



**SCIENTIFIC COMMITTEE
OF THE FEDERAL AGENCY FOR THE SAFETY
OF THE FOOD CHAIN**

Advice 04-2013

Subject: Evaluation of the scores that are allocated to hazards in the context of programming official controls (dossier Sci Com 2012/26).

Advice approved by the Scientific Committee on 18 January 2013.

Summary

The Scientific Committee has assessed the scores attributed to the severity of the adverse effects of hazards (food safety, animal health and plant health) in the context of the programming of the official controls of the FASFC, in order to detect the presence of a hazard in the food chain. The Scientific Committee formulates several general and specific recommendations.

Key words

Score – hazard – programming – official inspections

1 Terms of reference

The Scientific Committee has been asked to evaluate the scores that are allocated according to the seriousness of the detrimental consequences (food safety, animal health and plant health) in the context of programming official controls for the FASFC, for the purposes of detecting a risk in the food chain. These scores are one of the parameters that are used by the FASFC to determine the number of planned, official inspections (see also the procedures 'Methodology for creating programme of official inspections for FASFC analyses and inspections 2009/78/PCCB').

Considering discussions during the working group meetings of 20 December 2012 and 3 January 2013, and the plenary session of 18 January 2013;

the Scientific Committee provides the following recommendation(s):

2. Introduction

In the context of programming official controls by the FASFC that focus on detecting the presence of a hazard in the food chain, the procedure "Methodology for developing the programme of official controls for FASFC analyses and inspections 2009/78/PCCB") specifies various parameters to be taken in consideration, including the seriousness of the corresponding detrimental consequences of the hazards.

In general, the scale for allocating scores according to the seriousness of the detrimental consequences is as follows:

- **score 1:** not or barely serious (e.g. parameters that are not directly linked to food safety, health of plants or animals and whereby any economic consequences would be insignificant);
- **score 2:** probably serious, parameters that refer back to food hygiene; standard assumed value if more accurate indications are lacking;
- **score 3:** serious (e.g. toxins in food and agents that cause disease that correspond with moderate gastroenteritis);
- **score 4:** very serious (e.g. toxins in food and agents that cause diseases with a low infectious dose and/or with a high fatality rate).

The seriousness of the detrimental consequences is then associated with the two other components of exposure, specifically the occurrence in the sampled population, and the contribution of the population to overall exposure, according to the following formula:

Seriousness of effect + (Occurrence x Contribution population)

This forms the risk assessment that enables to determine the reliability level according to the following divisions that are drafted by the DG Control policy of FASFC:

- 90%: risk assessment with score from 2 to 6 (e.g. limited toxicity, limited contamination via considered products);
- 95%: risk assessment with score from 7 to 12 (e.g. average toxicity, average contamination via considered products);
- 99%: risk assessment with score from 13 to 20 (e.g. product is a significant source of contamination of the food chain due to (very) hazardous contamination).

In the past, the Scientific Committee has already issued various opinions regarding the scores that are allocated to the seriousness of the detrimental consequences of hazards: see Advice 40-2005 and its amendment (FASFC, 2005; FASFC, 2006), as well as Advice 13-2010, 14-2010 and 21-2010 (FASFC, 2010a; FASFC, 2010b; FASFC, 2010c). However, considering the evolution of scientific expertise on one hand, and the FASFC's databases on the other,

the Scientific Committee was asked once again to review the allocation of seriousness of the detrimental consequences of hazards and, if necessary, to supplement them.

3. Advice

The Scientific Committee is of the opinion that it is not possible to allocate a score to specific 'quality parameters' (e.g. water activity or freezing point) as these are not hazards in themselves. Parameters that influence hazards, cannot therefore be scored. An unfavourable result for these quality parameters, however, could lead to (an increased chance of) the presence of the hazards.

The Scientific Committee is also of the opinion that, for sake of completeness, the list of parameters must contain all animal diseases that are set forth in Belgian legislation (cf. Royal Decree of 24 March 1987 on animal health), as well as all organisms that are damaging to plants that are set forth in Belgian legislation (cf. Royal Decree of 10 August 2005 on combating damaging organisms for plants and plant-based products).

It must be noted that certain parameters correspond with 'profiles' or, in other words, groups of individual parameters. This concerns parameters that start with 'PPG00' in the initial table. In that case, a generic score is allocated to the 'profile' that corresponds with the individual score for the hazard associated with the most detrimental consequences, as set forth in the details of the relevant 'profile'.

