

## Serial conflicts of interest on EFSA's management board

Corporate Europe Observatory, 23 February 2011

The European Food Safety Authority (EFSA) is responsible for assessing and communicating food safety in the European Union, for everything from genetically modified organisms (GMOs) to pesticides. However EFSA has recently been criticised because its scientific assessments of new GM crops and pesticides rely almost exclusively on corporate research data<sup>1</sup>. Some EFSA experts are also accused of being too close to the food and drink industry<sup>2</sup>. Several cases of 'revolving doors' (where EFSA employees move straight to industry, or from industry to EFSA) and conflicts of interest have recently been highlighted. Now, Corporate Europe Observatory (CEO) has discovered that three EFSA board members are advisors for Big Food companies, working through industry-funded think tanks which aim to manipulate political and scientific debate concerning food risks. A fourth member of the board is director of a fund which has shares in a company selling GM feed. Those conflicts of interest risk influencing the judgement of these board members when involved in EFSA's work, in particular when they establish work programmes and appoint members of the agency's scientific committee and panels.



**Milan Kováč (Slovak Republic)** is director of ILSI Europe and has a seat on the scientific advisory board of the food-industry-sponsored think tank EUFIC.



**Matthias Horst (Germany)** has been a lobbyist for the Federation of German Food and Drink Industries for more than 35 years.



**Jiří Ruprich (Czech Republic)** has been a member of the Czech Danone Institute's scientific committee since 2000.



**Piet Vanthemsche (Belgium)**, a member of the presiding council of the European Farmers' union COPA, has declared an executive position in a fund having shares in a company which sells GMOs.

The director of EFSA's management board, Diána Bánáti, made headlines in October 2010 when French MEP José Bové asked for her dismissal from EFSA because of alleged conflicts of interests<sup>3</sup>. Bánáti was a member of the European board of directors of the International Life Sciences Institute (ILSI), a food-industry funded organisation which seeks to coordinate and fund research and risk assessment, while working for EFSA. Within weeks, Bánáti resigned from ILSI, but not from EFSA<sup>4</sup>.

Research by Corporate Europe Observatory (CEO) has found more conflicts of interest among members of the European Food Safety Authority's management board. In spite of Bánáti's resignation from ILSI last October, at least three other EFSA board members have retained strong links with the European food industry – including with ILSI.

### **Board members appoint panel experts, establish work programmes and budget**

EFSA's management board was established in 2002, and is made up of 15 members. Each is appointed for four years and they meet several times a year. Their key tasks are to establish the budget and the work programmes, and to appoint the executive director and members of the scientific committee and panels<sup>5</sup>.

Board members “are mandated to act in the public interest” and “do not, in any way, represent a government, organisation or sector”, according to the agency's website<sup>6</sup>. “The Board plays a critical role in EFSA's governance, ensuring that EFSA acts independently.”

One board member Matthias Horst, however, has been working for the Federation of German Food and Drink Industries (BVE) for more than 35 years<sup>7</sup>. BVE members include Nestlé, Coca-Cola, Kraft, Mars and Unilever<sup>8</sup>. In fact Horst has been lobbyist-in-chief at BVE since 1994, when he became its director general.

Another board member, Milan Kováč, the former permanent representative of the Slovak Republic to the Food and Agriculture Organisation (FAO), has been on the board of directors of ILSI Europe for seven years<sup>9</sup> – the very same industry think tank from which Diana Bánáti was forced to step down. Kováč has also been a member of the scientific advisory board of the food industry-sponsored think tank, the European Food Information Council (EUFIC) since 2000.

EFSA's management board member Jiří Ruprich, is a director at the National Czech Institute of Public Health and has been a member of the Czech Danone Institute's scientific committee for more than 10 years<sup>10</sup>. Ruprich is quite active within EFSA: he has a seat on the Chemical Occurrence Expert Group, the Food Consumption Data Expert Group, and the Working Group on Total Diet Studies.

### **Only Bánáti stepped down**

On 21 October 2010, EFSA announced that Diana Bánáti had “resigned from positions which may create a potential conflict of interests with EFSA activities”<sup>11</sup>. Indeed the only position Bánáti stepped down from was as a member of the ILSI Europe board, according to her declaration of interests signed on 28 October 2010<sup>12</sup>.

But Kováč – also a board member of ILSI Europe – did not step down according to the revised list of directors issued by ILSI Europe just after Bánáti's resignation<sup>13</sup>. And he is still with EUFIC, according to EUFIC's website<sup>14</sup>.

Similarly Horst and Ruprich have not resigned from their conflicting roles. Their most recent declaration of interests, filed several weeks after Bánáti resigned, still mention their

affiliations to the German food industry lobby group and the French food and beverage giant Danone<sup>15</sup>.

Yet, Kováč, Horst and Ruprich's executive or advisory positions with industry-funded think tanks clearly "may create a potential conflict of interests with EFSA activities", as EFSA itself stated last October when announcing Bánáti's resignation from ILSI Europe<sup>16</sup>. ILSI, EUFIC, the Danone Institutes and other industry-funded think tanks promote specific information and research avenues in which the food industry has a direct interest – this is why it pays for it.

### **"No legal obligation" for EFSA board members to declare interests**

Legally, there is no obligation for EFSA board members to make public their declaration of interests: according to EU rules, these declarations are not available to third parties as they fall under Regulation (EC) No 45/2001 on the protection of personal data<sup>17</sup>.

