



IS THE SCIENTIFIC ADVICE FOR COMMISSION INDEPENDENT?

- The worst example of the lack of independency is the Food Authority EFSA-opinion on TTC (Threshold of Toxicological Concern, a tool to qualify chemicals with unknown toxicity as safe), see PAN report, [PAN E report on TTC](#); Industry managed to get 18 of their people in a 22-member EFSA working group
- Many experts in the EFSA panels have industry links; there are improvements with conflicts of interest since Eur. Parliament pressurized EFSA to change their policy on conflicts of interest, but still 50% of the people in the panels have ties to industry
- Academics – national experts; EFSA doesn't manage to get independent scientists in their panels; it can be questioned if EFSA is really doing their best though. Now with less industry people, national civil servants start to dominate. This creates another conflict of interest since national experts many times have a national political agenda.
- Example: The opinion on endocrine disrupting pesticide was dominated by the national lobbyists of UK and Germany (who managed somehow to get a seat in the panels) and they succeeded to impose their ideas on the EFSA opinion