3.1 *Partim 'Microbiological contaminants and animal health'*

3.1.1. General recommendations

As already mentioned in Advice 21-2010 (FASFC, 2010c), alongside the scores regarding the significance for public health, animal health and plant health, a fourth score should be included for 'significance for the safeguarding of the food safety system'. Microbiological indicator organisms could be scored in this column.

The scores in the 'Effect' column of the list have no scientific meaning and, as a result, scores will only be allocated to the four aforementioned categories.

It is recommended that for the parameters total aerobic germ count, total yeasts and fungi, *Escherichia coli* and *Enterobacteriaceae* in food a score of 3 is attributed for 'significance for good safeguarding of the food safety system'.

Given the parameters 'Enterococci' and 'Faecal streptococci' concern the same type of faecal germs, they must be combined as the group 'Enterococci' and a score of 2 should be allocated for significance for good management of the food safety system.

It is decided not to add the Porcine Reproductive and Respiratory Syndrome (PRRS) virus and the Schmallenberg virus to the list, in light of the fact that both viruses are endemic and do not have to be notified.

3.1.2. Specific recommendations

The Scientific Committee has also formulated the following specific recommendations.

Parameter	Score				Comments/Notes
	Public health	Animal production	Plant production	Management of food safety system	
Parameters for which there is no score					
Genotyping				3	
Genotyping linked to sensitivity for scrapie		3			
Sulphite reducing anaerobe (detection)				2	This parameter will be applied to determine water quality.
Baseline study breeding pigs MRSA	3				Given that a score of 3 is allocated to the individual parameter 'MRSA', which forms part of this profile.
Baseline study breeding pigs <i>Salmonella</i>	3				Given that a score of 3 is allocated to the individual parameter 'Salmonella', which forms part of this profile.
Baseline study <i>Campylo</i> broilers	3				Given that a score of 3 is allocated to the individual parameter 'Campylobacter', which forms part of this profile.
Baseline study <i>Campylo/Salm</i> broilers carcasses	3				Given that a score of 3 is allocated to the individual parameters that are included in this profile.
Baseline study <i>Listeria</i> in sample	4				Given that a score of 4 is allocated to the individual parameter ' <i>Listeria monocytogenes</i> ', which forms part of this profile.
Baseline study <i>Listeria</i> on Use-by date	4				Given that a score of 4 is allocated to the individual parameter ' <i>Listeria monocytogenes</i> ', which forms part of this profile.
<i>Coxiella burnetii</i> (detection)	3	3			
CVTI/TIAC					Remove from the list given that this is not a risk in itself, but rather the consequence of the presence of one or more risks.
Protein degradation (TNBS method)				3	
<i>Escherichia coli</i> O other (detection)	4				This term must be replaced with 'human pathogen VTEC'.
Total germ count aerobic 55 °C				2	
Total germ count anaerobic 37 °C					Pursuant to Advice 25-2012 (FASFC, 2012) of the Scientific Committee, in future this analysis will not be conducted in the context of bacteriological meat research. Based on expert opinion and after analysis of the lab results obtained, it seemed that determining the total anaerobic germ count in the context of bacteriological

					meat research, has little added value. The subsequent advice is to remove this parameter.
Total aerobic germ count at 21°C				3	
Total aerobic germ count at 21°C after incubation				3	
Total aerobic germ count at 6°C				3	
<i>Listeria monocytogenes</i> (detection/count)	4				
<i>Melissococcus pluton</i> (European foul brood)		4			
Microbiology quick sale A on Use-by	3				Given that a score of 3 is allocated to the individual parameter 'Salmonella', which forms part of this profile.
Microbiology quick sale A sample	4				Given that a score of 4 is allocated to the individual parameter ' <i>Listeria monocytogenes</i> ', which forms part of this profile.
Microbiology quick sale B on Use-by	3				Given that a score of 3 is allocated to the individual parameter 'Salmonella', which forms part of this profile.
Microbiology quick sale B sample	3				Given that a score of 3 is allocated to the individual parameter 'Salmonella', which forms part of this profile.
Microbiology	4				Given that a score of 4 is allocated to the individual parameter ' <i>Listeria monocytogenes</i> ', which forms part of this profile.
MRSA (detection)	3				For this parameter, it must be noted that transfer of this germ via food should not be regarded as a risk factor, but that transfer to humans via direct contact was observed. This primarily concerns a risk for persons who come into direct contact with animals due to their professional activities, such as farmers and their families, veterinarians, etc.
<i>Paenibacillus larvae</i> (American foul brood)		4			
Parameters microbiological mains water				3	Given that a score of 3 is allocated to the individual parameter ' <i>Escherichia coli</i> ', which forms part of this profile.
Profile FREE foul brood		4			Given that a score of 4 is allocated to the individual parameters ' <i>Paenibacillus larvae</i> ' and ' <i>Melissococcus pluton</i> ' that make up the profile.
Screening bee viruses		3			
<i>Streptococcus thermophilus</i> (detection)					To be removed from list, given the application of this is unknown.
VTI/TIA (< 2 pers.)					Remove from the list given that this is not a hazard in itself, but rather the consequence of the presence of one or more hazards.
Yeast (count)				3	
Epizootic ulcerative syndrome		4			