EFSA has however decided to make them available: "This was a transparency measure adopted proactively by EFSA's management team as there is no legal obligation to do so", the head of EFSA's legal team Dirk Detken told Corporate Europe Observatory<sup>18</sup>.

There are also no checks – or only minimal checks – of the accuracy of declarations. Bánáti was appointed to the ILSI board of directors in April 2010 but did not declare it until September 28<sup>th</sup>, when Bové sent journalists an invitation to a press conference aimed at exposing her.

In the same declaration, Bánáti also declared owning shares in EFSA – which is not possible. In a previous declaration filed in March 2010, she declared that corporate-funded ILSI was a "public" organisation. Neither of these errors were corrected by EFSA.

Before the Bánáti scandal broke, only two thirds of EFSA's management board had published declarations. Now, they all have.

### **Corporate-sponsored think tanks' damaging activities**

ILSI's 494 industry members are the world's leading manufacturers of food and food ingredients, chemicals, pharmaceuticals and other consumer products. Its 2010 list includes BASF, Bayer, Cargill, Coca-Cola, Danone, Heinz, Kellogg's, Kraft Foods, Mars, McDonald's, Monsanto, Nestlé, Pepsi-Cola, Pfizer, Pioneer, Procter & Gamble, Red Bull and Unilever<sup>19</sup>.

Over the last 10 years, ILSI Europe's research has been used to weaken EFSA's evaluation process for GM plants<sup>20</sup>. Before joining EFSA, the head of the GMO Panel, Harry Kuiper worked for an ILSI 'task force' which, according to ILSI, successfully influenced EFSA's guidelines for the risk assessment of genetically engineered plants. In 2006, Monsanto's Kevin Glenn, chair of an ILSI task force, boasted at a workshop in Athens, Greece, that a key 2004 ILSI report had had a huge impact on EFSA's guidelines<sup>21</sup>.

In the late 1990s and early 2000s, ILSI worked with Big Tobacco to lobby the World Health Organisation (WHO) to limit tobacco control<sup>22</sup>. In 2006, the UN agency banned ILSI from taking part in WHO activities related to setting standards for food and water because of its track record of putting the interests of its corporate members ahead of science and health concerns<sup>23</sup> (see Appendix 1).

Previous research by CEO has shown that all EUFIC's management board members are top-level EU lobbyists for the food and drink industry<sup>24</sup>. Several members of EUFIC's scientific advisory board, where Kováč has a seat, have been involved in controversies, including a science funding scandal at the UN Food and Agriculture Organisation<sup>25</sup>, and a conflict of interests while working for the European Commission<sup>26</sup>. Despite these clear links to industry, EUFIC sometimes fails to make it clear on its website that some of the research it disseminates is industry-sponsored (see Appendix 2).

The Danone Institutes, which are found in 17 countries, aim to "link scientists involved in nutrition research with health and education professionals"<sup>27</sup>. To accomplish this goal, the Danone Institutes have so far sponsored more than 900 research projects and distributed more than €18 million in research support on the relationship between diet and health. For instance the Danone Institute in Canada recently distributed grants for research on "nutrition claims and food perceptions" and on the "impact of a milk supplementation" on bones and satiety in overweight women<sup>28</sup> – topics in which Danone has a direct interest. Danone regularly files health claim applications for its products with EFSA (see Appendix 3).

At EFSA, Ruprich has been involved in discussions on nutrition and health – areas of clear interest to Danone<sup>29</sup>.

### **Whose interests?**

ILSI, EUFIC and the Danone Institutes do not do face-to-face lobbying with policy-makers. Their job is more subtle: they try to capture the public research agenda to influence the nature of the science that will be produced and communicated to health professionals on certain topics – science that will later be taken into account by policy-makers. They could be considered as 'pseudo-scientific think tanks' which aim to frame the public debate on food risks in a positive way for industry.

As such, ILSI, EUFIC and the Danone Institutes do fall into the EU Commission's definition of a "lobbyist": entities engaged in "activities carried out with the objective of influencing the policy formulation and decision-making processes of the European institutions"<sup>30</sup>. And so they are expected to register in the Commission's voluntary lobby register. But none have done so<sup>31</sup>.

Kováč, Horst, Ruprich and other board members hold executive or advisory positions in non-public interest groups which lobby EFSA directly through the agency's so-called 'stakeholder consultative platform'. ILSI and EUFIC are members of the platform, and Danone is represented through the Confederation of the Food and Drink Industries in the EU (CIAA).

Another example of a lobby group having both a seat on the platform and on the management board is COPA, the European Farmers' union. EFSA management board Belgian member Piet Vanthemsche, president of the Flemish farmers' union Boerenbond since May 2007, has been a member of the president's council of COPA since March 2008.

The very fact that COPA has a seat on EFSA's management board is questionable: COPA represents industrial farmers, not all farmers. Several COPA members, including the powerful Fédération nationale des syndicats d'exploitants agricoles (FNSEA) in France, are overtly in favour of GM crops<sup>32</sup>. COPA itself is generally recognised as being pro-GM and its position could influence Vanthemsche's judgement when making decisions for EFSA.

