling and claims are directly for consumers' use - to ensure appropriate, informed consumer choices. Consumers' perception and use of labelling information and claims can be very different in practice from what was originally intended and assumed by the regulator. For example, this is the case with nutrition labelling.

⁶ It is obvious that there are running research projects dealing with some of these aspects, they were however not particularly mentioned during the discussion

DAY 2 - GENETICALLY MODIFIED ORGANISMS (GMOS)

The second day concentrated on GMOs in food production - focusing on scientific risk assessment, products in the pipeline and GMO products in Europe: the pros and cons. Several themes emerged from the discussions, the acceptability of GM products, post-launch monitoring and longer-term monitoring in the wider sense, co-existence and communication. There was consensus on several matters but there were also many differing views and areas of uncertainty.

- **GM acceptability**

There was consensus that GM products could be acceptable to consumers - the specific conditions for any future acceptance were not explored. Yet it was clear that there needed to be a proper thorough assessment, and prior discussion with consumers before their introduction. Meaningful consultation with the public was essential - yet how and when to do this presented problems.

The farm animal industrial platform has raised the issue and introduced the discussion of the use of GM technologies for farm animals.

It was highlighted that an ethical debate was necessary and acknowledgement that this would be included in the approval system and regulations for GM food and feeds. The weight given by risk managers to criteria such as ethics and cultural aspects, as well as technical issues was of concern.

The consequences of not applying GM technologies were also discussed. If there were no acceptance of GM now this would undoubtedly stifle further developments, which might in time be more beneficial and acceptable for consumers. Science is constantly evolving and the long-term consequences of not adopting GM technology at this point need to be considered, especially in the global context.

The benefits of GM for consumers were discussed, such as improvements in quality, decrease in environmental impact - less pesticides, lower process, etc. The crucial formula for consumer acceptance seems to be the demonstration of positive benefits for the individual and the communication and acceptance of these positive benefits.

There was consensus that it was difficult to discuss the introduction of the technology and its acceptance without specific products to assess; each would be judged on a case-by-case basis depending on the crop concerned and the national situation.

- **Maintaining choice**

The problem of premature introduction of GM technology was discussed; it isn't that consumers are against innovation in general, rather that the benefits need to be clear and communicated. And, consumers should be able to make a positive choice for GM rather than merely be faced with a 'fait accompli' over its introduction.

The role of global companies introducing GM technologies came into question with their responsibility worldwide to consumers. The role of the retailers, since they are closer to consumers was seen to be more responsive to their concerns than the motives of the companies developing GM technologies. The role of retailers in respect to farmers choice of growing seeds for conventional or organic products was brought into the discussion. (suggestion to delete the rest)

The principles of consumers' right to chose and the maintenance of market for non-GM foods were upheld. This was also true for farmers. There are essentially three systems of production ranging from a GM system, conventional (non-GM) agriculture and organic food production. All three would need to co-exist to meet different consumer choices, and different markets.

- **Co-existence**

This was a fundamental issue raised throughout the discussions.

There was consensus that co-existence of all three systems (GM, conventional and organic) should be achieved, but how this could be achieved in practice was not known, particularly when considering differences in crops, local geography and climate - this presents EU regulators with more challenges in a Pan-European context.

Co-existence was noted as being one of the most politically difficult questions to address and to achieve with certainty to maintain consumer and farmer choices. How can freedom of choice be maintained for all three systems of agriculture and how can the integrity of these fundamentally different systems and philosophies be guaranteed?

Clearly it is necessary for more research to determine what is feasible, to protect against GM contamination, especially with cross contamination in the field. There was much confusion about what is possible regarding separation distances to ensure that there is no cross-contamination of crops, especially while trying to maintain organic production systems without the use of GM technologies and to eliminate adventitious contamination in production. More research is necessary, on a crop by crop basis.

- **Scientific assessment**

There were differing views about scientific risk assessment: how was this to be achieved in a transparent manner and in a way that could be trustworthy?

- **The risk analysis process**

Of particular interest was the role of the risk managers and what information they used to base and make their decisions on. More clarity was needed about the scientific decision-making process - what were the factors considered? How were they weighted in decision-making? What about 'other legitimate factors' so important to consumers? There needs to be a more open and transparent process taking into account consumer concerns throughout the whole risk analysis process: this was seen as an important step in building confidence.

- **Concerns**

It was recognised that there are legitimate consumer concerns over the introduction of GM technologies in agriculture. The message, by consensus, was that it was vital to proceed with caution, taking appropriate precaution to address consumer concerns.

Discussion focussed on some misconceptions about GM crops. For example, it should be noted that even GM crops need the use of pesticides for pests 'other' than those controlled by this new technology; development of resistance to GM 'fixes' - how long would it be before resistance to the new GM technology developed? It should be recognised for example, that while the fight against the European Corn Borer in maize was vital, GM was not the only tool to deal with this problem; improvements in the use of natural predators and rotations were also important in dealing with such problems.

- **Long-term monitoring**

There was consensus that long-term monitoring was essential yet there was no consensus on how this should be achieved in practice. What parameters should be included to ensure appropriate monitoring long-term, for human health and environmental impacts? There was no consensus on how or what to do, or even what should be investigated.