<i>Acarapis woodi</i> (mite disease)		4			
<i>Aethina tumida</i> (small beehive beetle)		4			
<i>Bonamia exitiosa</i>		4			
<i>Bonamia oestrea</i>		4			
<i>Marteilia refringens</i>		4			
<i>Microcytos mackini</i>		4			
<i>Nosema</i> spp.		4			
Frogs' legs parasites	3	3			
Fish parasites	3	3			
<i>Perkinsus marinus</i>		4			
<i>Tropilaelaps</i> spp.		4			
<i>Toxoplasma gondii</i>	4	3			
Infectious salmon anaemia		4			
Koi herpes virus (KHV)		4			
Contamination with yellow-head-virus		4			
Contamination with white spot virus		4			
Epizootic haematopoietic necrosis		4			
IHN infectious haematopoietic necrosis		4			
VHS viral haemorrhagic septicaemia		4			
Contamination with the taura-syndrome-virus		4			
<i>Varroa destructor</i>		4			
<i>Trichinella spiralis</i>	4				
Water activity					Cf. general comment above in relation to 'quality parameters'.
Water capacity Ca (NO ₃) ₂					
Respiration test (Oxitop)					
Oxygen consumption					
Parameters for which there is already a score					
<i>Yersinia</i> spp.	3				This term must be replaced by "human pathogen <i>Yersinia enterocolitica</i> " with reference to the human pathogen biotypes and any serotypes.
Coliforms (count/detection)				2	Allocate a score of 2 for the good management of the food safety system for thermotolerant coliforms.
<i>Clostridium botulinum</i>	4	4			Allocate a score of 4 for animal production.
Enterohemorrhagic <i>Escherichia coli</i> O157	4				Allocate a score of 4 only for public health and not for animal production.
<i>Listeria monocytogenes</i>	4				Specify "when the number of bacteria > 100 per gram product for the latest consumption date".
<i>Vibrio cholerae</i> O1 and O139	4				Replace "cholerae" by "cholerae" and distinguish between O1 and O139, and non-O1. Specify "when the number of bacteria > 1,000 per gram product".
<i>Vibrio cholerae</i> non-O1	3				Replace "cholerae" by "cholerae" and distinguish between O1 and O139, and non-O1. Specify "when the number of bacteria > 1,000 per gram product".
<i>Vibrio parahaemolyticus</i>	3				Specify "when the number of bacteria > 1,000 per gram product".
Aujeszky's disease		4			Allocate a score of 4 instead of 3.