Vanthemsche has also declared that he holds an executive position in the Agri Investment Fund, which has shares in 19 companies ranging from meat processing to real estate<sup>33</sup>. One of these companies, Aveve N.V. sells GM animal feed<sup>34</sup>. This also creates a conflict of

interest which could influence Vanthemsche's decisions for EFSA – including appointment decisions on members of the scientific committee and panels.

### Industry groups both 'inside' and 'outside' EFSA

The agency's stakeholder consultative platform, which was created in 2005, holds three meetings a year and "advises EFSA's Executive Director on many general issues related to EFSA's work, and in particular impact of EFSA's work on stakeholders"<sup>35</sup>. Each year, members of the platform can comment on EFSA's preliminary annual 'Management Plan'.

Out of the 24 members of EFSA's stakeholders platform<sup>36</sup>, as many as 16 – or two thirds – are industry lobby groups, three are environmental NGOs, one represents consumers, one farmers, one workers in the food and agriculture sector, one defends human health and one animal rights. (See Table 1 below.)

The fact that ILSI, EUFIC, the Danone Institutes or COPA are considered by EFSA as being both inside (represented on the management board) and outside of the agency (as stakeholders) appears incoherent and reveals the lax rules on conflicts of interests. How can EFSA board members be actively involved with organisations which lobby EFSA?

**Table 1: EFSA's industry-dominated stakeholder platform**

Category	EFSA Stakeholders
Industry	CIAA - Confederation of the Food and Drink Industries in the EU CEFIC - The European Chemical Industry Council EuropaBio - European Association for Bioindustries EuroCommerce - European Retail, Wholesale and International Trade Association CELCAA - European Liaison Committee for the Agri-food Trade UEAPME - European Association of Craft, Small and Medium-sized Enterprises EuroCoop - European Community of Consumer Co-operatives Freshfel Europe - European Association for the fresh produce industry EMRA - European Modern Restaurant Association ESA - European Seed Association ECPA - European Crop Protection Association FEFAC - European Feed Manufacturers Federation FEFANA - EU Association of Specialty Feed Ingredients and their Mixtures EFFA - European Flavour and Fragrance Association EUFIC - European Food Information Council ILSI Europe - International Life Science Institute
Environment	Greenpeace Friends of the Earth Europe EEB - European Environmental Bureau
Farmers	COPA-COGECA - European Farmers - European Agri-Cooperatives
Workers	EFFAT - European Federation of the Food, Agriculture and Tourism Trade Unions
Consumers	BEUC - European Consumers' Organisation
Human health	EPHA - European Public Health Alliance
Animal health	Eurogroup for animals - The voice for animal welfare organisations in Europe

Source: EFSA, 2010

### EFSA denies the problem

Asked to explain the apparent conflict of interests for the four board members, an EFSA spokesperson said that EFSA's Founding Regulation "clearly specified that four of the members of the Board should have a background in organisations representing the interests of consumers (...) and other interests in the food chain, including industry, agricultural production and food processing, distribution, and public research"<sup>37</sup>.

She added that the Board had decided that to avoid "misperception", the Chair should refrain from having a management role or other influential roles in organisations representing interests in the food chain, other than public interests (see Appendix 4 for full response).

This "misperception" apparently does not apply to other members of the board, although EFSA gives no reason as to why this is the case. Indeed the very fact that board members are responsible for deciding whether or not their outside interests create a conflict of interests creates another conflict of interests.

## **Conclusion**

Disclosing EFSA board members' declarations of interests should clearly be a legal obligation to allow EU citizens to assess whether board members are really independent from vested interests. The Commission should revise Regulation (EC) No 45/2001 on the protection of personal data to make the publication of declarations mandatory, and not voluntary as is currently the case. The Commission should also put in place an independent committee to assess the accuracy and veracity of declarations.

EFSA should also act to ensure that individuals with vested interests in the food industry are not members of its board. EFSA's founding regulation, which creates a situation where board members are allowed to hold blatant conflicts of interest, should be changed.

Corporate lobbying, including by the food industry, does not serve the wider public interest, social or environmental goals. Food giants fight to protect certain markets and to open up others, they outcompete independent and local producers, and push for weak social and environmental standards. Given that EFSA's stakeholder platform seems to fulfil the role of an advisory group, commenting on its policies, should industry lobbyists, which do have a clear stake, be allowed to advise EFSA in this way?

## Appendix 1

### What's ILSI and what's wrong with it?

ILSI is a WashingtonDC-based lobby group founded in 1978 with offices throughout the world. Funded by food, chemical and pharmaceutical companies, it aims to “advance the understanding of scientific issues related to nutrition, food safety, toxicology, and the environment” through the exchange of ideas and information between scientists from various backgrounds: academia, government, industry, and the private sector.

In 2001, the World Health Organization (WHO) published a detailed case study on ILSI's close collaboration with the tobacco industry to subvert tobacco control. Big Tobacco has funded and was involved in seemingly unbiased scientific groups – including ILSI – “to manipulate political and scientific debate concerning tobacco and health”, according to the WHO<sup>38</sup>.

In 2006, the WHO banned ILSI from taking part in “WHO activities setting microbiological or chemical standards for food and water” after health, environmental and union groups had asked the UN agency to sever ties with ILSI because it has “a demonstrated history of putting the interests of its exclusively corporate membership ahead of science and health concerns”<sup>39</sup>.