More discussion and detailed information was needed to progress this debate. It was not that there was particular disagreement, rather a lack of knowledge, but it was stressed that this knowledge must be developed - just because it was difficult the problem wouldn't go away - it had to be solved.

Some feasibility studies had so far been inconclusive but this pointed to the fact that more research was needed to address this central issue.

- **Communication**

Communicating with consumers about GM technologies had been difficult in the past. The example of the use of antibiotic resistance markers for GM modifications had been notoriously difficult to explain in the context of antibiotic resistance and human health. It was recognised that sometimes it was better to avoid such controversial and difficult side issues by removing them from the GM equation. There was consensus on this point. It was also recognised that this was not a health problem but a communication problem.

There was consensus that it was vital to maintain communication and dialogue with consumers, engaging with all stakeholders, from scientists, to the regulators, the food and farming industry in an open and responsible way. Only by developing and maintaining such communication could confidence and trust be established. This workshop was exactly the type of forum necessary to explore these issues and develop these relationships across stakeholder groups.

There were lessons to be learned from the past, in communication and education of consumers. It was recognised that consumers needed to reconnect with agriculture - the links had been broken, understanding was very poor and consequently confidence in food and farming was fragile.

- **Issues for further discussion on GMOs**

While the emphasis of the discussions had been on the use of GM for food and feed production it was noted that there could be other significant uses of agriculture for non-food materials, such as biopharmaceuticals. This area needed to be explored in another forum.

It was clear throughout the discussions that in addition to current research, further research was needed about the impact of GM technologies, longer term on the environment, plants and micro-organisms in the soil particularly. Consumer representatives questioned whether these aspects had already been adequately addressed in the dossiers, as no judgements can be made due to the lack of clarity of the risk assessment and public access to, and interpretation of the dossier information.

- **Future research needs**

Effective long-term monitoring systems were essential yet further research is needed to progress this ensuring better implementation and assessment.

Co-existence presents one of the most fundamental challenges to the introduction of GM technologies and the maintenance of choice in different systems of agriculture; more additional research with suggestions for practical application is needed to facilitate and ensure that choice is maintained long term.

DAY 3 - NOVEL PROCESSES

The presentations from industry representatives in the plenary session illustrated the breadth and complexity of new food production processes in use, and in development. The technical aspects behind these modern food-processing techniques were outlined. Much of this information was new for the consumer representatives.

- **Innovation**

Industry needs to innovate to survive, to be able to provide consumers with the diversity and range of foods they need, and that they have come to expect. Potential advantages of new processing technologies for consumers include maintaining the 'fresh-like' qualities, taste, nutritional status, convenience and environmental aspects. Benefits of new technologies as well as any potential risks should also be taken into account by legislators.

Innovation is often presented to emphasise progress and beneficial outcomes, yet longer term there can also be unforeseen risks, which all supports the need for longer-term monitoring of innovative processes.

There was consensus that industry needs simple legislative procedures when introducing novel foods and processes.

Limitations to the introduction of new food technologies include the costs of both research and capital development. Consumer acceptance of new technologies as they are adopted is therefore critical. It was clear from the presentations in the plenary session that food technology has forged way ahead of consumers' understanding and comprehension about the way food is produced.

- **Novel processes**

There was a complex discussion about whether processes could be novel - or was this term only relevant for foods? Opinions varied and there appeared to be some contradictions. High-pressure technology for producing juices was often quoted as a novel process yet these had been on the market in the EU since 1997.

When an established technology is used to produce a new food, should this be treated as a novel food? Novel foods are easier to define since there is a change in the structure or composition as a result of processing. The application of new processes to familiar foods can however have unexpected outcomes. For example, pasteurisation of apple juice makes it acceptable to consumers who previously have had an allergic reaction to it. But this effect is not achieved to the same degree by high-pressure processing. This makes it all the more important for consumers to understand critical issues about the foods that they are selecting.

With any new technology the consensus message from consumer representatives was to proceed with caution, taking all precaution to address consumer concerns.

- **Information and communication**

Consumers arguably do not need to know all the details about how their foods are produced. Yet there can be serious implications of new technologies, for example, there might be different storage, preparation and cooking requirements, or adverse effects on allergenicity.

There was consensus that consumers need accurate and clear information to make informed choices and to be knowledgeable about their food and how it is produced. Currently there is perceived to be a lack of understanding of new technologies, but who should be responsible for providing this information? It was agreed by consensus that all stakeholders in the food and feed chain should have responsibility for providing information. But the best ways to communicate with consumers needs further exploration. It is not a matter of simple labelling. A general question was raised whether it should be necessary to label new technologies and processes.

- **Addressing consumer concerns**

A major discussion concerned how the gap between consumers' knowledge of the food industry could be bridged, particularly when developing new food technologies. There was consensus that industry needs to work towards regaining consumer confidence and trust and engage more with consumers.

Several examples were noted of successful models for engaging in a dialogue with consumers. Congresses, fairs, consumer panels, and the provision of consumer advisers based in the community were all mentioned. However, the cost of these activities was often prohibitive and their effectiveness needs to be assessed further. Nevertheless formulas should be found for engaging in meaningful dialogues with consumers. In some countries, such as Norway and Sweden, innovative techniques for involving consumers in dialogues have been used and have been effective; these have so far been funded by the State. For example, consensus workshops have been held on GM issues and on Codex matters.

