

The TTC-story proves EFSA's lack of independence.

- The industry-promoted tool TTC, a level of exposure regarded as safe for all chemicals substituting for safety testing, was initially developed by the Flavor and Extracts Manufacturers Association of the United States (or FEMA) and subsequently promoted by the food and chemical **industries lobby group ILSI** (International Life Sciences Institute) and industry-linked academics at the end of the 90-ties;
- TTC next was promoted in WHO and EFSA by many of the same people who developed and promoted the tool and who managed to get seats in the EFSA-working group on TTC; 10 out of 13 members of the EFSA working group turned out to be advocates of the tool, [PAN E report on TTC](#) ; EFSA ignored the outcome of the PAN-research
- In a 2012-report on conflicts of interests at EU agencies, the **European Court of Auditors** concluded on the same topic that "*the majority of the members of a scientific body have been advocates of a concept which have been subject to the analysis of the same scientific body*" (report attached, page 26); EFSA didn't implement the recommendations of the Court in the team that drafted the TTC-opinion;
- In a 2014-verdict the **European Ombudsman** found EFSA guilty of maladministration on TTC. EFSA should have started "*a thorough investigation*" (report attached, page 5, point 21) after the publication of the PAN-research on TTC. But EFSA did not respond at all to the "*significant evidence on conflict of interest*" put forward by the complainant (page 5, point 19). "*It was not until the Ombudsman opened this inquiry that EFSA presented its views on the matter*" (page 6, point 22), a case of maladministration. Even after the verdict EFSA did not justify their policy to allow advocates of a tool to develop an (independent) EFSA-opinion on the tool and only promised to the Ombudsman to do better in future;
- In the 2014-verdict the **Ombudsman** also criticizes the fact that EFSA in 2011 organised a scientific meeting together with ILSI and industry on TTC, excluding independent experts and stakeholders. Also on this point EFSA ignored the criticism in the PAN report. EFSA "*gave the impression that it preferred to avoid addressing the issue, thus failing to dispel doubts as to its efforts to ensure a balanced stakeholder composition in external meetings*", according to the Ombudsman (verdict page 9, point 36) and a case of maladministration. EFSA up to this day fails to address the issue;
- On 3 - 5 December 2014 EFSA organised an **expert meeting** to 'review' TTC. Again the vast majority of the experts were advocates of TTC, a quick scan shows that at the minimum 18 out of the 28 experts present were advocates of the tool. An independent review remains an illusion;
- Just before the expert meeting EFSA organised a **stakeholder meeting** on December 2, 2014. While all presentations were put on the EFSA website to inform the experts, the critical presentation of PAN Europe (attached) was kept behind by EFSA staff for the reason of "*waiting for a written confirmation from our legal dept.*" and only added to the EFSA website after the expert meeting.