In March 2007, Jennifer Sass of the Natural Resources Defense Council (NRDC), an American environmental organisation, testified before the House Science and Technology Committee about industry influence on EPA, the US environment agency. According to Sass, ILSI's relationship with EPA “has demonstrably compromised the quality of EPA's scientific inquiry”<sup>40</sup>. She bemoaned the fact that ILSI managed to get funding from EPA for several joint EPA-ILSI projects and that EPA supports “closed-door, industry-driven science that feeds directly or indirectly into the regulatory process”.

ILSI has also sought to influence the evaluation process for GM plants in the EU. Before joining EFSA, the head of the GMO Panel Harry Kuiper worked for an ILSI ‘task force’ which successfully influenced EFSA's guidelines for the risk assessment of genetically engineered plants, according to ILSI. The controversial principle of ‘substantial equivalence’ was implemented as a starting point for risk assessment<sup>41</sup>.

EFSA does not normally require feeding studies for new GMOs to test for potential health impacts. The EFSA document explaining why such studies are not necessary was partially copied from an ILSI paper.

Most people working at ILSI Europe come directly from the food industry. ILSI Europe's executive director is Dr Nico van Belzen<sup>42</sup>, who previously worked for DMV International, the business-to-business division of the Dutch dairy giant Campina (now FrieslandCampina)<sup>43</sup>. Deputy director Laura Contor worked for Colgate-Palmolive<sup>44</sup> and co-signs scientific articles with Danone employees<sup>45</sup>. Four ILSI Europe scientific project managers worked or are still working for the food industry: Agnès Méheust formerly worked for Danone<sup>46</sup>, Fiona Samuels is also scientific & regulatory affairs manager for Mars<sup>47</sup>, Maria Skarp comes from dairy products giant Valio Ltd.<sup>48</sup>, and Fanny Rollin formerly worked for the food industry-sponsored think tank EUFIC<sup>49</sup>.

Describing the ILSI Europe newsletter recently, Dr van Belzen made it clear: for industry members the newsletter is “an update on how their support is translated into science”<sup>50</sup>. Science that could help to advance public health, of course.

## Appendix 2

### What's EUFIC and what's wrong with it?

The European Food Information Council (EUFIC) is a think tank set up in 1995 by the EU food and drink industry. It was officially launched to enhance the public's understanding of nutrition by providing "credible, science-based information on the nutritional quality and safety of foods"<sup>51</sup>. The organisation's scientific advisory board must ensure that the information is "representative, factually correct and truthful".

EUFIC's current member organisations, which also fund the organisation, are: Barilla, Cargill, Coca-Cola HBC, Coca-Cola, DSM Nutritional Products Europe Ltd., Ferrero, Danone, Kraft Foods, Mars, McCormick Foods, McDonald's, Nestlé, Novozymes, PepsiCo, Pfizer, Procter & Gamble, Südzucker, Unilever, and Yakult<sup>52</sup>.

Several funders and Scientific Advisory Board members of EUFIC have been involved in controversies which seem to contradict EUFIC's mission<sup>53</sup>.

EUFIC is chaired by Josephine Wills, a vet who worked for the snack company Mars for 18 years, where she was the EU lobbyist-in-chief for all products. In 2000, she promoted a new chocolate-making process to the press, which the company claimed could help to reduce heart disease – but these claims carefully ignored the fact that Mars' products are also high in fat and high in sugar – both of which contribute to heart disease<sup>54</sup>.

John Lupien, the former chairman of the EUFIC Scientific Advisory Board<sup>55</sup> was involved in an science funding scandal at the UN Food and Agriculture Organisation (FAO) that cost him his position. In 2004, a BBC investigation revealed that a key FAO consultation into how much sugar people should be eating had been secretly funded by the sugar industry. The funding was accepted and industry was allowed to influence the choice of experts and the wording of the report. In a statement, the FAO said the consultation was not illegal but "did contravene common sense norms of transparency and the avoidance of perceived conflict of interest."<sup>56</sup> The funding deal was agreed with John Lupien, the then FAO's Director of the Food and Nutrition Division, who seemingly left the UN agency just a few days after the BBC report was aired<sup>57</sup>.

Ronald Walker – also a former member of EUFIC's Scientific Advisory Board<sup>58</sup> – was a consultant for a company that sold the artificial sweetener aspartame, has held official positions with associations sponsored by aspartame manufacturers and marketers<sup>59</sup> and has co-authored a review for the European Commission claiming that aspartame was safe<sup>60</sup>. None of his links with the aspartame industry were disclosed in the aspartame review nor on EUFIC's website.

Articles on EUFIC's website include headlines such as "Chewing gum found to control appetite", which goes on to suggest that a cheap and easy slimming cure is possible simply by chewing gum<sup>61</sup>. A headline which must have been quite popular with Wrigley and Orbit – both owned by Mars Inc.<sup>62</sup> – and Stimorol, Hollywood or Trident – owned by Kraft Foods<sup>63</sup> – both members of EUFIC. What EUFIC does not tell its readers – misleadingly – is that the research was entirely sponsored by Wrigley<sup>64</sup>.