Providing information by a top down approach is less successful than one where consumers are engaged in a meaningful dialogue; means to achieve this should be further pursued.

- **Safety**

Safe food is basic consumer right. Food safety is demanded - all food should be safe. In some cases it now seems that safety is being used as a form of marketing, with key placements alongside premium products. Terms such as fresh or fresher, safe or safer are creeping into marketing messages, but in reality these terms are meaningless for consumers. It was noted that currently an element of competition was occurring between different retailer groups based on different understanding and promotion of 'safe', such as when one retailer group promotes a higher level of security through a traceability approach. This was not helpful for consumers; they should be guaranteed safe food by all production systems.

Food should not be marketed on its safety; safety is a basic requirement for all foods, whatever its processing. Food should be marketed for other characteristics, such as its sensory qualities.

- **Transparency and trust**

The issue of transparency was of great concern and was discussed extensively. Basically there should be transparent and accountable procedures throughout the food and feed chain, yet how was this to be achieved?

The newly formed EFSA would be judged on the way it handles future food crises. It will need to build consumer trust, operating in an open and transparent way, employing best science in an unbiased and open manner. However, consumer representatives noted the way in which the Board of EFSA had been appointed and their disappointment in this process, which had already raised questions about the operation of transparency of setting up EFSA. There are opportunities with this new Agency to do things differently, and to engage consumers much more in the regulatory process, including the risk assessment stage. These opportunities should not be underestimated.

The development of better systems for transparency and accountability is not only an issue in the EU but also for national institutions, and the food industry overall.

There is a problem of consumer trust in food, in Europe. Stakeholders from the food and feed chain, working together, should identify the key issues to address for the public. There will always be differing opinions on some issues, but without dialogue there will be no progress towards addressing these problems.

A lack of openness breeds suspicion and mistrust; a policy of openness for the food industry is important, it was then for the market to decide.

- **Dialogue with consumers**

There was some scepticism about whether industry really wanted to engage in a meaningful dialogue with consumers. Some industry representatives responded that the experience of this workshop had been most useful and that they were encouraged to extend dialogue with consumers further, by for example, inviting consumers to be part of industry conferences and to forums at technical universities.

Differences in the ways of involving consumers were apparent in different countries; models had to be culturally acceptable. The European Commission had also encouraged the setting up of consumer/industry platforms on food safety, which had been most useful to extend opportunities for dialogue.

With globalisation, the food industry might be the same worldwide - this cannot be assumed for consumers; differences must be recognised.

It is vital for industry to listen to the concerns of consumers - industry needs to know what issues are of current and future concern to be able to respond to them, and focus on the different consumer needs within and between countries. Better methods of achieving this need to be explored further and put into practice.

Industry was cautious of stepping over pragmatic boundaries, such as commercial competitiveness - where there were issues of confidentiality, and was not open to discussing these issues. It was suggested that a framework or code of practice might be useful to set pragmatic boundaries for any such dialogue. Whatever means for dialogue was established it was vital to recognise that in this context, consumers' needs should be central.

Involving consumers in dialogues or participatory discussions about food policy is taking place in many different situations throughout Europe. There is much valuable experience of what works and what doesn't. Key is the involvement of consumers at the earliest stages possible, for example, at universities and particularly in the initial stages of research and development of ideas, and in projects such as this one.

It was recognised that there was involvement of consumer representatives in current European research projects and additionally in the on-going and/or just started European projects. This is a positive feature, but it also puts considerable strain on consumer organisations resources and capabilities for their effective and timely participation. The priority 5 on food quality and safety within the Sixth Framework Programme puts consumers first, which is considered positive, but realistically is likely to compound the resource problems of consumer organisations. Meaningful consultation and involvement of considered consumer views, from throughout Europe, is not easy to achieve within such research projects.

There was a strong feeling that last minute, post-haste consultation and inclusion of consumers in research proposals is not acceptable. Neither is it appropriate to involve consumers and then ignore their input, forging ahead with technologies that were not acceptable at the onset. These views were strongly held by consumer representatives, many of whom had generally not had positive experiences of involvement in the initial stages of the development of project proposals. Sometimes consumer representatives had been pressured to be involved at the later, or last stages of development of a proposal by which time it was difficult to have a real influence or meaningful input.

- **Role of professional organisations**

Given the apparent lack of information on food processing techniques and their applications and the sensitive issue of commercial confidentiality, one channel for providing information could be through professional or trade associations.

These could play an impartial role in explaining basic processing, for example, how a fruit juice is produced and why it goes through so many processes.

Industry tends to be inward facing and only at the point of marketing a new product is consumer information considered, and then it can become a problem to communicate what has been done.

Professional associations across Europe could play a key role in providing consumer information. Professional organisations (for food scientists and nutritionists) do not exist in Europe in the same way as they do in North America. There could be a strengthening of these professional organisations since they all share the common goal of professional excellence and, could provide a useful platform for dialogue in Europe.

**CONSENSUS WORKSHOP ON NOVEL FOOD
BRUSSELS, 5/6/7 FEBRUARY 2003**

AGENDA

VENUE: **INTERNATIONAL ASSOCIATION CENTRE (MAI)**
Rue Washington, 40
B-1050 Brussels
Tel: +32 2 640 1665 Fax: +32 2 646 0525

Wednesday 5 February 2003

Time	
08.30	Registration
09.15	Welcome and Introduction
09.30	1st Plenary Session: Novel Food
	Chair: Jim Murray, Director, BEUC
09.35	A review of existing Novel Food Legislation, excluding GMOs, with a view to future developments. <i>Patrick Deboyser, European Commission, DG SANCO</i>
10.00	The industry point-of-view – a successful application Perspectives on Functional Foods: The case “pro.activ” <i>Paulus Verschuren, Unilever Health Institute, Netherlands</i>
10.25	Coffee break
10.40	Food and health, consumer and scientist -living apart together <i>Tiina Mattila-Sandholm, VTT, Finland</i>
11.05	How does the consumer perceive novel foods other than GMOs? <i>Annemiek van der Laan, Consumentenbond, Netherlands</i>

- 11.30 Introduction to the workshops
- 12.00 Lunch
- 13.00 **Workshop 1:** Focusing on claims
- Workshop 2:** Focusing on new products
- Workshop 3:** Focusing on critical products **e.g.** noni juice
- 15.45 Coffee break
- 16.00 **Closing plenary session**
- 18.00 **End of session**

Thursday 6 February 2003

- 08.45 **Welcome and Refreshments**
- 09.15 **2nd Plenary Session: Genetically Modified Organisms**
- Chair: Jim Murray, Director, BEUC**
- 09.20 Regulatory requirements for the assessment of GMOs.
- Kim Madsen, European Commission, DG SANCO*
- 09.45 The risk assessment process – the voice of the scientist with an eye on products in the pipeline.
- Anthony Hardy, Central Science Laboratory, United Kingdom*
- 10.10 Coffee break
- 10.30 A novel food application Genetically Enhanced Bt11 Sweet Maize from Syngenta
- Hilde Willekens, Syngenta, Belgium*

- 11.00 The view of a consumer organisation – the British case.
Sue Davies, The Consumer Association, United Kingdom
- 11.25 **Introduction to the workshops**
- 12.00 Lunch
- 13.00 **Workshop 1:** Focusing on scientific risk assessment
Workshop 2: Focusing on products in the pipeline
Workshop 3: GMO products in Europe: The pros and the cons
- 15.45 Coffee break
- 16.00 **Closing plenary session**
- 18.00 **End of session**

Friday 7 February 2003

- 08.45 **Welcome and refreshments**
- 09.00 **3rd Plenary Session: Novel Processes**
Chair: Rasmus Kjeldahl, Director, Forbrugerrådet, Denmark
- 09.05 Overview of applications and procedures for novel processes, including review of approved novel foods and processes.
Andreas Klepsch, European Commission, DG SANCO
- 09.20 Innovation in food technology: an overview of recent trends and processes.
Jean-Claude Cheftel, Montpellier University, France
- 09.50 Sterilisation/Pasteurisation by high pressure: the inventor – a scientific point-of-view.
Volker Heinz, Berlin University of Technology, Germany

- 10.10 A successful industry application: Groupe Danone – Fruit preparations pasteurised using a high-pressure treatment process.
John O’ Brien, Danone Vitapole, France
- 10.30 Consumer responses to new technologies.
Unni Kjearnes, SIFO – National Institute for Consumer Research, Norway
- 10.50 **Introduction to the workshops**
- 11.00 Coffee
- 11.15 **Workshop 1:** Focusing on emerging new technologies.
Workshop 2: Existing and new technologies not covered by the novel food legislation.
Workshop 3: Approved new technologies and possible technologies in the pipeline.
- 12.00 Lunch
- 12.45 **Continuation of the workshops**
- 14.20 Coffee
- 14.30 **Closing Plenary: Conclusions and recommendations**
- 16.00 **Conclusion of Second Consensus Workshop on Novel Food**