"Snacking for health?" is the sub-heading introducing the conclusion of another article which argues that "having up to 3 snacks a day and ingesting a wide range of foods and drinks can have a positive, rather than a negative, impact on health"<sup>65</sup>. Good news for leading EUFIC members PepsiCo, Kraft and Mars, leaders in the snacks industry.

EUFIC also seems to have a bias in favour of genetically modified food. One of its articles<sup>66</sup> has been described as "abound[ing] in industry spin"<sup>67</sup>. Nestlé, Kraft, Cargill and Novozymes



– all pro-GM companies – are members of EUFIC.

Financially, EUFIC is as opaque as its sister organisation CIAA and has not registered in the Commission's lobby register. Only Barilla<sup>68</sup> and Novozymes<sup>69</sup> mention they are members of EUFIC in their lobbying expenditure declarations.

## Appendix 3

### **What are the Danone Institutes and what's wrong with them?**

Danone Institutes are not-for-profit private organisations funded by French food giant Danone. The first institute was created in France in 1991 but there are now Danone Institutes in 17 countries. Their official goal is to “link scientists involved in nutrition research with health and education professionals”<sup>70</sup>. Through these efforts, these institutes aim to “bring relevant scientific knowledge about diet to the attention of the general public.”

To accomplish their goal, the Institutes “support research on the relationship between diet and health, inform and educate health and education professionals on all subjects related to diet and nutrition, [and] develop and disseminate educational materials on nutrition for the general public” – including radio and TV programmes.

Over the past 17 years Danone Institutes have sponsored more than 900 research projects and distributed more than €18 millions in research support. They have organised 90 symposia and workshops, and published more than 90 books. In other words, Danone Institutes are kind of national think tanks which fund and disseminate scientific research on the relationship between diet and health to the company's interests. For instance the Danone Institute in Canada recently distributed grants for research on “nutrition claims and food perceptions” and on the “impact of a milk supplementation” on bones and satiety in overweight women<sup>71</sup> – topics in which Danone has a direct interest.

In 2008, the French Danone Institute was criticised for ‘buying’ high-level scientists from the Institut Pasteur and INRA (Institut National de la Recherche Agronomique) and famous TV science journalists. In exchange for research funding, French scientists promoted Danone's ‘blockbuster brand’ Actimel, although health claims by the company for this product had not been approved by France's food safety agency<sup>72</sup>.

EFSA reviews of health claims submitted by companies like Danone are closely watched by investors, as validation of such health claims would be a strong marketing tool for those companies. Last year, Danone withdrew health claim applications on two of its bestselling yoghurts from fear of having them rejected<sup>73</sup>. Several brokers had voiced concern that EFSA might reject Danone's health claims, saying this could hurt the group's stock price and image.

## Appendix 4

### **EFSA's full response to questions regarding the apparent conflict of interests of the four board members**

"Thanks for your request which allows me to clarify some misunderstanding.

First of all let me clarify that EFSA's Management Board (MB) Members are appointed by the Council (following consultation of the European Parliament on the basis of a short list drawn up by the European Commission ) in such a way as to secure the highest standards of competence, a wide range of relevant expertise, and consistent with these, the broadest possible geographic distribution within the EU.

MB members do not represent any country or sector but are chosen for their expertise. EFSA's sole aim is to provide scientific advice to protect consumers from possible risks associated with the food chain. It is therefore quite understandable that individuals appointed to serve on EFSA's Board have relevant experience in areas related to EFSA's mission. In fact EFSA's Founding Regulation clearly **specifies that four of the members of the Board shall have their background in organisations representing the interests of consumers** - which is the case if you go through the list of members available on EFSA's website - **and other interests in the food chain, including industry, agricultural production and food processing, distribution, and public research.**

The role of the Management Board is to ensure an effective and efficient functioning of the Authority and decides on its work programme and priorities. The Board has no influence on EFSA's scientific advice; this is the sole responsibility of EFSA's Scientific Committee and Panels.

To ensure the independence of its work EFSA has implemented a stringent policy on Declarations of Interests which also applies to EFSA Management Board members who, although not involved in EFSA's scientific work, provide and all Declaration of Interests which are publicly available on EFSA's website. The members you refer to have openly declared all their interests in areas relevant to EFSA's work.

To answer your point on Prof. Banati, I have to clarify that Prof. Banati is Chair of the Management Board and that on 21st October 2010, at the first meeting of the newly re-appointed Management Board, **the Board decided** that in order to avoid any misperception of its role, the Chair should refrain from having a management role or other influential roles in organisations representing interests of the food chain, other than public interests. You can read the declaration of the Board at the following address: <http://www.efsa.europa.eu/en/press/news/corporate101021.htm>

Regards"