Appendix 2
List of Participants

<p>Mrs Helena Arph Tetra Pak Processing Systems Ruben Rausings gata S-221 86 Lund Sweden Tel: +46 46 361 000 Fax: +46 46 362 970 E-mail: helena.arph@tetrapak.com</p>	<p>Prof. Nils-Georg Asp Swedish Nutrition Foundation (& Lund Univ.) Research Park Ideon S-22370 Lund Sweden Tel: +46 46 286 2282 Fax: +46 46 286 2281 E-mail: asp@snf.ideon.se</p>
<p>Ms Birgit Beck VKI Linke Wienzeile 18 A-1060 Vienna Austria Tel: +43 1 588 77 0 Fax: +43 1 558 77 99 257 E-mail: bbeck@vki.or.at</p>	<p>Ms Uta Boehne Suedzucker AG Maximilianstrasse 10 D-68165 Mannheim Germany Tel: +49 621 421 0 Fax: +49 621 421 399 E-mail: uta.boehne@suedzucker.de</p>
<p>Dr Achim Boenke European Commission – DG Research SDME 08/31, Rue de la Loi 200 B-1049 Brussels Belgium Tel: +32 2 296 0756 Fax: +32 2 296 4322 E-mail: achim.boenke@cec.eu.int</p>	<p>Dr Sigurdur Bogason European Commission – DG FISH J99 6/27, Rue de la Loi 200 B-1049 Brussels Belgium Tel: +32 2 295 3646 Fax: +32 2 295 7864 E-mail: sigurdur.bogason@cec.eu.int</p>
<p>Mr Eric Bonneff UFC-Que Choisir 11, rue Guénot F-75011 Paris France Tel: +33 1 44 93 19 40 Fax: +33 1 44 48 22 74 E-mail: ebonneff@quechoisir.org</p>	<p>Mrs Antonella Borrometi Altroconsumo Via Valasina 22 I-20159 Milan Italy Tel: +39 02 6689 01 Fax: +39 02 6689 0288 E-mail: antonella.borrometi@altroconsumo.it</p>
<p>Mr Bernard Bottex ILSI Europe Avenue E. Mounier 83, Box 6 B-1200 Brussels Belgium Tel: +32 2 771 0014 Fax: +32 2 762 0044 E-mail: bbottex@ilsieurope.be</p>	<p>Mr Arnaud Bouxin FEFAC Rue de la Loi 223, box 3 B-1040 Brussels Belgium Tel: +32 2 285 0050 Fax: +32 2 230 5722 E-mail: fefac@fefac.org</p>
<p>Mr Liam Breslin European Commission – DG Research SDME 08/12, Rue de la Loi 200 B-1049 Brussels Belgium Tel: +32 2 295 0477 Fax: +32 2 296 4322 E-mail: liam.breslin@cec.eu.int</p>	<p>Ms Beatriz Cerviño CECU C/ Cava Baja, 30 ES-28005 Madrid Spain Tel: +34 91 364 0276 Fax: +34 91 366 9000 E-mail: beatriz.cervino@cecu.es</p>

<p>Prof. Jean-Claude Cheftel Universite des Sciences at Techniques Place Bataillon F-34095 Montpellier cedex 5 France Tel: +33 4 67 14 33 51 Fax: +33 4 67 63 33 97 E-mail: c.cheftel@univ-montp2.fr</p>	<p>Mr Patrick Coppens Nutricia Belgie NV Rijksweg 64 B-2880 Bornem Belgium Tel: +32 3 890 2284 Fax: +32 3 890 2329 E-mail: patrick.coppens@nutricia.be</p>
<p>Ms Rosanna D'Amario European Commission – DG Research SDME 08/8, Rue de la Loi 200 B-1049 Brussels Belgium Tel: +32 2 298 4374 Fax: +32 2 296 4322 E-mail: rosanna.d'amario@cec.eu.int</p>	<p>Ms Irina Danada Consumers International 24 Highbury Crescent London N5 1RX United Kingdom Tel: +44 207 226 6663 Fax: +44 207 354 0607 E-mail: idanada@consint.org</p>
<p>Ms Sue Davies Consumers' Association 2 Marylebone Road NW1 4DF London United Kingdom Tel: +44 207 770 7000 Fax: +44 207 770 7666 E-mail: sue.davies@which.co.uk</p>	<p>Mr Patrick Deboyser European Commission – DG SANCO F101 09/38, Rue de la Loi 200 B-1049 Brussels Belgium Tel: +32 2 295 1529 Fax: +32 2 295 1735 E-mail: patrick.deboyser@cec.eu.int</p>
<p>Ms Livia Dömölki OFE Balaton u. 27 H-1055 Budapest Hungary Tel: +36 1 311 7030 Fax: +36 1 331 7386 E-mail: domolki@ofe.hu</p>	<p>Mr Alexander Döring FEFAC Rue de la Loi, 223 bte 3 B-1040 Brussels Belgium Tel: +32 2 285 0050 Fax: +32 2 230 5722 E-mail: fefac@fefac.org</p>
<p>Ms Anne Christine Duer Danish Veterinary and Food Administration Mørkhøj Bygade 19 DK-2860 Søborg Denmark Tel: +45 33 95 60 00 Fax: +45 33 95 60 01 E-mail: acd@fdir.dk</p>	<p>Ms Carolina Falk European Parliament GUE/NGL PHS SC25 Rue Wiertz B-1047 Brussels Belgium Tel: +32 2 284 4572 Fax: +32 2 284 3609 E-mail: cfalk@europarl.eu.int</p>
<p>Prof. József Farkas Szent Istvan University Menesi ut 43-45 H-1118 Budapest Hungary Tel: +36 1 372 6303 Fax: +36 1 372 3621 E-mail: jfarkas@alarmix.net</p>	<p>Dr Helen Goulielmou EKPIZO 43-45 Valtetsiou Srt. GR-10681 Athens Greece Tel: +30 210 330 4444 Fax: +30 210 330 0591 E-mail: contact@ekpizo.org.gr</p>

<p>Mrs Gitte Gross The Danish Consumer Council Fiolstraede 17, Postboks 2188 DK-1018 Copenhagen K Denmark Tel: +45 77 41 77 41 Fax: +45 77 41 77 42 E-mail: gg@fbr.dk</p>	<p>Mrs Andrea Grundelius Tetra Pak Processing Systems Ruben Rausing's gata S-221 86 Lund Sweden Tel: +46 46 361 000 Fax: +46 46 362 970 E-mail: andrea.grundelius@tetrapak.com</p>
<p>Prof. Dr. Jana Hajšlová Institute of Chemical Technology Technicka 5 CZ-16628 Prague 6 - Dejvice Czech Republic Tel: +420 2 2435 3185 Fax: +420 2 2435 3185 E-mail: jana.hajslova@vscht.cz</p>	<p>Prof. Tony Hardy Central Science Laboratory Sand Hutton York YO41 1LZ United Kingdom Tel: +44 1904 462 000 Fax: +44 1904 462 256 E-mail: a.hardy@cs.l.gov.uk</p>
<p>Dr Volker Heinz Berlin University of Technology Dept of Food Technology Konigin-Luise Strasse 22 D-14158 Berlin Germany Tel: +49 30 3147 1441 Fax: +49 30 3142 7518 E-mail: volker.heinz@tu-berlin.de</p>	<p>Mrs Hilde Helgesen The Consumer Council of Norway Postbox 4594 Nydalen NO-0404 Oslo Norway Tel: +47 23 400 500 Fax: +47 23 400 503 E-mail: hilde.helgesen@forbrukerradet.no</p>
<p>Dr Adriana Horníková The Association of Slovak Consumers Palisády 22 SK-811 06 Bratislava Slovak Republic Tel: +421 2 5441 1148 Fax: +421 2 5441 1148 E-mail: zss@zss.sk</p>	<p>Mr Jiri Hotzky Consumer Defense Ass. of the Czech Rep. Sdruzeni obrany spotřebitelu CR Rytířská 10 CZ-110 00 Praha 1 Czech Republic Tel: +420 224 239 940 Fax: +420 224 239 941 E-mail: hotzky@consumers.cz</p>
<p>Mrs Jutta Jaksche VZBV Markgrafenstrasse 66 D-10969 Berlin Germany Tel: +49 30 2580 0436 Fax: +49 30 2580 0418 E-mail: jaksche@vzbv.de</p>	<p>Mr Christiaan Kalk TNO Nutrition and Food Research Utrechtseweg 48, P.O. Box 360 NL-3700 AJ Zeist The Netherlands Tel: +31 30 694 4144 Fax: +31 30 694 4901 E-mail: kalk@voeding.tno.nl</p>
<p>Mr Dorian Karatzas European Commission – DG Research SDME 06/73, Rue de la Loi 200 B-1049 Brussels Belgium Tel: +32 2 295 0027 Fax: +32 2 298 4686 E-mail: isidoros.karatzas@cec.eu.int</p>	<p>Mrs Beate Kettlitz BEUC Avenue de Tervueren 36/4 B-1040, Brussels Belgium Tel: +32 2 743 1590 Fax: +32 2 740 2802 E-mail: bke@beuc.org</p>

<p>Ms Unni Kjaernes National Instit for Consumer Research (SIFO) PO Box 4682 Nydalen N-0405 Oslo Norway Tel: +47 22 04 35 00 Fax: +47 22 04 35 04 E-mail: unni.kjarnes@sifo.no</p>	<p>Mr Rasmus Kjeldahl Forbrugerrådet/Danish Consumer Council Fiolstraede 17, Postboks 2188 DK-1017 Copenhagen K Denmark Tel: +45 77 41 77 30 Fax: +45 77 41 77 42 E-mail: rk@fbr.dk</p>
<p>Dr Juliane Kleiner ILSI Europe Avenue E. Mounier 83, Box 6 B-1200 Brussels Belgium Tel: +32 2 771 0014 Fax: +32 2 762 0044 E-mail: jkleiner@ilsieurope.be</p>	<p>Mr Andreas Klepsch European Commission – DG SANCO F101 08/70, Rue de la Loi 200 B-1049 Brussels Belgium Tel: +32 2 295 3210 Fax: +32 2 296 0951 E-mail: andreas.klepsch@cec.eu.int</p>
<p>Dr Ada Knaap RIVM Postbus 1 NL-3720 BA Bilthoven The Netherlands Tel: +31 30 274 9111 Fax: +31 30 274 2971 E-mail: ada.knaap@rivm.nl</p>	<p>Mrs Esther Kok RIKILT Institute for Food Safety Bornsesteeg 45 PO Box 230 NL-6700 AE Wageningen The Netherlands Tel: +31 31 747 5400 Fax: +31 31 741 7717 E-mail: e.j.kok@rikilt.wag-ur.nl</p>
<p>Mr Laurent Labouré Council Secretariat of the EU Rue de la Loi 175 B-1048 Brussels Belgium Tel: +32 2 285 7400 Fax: +32 2 285 7822 E-mail: laurent.laboure@consilium.eu.int</p>	<p>Mrs Susanne Langguth Suedzucker AG Maximilianstrasse 10 D-68165 Mannheim Germany Tel: +49 621 421 0 Fax: +49 621 421 399 E-mail: susanne.langguth@suedzucker.de</p>
<p>Dr Sandy Lawrie UK Food Standards Agency Room 526, Aviation House 125 Kingsway London WC2B 6NH United Kingdom Tel: +44 207 276 8565 Fax: +44 207 276 8564 E-mail: sandy.lawrie@foodstandards.gsi.gov.uk</p>	<p>Ms Petra Lehner AK Prinz-Eugen-Strasse 20-22 A-1041 Vienna Austria Tel: +43 1 501 652 721 Fax: +43 1 501 652 751 E-mail: petra.lehner@akwien.or.at</p>
<p>Mr Dan Leskien Greens/EFA PHS 06 C 69, EP, Rue Wiertz 60 B-1047 Brussels Belgium Tel: +32 2 284 1692 Fax: +32 2 284 2560 E-mail: dleskien@europarl.eu.int</p>	<p>Mrs Magda Lewandowski COPA-COGECA Rue de la Science 23-25, box 3 B-1040 Brussels Belgium Tel: +32 2 287 2711 Fax: +32 2 287 2700 E-mail: magda.lewandowski@copa-cogeca.be</p>