## Notes and references

- <sup>1</sup> “EU food safety agency aims for more transparency”, EurActiv.com, 9 June 2008; <http://www.euractiv.com/en/cap/eu-food-safety-agency-aims-transparency/article-173171>. “EFSA undermines pesticide Regulation 1107/2009 on use of scientific peer-reviewed open literature”, Pesticide Action Network, 6 September 2010; [http://www.pan-europe.info/News/PR/101020\\_PANE\\_comment.doc](http://www.pan-europe.info/News/PR/101020_PANE_comment.doc); “So rather than use this new mandate to rely less on industry data, EFSA plans to use the same tool, GLP, to keep on removing independent studies from consideration”, writes Pesticide Action Network in its comment piece.
- <sup>2</sup> EFSA’s Advisory Group on Risk Communications (AGRC) for instance is made up of seven experts some of whom are funded by the food and drink industry: Ragnar Löfstedt from King’s College has recently received research funding from Coca-Cola and is a paid consultant with EUFIC, Porto university nutritionist Maria Daniel Vaz de Almeida receives research funding from Nestlé, and French sociologist Claude Fischler has recently acted as a paid consultant for Unilever and Bonduelle. “How EFSA let Big Food shape its risk communication policy”, Corporate Europe Observatory, 29 November 2010. [http://www.corporateeurope.org/system/files/files/article/EFSA\\_big\\_food\\_nov\\_2010.pdf](http://www.corporateeurope.org/system/files/files/article/EFSA_big_food_nov_2010.pdf)
- <sup>3</sup> [http://www.lemonde.fr/planete/article/2010/09/29/la-presidente-de-l-autorite-europeenne-de-securite-des-aliments-appartient-a-un-lobby-industriel\\_1417442\\_3244.html](http://www.lemonde.fr/planete/article/2010/09/29/la-presidente-de-l-autorite-europeenne-de-securite-des-aliments-appartient-a-un-lobby-industriel_1417442_3244.html) ; <http://www.nature.com/news/2010/101005/full/news.2010.513.html>
- <sup>4</sup> “Food authority chief resigns industry position”, The Great Beyond, Nature.com, 25 October 2010. [http://blogs.nature.com/news/thegreatbeyond/2010/10/food\\_authority\\_chief\\_resigns\\_i.html](http://blogs.nature.com/news/thegreatbeyond/2010/10/food_authority_chief_resigns_i.html)
- <sup>5</sup> “Management Board”, EFSA website. <http://www.efsa.europa.eu/en/efsawho/mb.htm>
- <sup>6</sup> “EFSA’s independence: understanding the role of its Management Board”, EFSA website. <http://www.efsa.europa.eu/en/mb/role.htm>
- <sup>7</sup> <http://www.efsa.europa.eu/en/mbmembers/member/matthiashorst.htm>
- <sup>8</sup> <http://www.bve-online.de/bve/mitglieder/unternehmen/>
- <sup>9</sup> Milan Kováč’s declaration of interests to EFSA. <https://doi.efsa.europa.eu/doi/doiweb/wg/74160>
- <sup>10</sup> Jiří Ruprich’s declaration of interests to EFSA. <https://doi.efsa.europa.eu/doi/doiweb/wg/74160>
- <sup>11</sup> EFSA Management Board statement, 21 October 2010. <http://www.efsa.europa.eu/en/press/news/corporate101021.htm>
- <sup>12</sup> Archived at: XXXXXXXXXXXXXXXXXXXX
- <sup>13</sup> <http://www.ilsi.org/Europe/Documents/Members%20of%20the%20ILSI%20Europe%20Board%20of%20Directors%2021oc10.pdf>
- <sup>14</sup> <http://www.eufic.org/article/en/page/ONEUFIC/rid/eufic-scientific-advisory-board/>
- <sup>15</sup> See Matthias Horst and Jiří Ruprich’s declarations of interests to EFSA. <https://doi.efsa.europa.eu/doi/doiweb/wg/74160>
- <sup>16</sup> EFSA Management Board statement, 21 October 2010. <http://www.efsa.europa.eu/en/press/news/corporate101021.htm>
- <sup>17</sup> <http://eur-lex.europa.eu/LexUriServ/LexUriServ.do?uri=CONSLEG:2001R0045:20010201:EN:PDF>
- <sup>18</sup> E-mail from Dirk Detken, 5 October 2010.
- <sup>19</sup> ILSI Annual Report 2010, p. 13-15. [http://www.ilsi.org/Features/ILSI\\_AR\\_2010\\_Web.pdf](http://www.ilsi.org/Features/ILSI_AR_2010_Web.pdf)
- <sup>20</sup> “European Food Safety Authority: A playing field for the biotech industry”, TestBiotech, 1 December 2010. [http://www.testbiotech.de/sites/default/files/EFSA\\_Playing\\_Field\\_of\\_ILSI.pdf](http://www.testbiotech.de/sites/default/files/EFSA_Playing_Field_of_ILSI.pdf)
- <sup>21</sup> <http://www.ilsi.org/FoodBioTech/Pages/ViewEventDetail.aspx?ID=1>. See also ILSI, 2008, Assessments of Foods and Feeds Nutritionally Improved through Biotechnology: Case Studies Prepared by a Task Force of the ILSI International Food Biotechnology Committee, Comprehensive Reviews in Food Science and Food Safety, Vol. 7, 53–113, [http://www.ilsi.org/FoodBioTech/Publications/10\\_ILSI2008\\_CaseStudies\\_CRFSFS.pdf](http://www.ilsi.org/FoodBioTech/Publications/10_ILSI2008_CaseStudies_CRFSFS.pdf)
- <sup>22</sup> The Tobacco Industry and Scientific Groups - ILSI: A Case Study, The Tobacco Free Initiative, WHO, February 2001. <http://www.who.int/tobacco/media/en/ILSI.pdf>
- <sup>23</sup> “WHO to Rely Less on U.S. Research”, Associated Press, 27 January 2006. <http://www.trwnews.net/Documents/News/2006/ap012706.htm>
- <sup>24</sup> “How EFSA let Big Food shape its risk communication policy”, Corporate Europe Observatory, 29 November 2011. [http://www.corporateeurope.org/system/files/files/article/EFSA\\_big\\_food\\_nov\\_2010.pdf](http://www.corporateeurope.org/system/files/files/article/EFSA_big_food_nov_2010.pdf)
- <sup>25</sup> BBC’s Panorama report “The Trouble With Sugar” was broadcast on BBC One on 10 October 2004. John Lupien’s name in relation to EUFIC first appears on the Internet as Chairman of the Advisory Board of EUFIC in a presentation by EUFIC’s Anna Jung at Cardiff University in October 2004. <http://www.lse.ac.uk/collections/CARR/events/previousConferencesWorkshops/brass/Brass%20PresentationsPapers/jung.pdf>
- <sup>26</sup> “Aspartame and Manufacturer-Funded Scientific Reviews”, Mark D. Gold, Aspartame Toxicity Info Center, testimony to the SB2506 “Ban Aspartame in Hawaii”, Hawaii Senate Health Committee, 24 February 2008. [http://www.capitol.hawaii.gov/session2008/Testimony/SB2506\\_HTH\\_02-25-08\\_.pdf.pdf](http://www.capitol.hawaii.gov/session2008/Testimony/SB2506_HTH_02-25-08_.pdf.pdf); See also: “Opinion of the Scientific Committee on Food: Update on the Safety of Aspartame”, European Commission, Scientific Committee on Food, Document # CS/ADD/EDUL/222 Final, 10 December 2002. The list of the Scientific Committee on Food members who wrote the review is available in the Minutes of the 128th Plenary Meeting of the Scientific Committee on Food held on 10-11 July 2001 in Brussels. [http://ec.europa.eu/food/fs/sc/scf/out101\\_en.pdf](http://ec.europa.eu/food/fs/sc/scf/out101_en.pdf) of the Scientific Committee on Food held on 10-11 July 2001 in Brussels.
- <sup>27</sup> [http://www.danoneinstitute.org/about\\_danone\\_institute/di\\_mission.php](http://www.danoneinstitute.org/about_danone_institute/di_mission.php)
- <sup>28</sup> <http://www.danoneinstitute.ca/en/recipients/>