<p>Mrs Aude l'Hirondel EuroCoop rue Archimède 17, box 3 B-1000 Brussels Belgium Tel: +32 2 285 0070 Fax: +32 2 231 0757 E-mail: alhirondel@eurocoop.org</p>	<p>Mr Herbert Lundström Swedish Consumers' Association PO Box 855 SE-101 37 Stockholm Sweden Tel: +46 84 060 860 Fax: +46 84 060 260 E-mail: herbert.lundstrom@public.leissner.se</p>
<p>Mr Kim Madsen European Commission – DG SANCO F101 08/62, Rue de la Loi 200 B-1049 Brussels Belgium Tel: +32 2 299 2201 Fax: +32 2 296 0951 E-mail: kim-helleberg.madsen@cec.eu.int</p>	<p>Prof. Tiina Mattila-Sandholm VTT Biotechnology Tietotie 2 P.O. Box 1500 FIN-02044 VTT Finland Tel.: +358 50 552 7243 Fax: +358 9 455 2103 E-mail: tiina.mattila-sandholm@vtt.fi</p>
<p>Ms Diane McCrea The Food Consultancy 17 Vernon Road N8 0QD London United Kingdom Tel: +44 208 889 4226 Fax: +44 208 352 0564 E-mail: diane@mccrea1.demon.co.uk</p>	<p>Ms Astrid Meesters FEFAC Rue de la Loi 223, box 3 B-1040 Brussels Belgium Tel: +32 2 285 0050 Fax: +32 2 230 5722 E-mail: fefac@fefac.org</p>
<p>Mrs Sofia Mendonça DECO Av. Engenheiro Arantea e Oliveria N^o 13-1^o B P-1900 – 221 Lisbon Portugal Tel: +351 210 321 915 Fax: +351 218 410 802 E-mail: smendonca@edideco.pt</p>	<p>Mrs Angelika Michel-Drees VZBV Markgrafenstrasse 66 D-10969 Berlin Germany Tel: +49 30 2580 00 Fax: +49 30 2580 0418 E-mail: michel-drees@vzbv.de</p>
<p>Ms Nerea Miguel BEUC Avenue de Tervueren 36/4 B-1040 Brussels Belgium Tel: +32 2 743 1590 Fax: +32 2 740 2802 E-mail: nmi@beuc.org</p>	<p>Mr Chris Moris FEVIA Avenue des Arts 43 B-1040 Brussels Belgium Tel: +32 2 550 1740 Fax: +32 2 550 1754 E-mail: cm@fevia.be</p>
<p>Prof. Bevan Moseley Blandford House 2 Hamilton Road RG1 5RD Reading United Kingdom Tel: +44 1189 661 675 Fax: +44 1189 661 675 E-mail: bevmos@bmosley.fsnet.co.uk</p>	<p>Mr Jim Murray BEUC Avenue de Tervueren 36/4 B-1040 Brussels Belgium Tel: +32 2 743 1590 Fax: +32 2 740 2802 E-mail: jmu@beuc.org</p>