- 
- <sup>29</sup> EFSA Conference on Nutrition and Health Claims, 8-10 November 2006, Bologna, Italy, p.280-85.  
<http://www.eski.hu/new3/konyvtar/bookshop/EFSA%20Conference%20on%20Nutrition%20and%20Health%20C%20aims.pdf>
- <sup>30</sup> [http://ec.europa.eu/transparency/docs/reg/FAQ\\_en.pdf](http://ec.europa.eu/transparency/docs/reg/FAQ_en.pdf)
- <sup>31</sup> As of 7 February 2011.
- <sup>32</sup> “Pro-OGM: la colère germe”, L'Express, 27 février 2008. [http://www.lexpress.fr/actualite/environnement/pro-ogm-la-colere-germe\\_470580.html](http://www.lexpress.fr/actualite/environnement/pro-ogm-la-colere-germe_470580.html)
- <sup>33</sup> Piet Vanthemsche's declaration of interests to EFSA. <https://doi.efsa.europa.eu/doi/doiweb/wg/74160>
- <sup>34</sup> <http://www.greenpeace.org/belgium/fr/actualites-blogs/nieuws/Aveveoctober/>
- <sup>35</sup> “EFSA stakeholders discuss public consultations”, EFSA news story, 8 June 2009.  
[http://www.efsa.europa.eu/EFSA/efsa\\_locale-1178620753812\\_1211902562907.htm](http://www.efsa.europa.eu/EFSA/efsa_locale-1178620753812_1211902562907.htm)
- <sup>36</sup> <http://www.efsa.europa.eu/en/membership/docs/cpmembers.pdf>
- <sup>37</sup> <http://eur-lex.europa.eu/LexUriServ/LexUriServ.do?uri=OJ:L:2002:031:0001:0024:EN:PDF>
- <sup>38</sup> The Tobacco Industry and Scientific Groups - ILSI: A Case Study, The Tobacco Free Initiative, WHO, February 2001. <http://www.who.int/tobacco/media/en/ILSI.pdf>
- <sup>39</sup> “WHO to Rely Less on U.S. Research”, Associated Press, 27 January 2006.  
<http://www.trwnews.net/Documents/News/2006/ap012706.htm>
- <sup>40</sup> Testimony of Jennifer Sass, Ph.D., senior scientist, Natural Resources Defense Council, before the U.S House Of Representatives Committee on Science and Technology, 14 March 2007.  
[http://democrats.science.house.gov/Media/File/Commdocs/hearings/2007/energy/14mar/sass\\_testimony.pdf](http://democrats.science.house.gov/Media/File/Commdocs/hearings/2007/energy/14mar/sass_testimony.pdf)
- <sup>41</sup> “European Food Safety Authority: A playing field for the biotech industry”, TestBiotech, 1 December 2010.  
[http://www.testbiotech.de/sites/default/files/EFSA\\_Playing\\_Field\\_of\\_ILSI.pdf](http://www.testbiotech.de/sites/default/files/EFSA_Playing_Field_of_ILSI.pdf)
- <sup>42</sup> <http://www.ilsi.org/Europe/Documents/Entity%20poster%20ILSI%20Europe.pdf>
- <sup>43</sup> <http://nl.linkedin.com/in/nicovanbelzen>
- <sup>44</sup> <http://patft.uspto.gov/netacgi/nph-Parser?Sect1=PTO1&Sect2=HITOFF&d=PALL&p=1&u=%2Fnetahml%2FPTO%2Fsrchnum.htm&r=1&f=G&l=50&s1=5133885.PN.&OS=&RS=>
- <sup>45</sup> <http://cat.inist.fr/?aModele=afficheN&cpsidt=20136346>
- <sup>46</sup> <http://be.linkedin.com/pub/agnes-meheust/4/a18/a1a>
- <sup>47</sup> <http://be.linkedin.com/pub/fiona-samuels/16/735/72>
- <sup>48</sup> <http://be.linkedin.com/pub/maria-skarp/20/45/428>
- <sup>49</sup> <http://be.linkedin.com/pub/fanny-rollin/22/849/871>
- <sup>50</sup> <http://www.ilsi-news.eu/#01>
- <sup>51</sup> “About EUFIC”, EUFIC.org, accessed 6 June 2010.
- <sup>52</sup> “EUFIC at a glance”, EUFIC.org, accessed 6 June 2010.
- <sup>53</sup> “European Food Information Council”, SpinProfiles.org, 4 September 2009.
- <sup>54</sup> “Can you swallow this Mars claim?”, The Independent, 21 April 2000.
- <sup>55</sup> “Eufic’s scientific advisory board”, EUFIC.org, 1 July 2007, archived copy on the Internet Archive.
- <sup>56</sup> “UN probes sugar industry claims”, BBC, 8 October 2004.
- <sup>57</sup> BBC’s Panorama report “The Trouble With Sugar” was broadcast on BBC One on 10 October 2004. John Lupien’s name in relation to EUFIC first appears on the Internet as Chairman of the Advisory Board of EUFIC in a presentation by EUFIC’s Anna Jung at Cardiff University in October 2004.  
<http://www.lse.ac.uk/collections/CARR/events/previousConferencesWorkshops/brass/Brass%20PresentationsPapers/jung.pdf>
- <sup>58</sup> “Eufic’s scientific advisory board”, EUFIC.org, 1 July 2007, archived copy on the Internet Archive.
- <sup>59</sup> “Aspartame and Manufacturer-Funded Scientific Reviews”, Mark D. Gold, Aspartame Toxicity Info Center, testimony to the SB2506 “Ban Aspartame in Hawaii”, Hawaii Senate Health Committee, 24 February 2008.
- <sup>60</sup> “Opinion of the Scientific Committee on Food: Update on the Safety of Aspartame”, European Commission, Scientific Committee on Food, Document # CS/ADD/EDUL/222 Final, 10 December 2002. The list of SCF members who wrote the review is available in the [Minutes of the 128th Plenary Meeting of the Scientific Committee on Food](http://www.eufic.org/page/en/show/latest-science-news/fftid/Chewing-gum-appetite/) held on 10-11 July 2001 in Brussels.
- <sup>61</sup> <http://www.eufic.org/page/en/show/latest-science-news/fftid/Chewing-gum-appetite/>
- <sup>62</sup> <http://www.mars.com/global/news-and-media/press-releases/news-releases.aspx?SiteId=94&Id=1497>
- <sup>63</sup> <http://www.kraftfoodscompany.com/BRANDS/LARGEST-BRANDS/index.aspx>
- <sup>64</sup> <http://pdfcast.org/pdf/short-term-effects-of-chewing-gum-on-snack-intake-and-appetite>
- <sup>65</sup> <http://www.eufic.org/article/en/page/RARCHIVE/expid/review-eating-between-meals-health/>
- <sup>66</sup> <http://www.eufic.org/article/en/food-technology/gmos/artid/viewpoints-genetically-modified-foods/>
- <sup>67</sup> <http://www.gmwatch.org/latest-listing/1-news-items/753-pr-operation-on-gm-foods-again-exposes-efsa-industry-bias-29122004>
- <sup>68</sup> [Profile of Barilla](http://www.eufic.org/page/en/show/latest-science-news/fftid/Chewing-gum-appetite/), Register of interest representatives, European Commission, last updated on 20 March 2010.
- <sup>69</sup> [Profile of Novozymes](http://www.eufic.org/page/en/show/latest-science-news/fftid/Chewing-gum-appetite/), Register of interest representatives, European Commission, last updated on 11 February 2010.
- <sup>70</sup> [http://www.danoneinstitute.org/about\\_danone\\_institute/di\\_mission.php](http://www.danoneinstitute.org/about_danone_institute/di_mission.php)
- <sup>71</sup> <http://www.danoneinstitute.ca/en/recipients/>
- <sup>72</sup> “Les failles informationnelles de la communication de Danone”, Knowckers.org, 13 November 2008.  
<http://www.knowckers.org/2008/11/les-failles-informationnelles-de-la-communication-de-danone/>
-

---

<sup>73</sup> “Danone withdraws health claims on yoghurts”, EurActiv.com, 16 April 2010.  
<http://www.euractiv.com/en/food/danone-withdraws-health-claims-yoghurts-news-451131>