<p>Mrs Anne-Marie Neetson-van Nieuwenhoven FAIP – Farm Animal Industrial Platform Benedendorpsweg 98 NL-6862 WL Oosterbeek The Netherlands Tel: +31 26 339 1538 Fax: +31 26 339 1539 E-mail: anne-marie.neetson@faip.dk</p>	<p>Dr John O'Brien Danone Vitapole Route Departementale 128 F-91767 Palaiseau cedex France Tel: +33 1 69 35 74 69 Fax: +33 1 69 35 76 97 E-mail: jobrien@danone.com</p>
<p>Mr Michael O'Neill National Consumer Council 20 Grosvenor Gardens London SW1W 0DH United Kingdom Tel: +44 207 730 3469 Fax: +44 207 881 3020 E-mail: m.oneill@ncc.org.uk</p>	<p>Dr André Penninks TNO Nutrition and Food Research Utrechtseweg 48, P.O. Box 360 NL-3700 AJ Zeist The Netherlands Tel: +31 30 694 4504 Fax: +31 30 696 0264 E-mail: penninks@voeding.tno.nl</p>
<p>Ms Marjana Peterman ZPS Frankopanska 5 SI-1000 Ljubljana Slovenia Tel: +386 1 474 0600 Fax: +386 1 433 3371 E-mail: marjana@zps-zveza.si</p>	<p>Dr Vittorio Ramazza Coop Italia S.c.a.r.l. Via Del Lavoro 6-8 I-40033 Casalecchio di Reno (BO) Italy Tel: +39 051 596 111 Fax: +39 051 596 145 E-mail: vittorio.ramazza@coopitalia.coop.it</p>
<p>Prof. Peter Raspor University of Ljubljana Biotechnical Faculty, Dept of Food Sc. & Tech. Jamnikarjeva 101 SI-1000 Ljubljana Slovenia Tel: +386 1 423 1161 Fax: +386 1 257 4092 E-mail: peter.raspor@bf.uni-lj.si</p>	<p>Ms Elena Schez European Commission – DG Research SDME 09/08, Rue de la Loi 200 B-1049, Brussels Belgium Tel: +32 2 295 8462 Fax: +32 2 299 1860 E-mail: elena.schez@cec.eu.int</p>
<p>Dr Marianna Schauzu Centre for Novel Foods & Genetic Engineering Federal Institute of Risk Assessment Thielallee 88-92 D-14195 Berlin Germany Tel: +49 30 8412 3758 Fax: +49 30 8412 3635 E-mail: m.schauzu@bfr.bund.de</p>	<p>Ms Sigrid Semlitsch Office of Karin Scheele MEP ASP 15 G 250, EP, Rue Wertz 60 B-1047 Brussels Belgium Tel: +32 2 284 7397 Fax: +32 2 284 9397 E-mail: kscheele@europarl.eu.int</p>
<p>Ms Nina Siegenthaler BEUC Avenue de Tervueren 36/4 B-1040 Brussels Belgium Tel: +32 2 743 1590 Fax: +32 2 740 2802 E-mail: food@beuc.org</p>	<p>Mr Patrick Sutton BEUC Avenue de Tervueren 36/4 B-1040 Brussels Belgium Tel: +32 2 743 1590 Fax: +32 2 740 2802 E-mail: psu@beuc.org</p>

<p>Mr Dominique Taeymans CIAA Avenue des Arts 36, bte 4 B-1040 Brussels Belgium Tel: +32 2 514 1111 Fax: +32 2 511 2905 E-mail: d.taeymans@ciao.be</p>	<p>Mr Frans van Dam Consumer and Biotechnology Foundation PO Box 1000 NL-2500 BA Den Haag The Netherlands Tel: +31 70 445 4399 Fax: +31 70 445 4595 E-mail: fvdam@consumentenbond.nl</p>
<p>Ms Annemiek van der Laan Consumentenbond Postbus 1000 NL-2500 BA Den Haag The Netherlands Tel: +31 70 445 4104 Fax: +31 70 445 4598 E-mail: avdlaan@consumentenbond.nl</p>	<p>Drs Lysanne Van der Lem Dutch Ministry of Health Postbus 20350 NL-2500 EJ Den Haag The Netherlands Tel: +31 70 340 7911 Fax: +31 70 340 5554 E-mail: l.vd.lem@minvws.nl</p>
<p>Mrs Gun Väyrynen Kukuttajat-Konsumenterna ry Kasöörinkatu 3B FIN-00520 Helsinki Tel: +358 9 8775 0120 Fax: +358 9 8775 0120 E-mail: kkry@kuluttajat-konsumenterna.fi</p>	<p>Drs Paulus Verschuren Unilever Health Institute Olivier van Noortlaan 120 NL-3133 AT Vlaardingen The Netherlands Tel: +31 10 460 5195 Fax: +31 10 460 5726 E-mail: paulus.verschuren@unilever.com</p>
<p>Ms Luisa Villa Altroconsumo Via Valasina 22 I-20159 Milan Italy Tel: +39 02 6689 01 Fax: +39 02 6689 0288 E-mail: pr@altroconsumo.it</p>	<p>Prof. Willem de Vos Wageningen University Hesselink van Suchtelenweg 4 NL-6703 CT Wageningen The Netherlands Tel: +31 31 748 2105 Fax: +31 31 748 3829 E-mail: willem.devos@wur.nl</p>
<p>Mr Huib de Vriend Consumer and Biotechnology Foundation PO Box 1000 NL-2500 BA Den Haag The Netherlands Tel: +31 70 445 4399 Fax: +31 70 445 4595 E-mail: hdvriend@consumentenbond.nl</p>	<p>Dr Jochen Wettach Stiftung Warentest Lützowplatz 11 D-10785 Berlin Germany Tel: +49 30 2631 0 Fax: +49 30 2631 2424 E-mail: j.wettach@stiftung-warentest.de</p>
<p>Ms Hilde Willekens Syngenta International AG Avenue Louise, 240 bte 4 B-1050 Brussels Belgium Tel: +32 2 642 2714 Fax: + 32 2 642 2720 E-mail: hilde.willekens@syngenta.com</p>	

Appendix 3
DG Research Funded Projects

For full details of these and other relevant projects see Useful links on website:

<http://www.consensusworkshops.org/uselinks.html>

Full details of all projects are given in the document 'EC, Quality of Life and Management of Living Resources, Key Action 1 RTD - Projects in the Areas of Novel Food and Food Processing' which is posted on the Consensus workshop and Flair Flow web page at <http://www.flair-flow.com/related3.html> and can be found in the EC, QoL-KA1-catalogue.