Norovirus	3				Allocate a score of 3 only for public health and not for animal production.
Suggestion to add the following parameters to the list					
Oyster herpesvirus		4			
Hepatitis E virus	4				
Bovine viral diarrhoea virus (BVD)		3			
Infectious bovine rhinotracheitis virus (IBR)		3			
Epizootic haemorrhagic disease virus		4			
<i>Campylobacter fetus</i> subsp. <i>venerealis</i>		4			
<i>Mycobacterium avium</i> subsp. <i>paratuberculosis</i>		3			
<i>Mycobacterium bovis</i>	4	3			
<i>Mycoplasma mycoides</i> subsp. <i>mycoides</i> Small colonies		4			
<i>Mycobacterium tuberculosis</i>	4	3			To be added to list, given that an infected farmer could pass disease onto animals.
<i>Pseudomonas</i> spp.				3	
<i>Salmonella typhi</i>	4				
<i>Shigella</i>	3				Specify "for the strains that are present in Belgium".
<i>Vibrio vulnificus</i>	4				Add to list and specify that transfer does not occur by feed, but via direct contact.
<i>Besnoitia besnoiti</i>		4			Given the emergence of besnoitiosis in France and Europe.
<i>Cysticercus bovis</i>	3				Add to list of parasites (cestodes). Larvae of the <i>Taenia saginata</i> in cows. Controls are already conducted nowadays in the abattoir.
<i>Cysticercus cellulosae</i>	4				Add to list of parasites (cestodes). Larvae of <i>Taenia solium</i> in pigs. Controls are already conducted nowadays in the abattoir.
<i>Cryptosporidium</i>	3				Add to list in a new section "Protozoan parasites".
<i>Echinococcus granulosus</i>	4				
<i>Echinococcus multilocularis</i>	4				
<i>Neospora caninum</i>		4			
Trichinella	4				
TSE in sheep		4			
TSE in goats		4			
Foot and mouth virus		4			
Infectious anaemia virus in horses		4			
Enzootic meningoencephalomyelitis virus (and in particular West-Nile fever, or West Nile virus)	4	4			Specify that transfer does not occur via feed but via vectors.
Horse sickness virus		4			
Vesicular stomatitis virus		4			
Bluetongue virus		4			
Cow sickness virus		4			Specify that this virus has been eradicated worldwide.
Rift Valley Fever virus	4	4			

Nodular dermatosis virus		4			
Sheep pox virus		4			
Goat pox virus		4			
Enzootic encephalomyelitis in pigs (Teschen disease)		2			
Swine vesicular disease		4			
African swine fever		4			
Viral enteritis in mink		2			
Pseudo-bird flu (Newcastle disease)		4			

3.2 Partim 'Chemical contaminants'

3.2.1. General recommendations

With respect to pesticides, the approach below is proposed by the expert from the FASFC:

- The allocation of a score based on the value of the ARfD or the ADI for the individual pesticides according to the following scale:
 - ARfD (or ADI) < 0.01 mg/kg l.g./day = score 4
 - ARfD (or ADI) < 0.01 - 0.1 mg/kg l.g./day = score 3
 - ARfD (or ADI) < 0.1 mg/kg l.g./day = score 2
 - ARfD (or ADI) not required = score 1
- For the pesticides profiles, each year the non-conformities from the two previous years taken into account. A score was allocated to pesticides for which a non-conformity was observed. The score for the profile (group) corresponds with the score for the pesticide with the lowest ARfD or ADI.

The Scientific Committee is of the opinion that this approach can be applied logically and easily. However, this approach does not take all detrimental consequences into account. Alongside the IARC (International Agency for Research on Cancer) classification, the approach must also account for endocrine effects or for bioaccumulation. As such, certain substances with a low ARfD, or even no ARfD, could nevertheless have consequences that are more detrimental than the acute effects. For example, benomyl (still used in agriculture abroad) has no ARfD but an ADI of 0.1 mg/kg l.g./day. This parameter should have a score of 3 if it is associated with the risk indications R60 (Can damage fertility), R61 (Risk during pregnancy of detrimental consequences for the child) and R46 (Can lead to inherited genetic damage). This parameter must subsequently, logically, have a score of 4. In addition, just as with the other "non-authorized" parameters (e.g. malachite green, chloramphenicol...), for those for which there was a preference to create a new group of parameters "banned substances" (see Recommendation 14-2010 (FASFC, 2010b)), it may be opportune to distinguish between authorised pesticides in Europe and those that are not/no longer authorised. These banned pesticides should be allocated a higher score. With respect to the pesticides profiles, the Scientific Committee understands the practical reasons for the applying method. However, this concerns not only an approach that is based on the seriousness of the harmful effects of the individual pesticide that form part of these profiles. It is therefore recommended that a more nuanced working method is applied, one that is not only based on the ARfD value as the most important criterion.

The Scientific Committee also recommends harmonising the title/name of the migration parameters. It would be better to report the name of the substance without clarifying whether it concerns the analysis of migration or the migration of the substance. This would allow double parameters to be eliminated.

The Scientific Committee further recommends that the CAS (*Chemical Abstracts Service*) number is indicated for all chemical substances given in the list in order to be able to identify all parameters unambiguously.

3.2.2. Specific recommendations

The Scientific Committee has also formulated the following specific recommendations.

Parameter	Score		Comments/Notes
	Public health	Animal Health	
Colourants			
Ponceau 4R, cochineal red A (E124)	2		
Victoria Pure Blue BO	2		
Preservatives			
Acetic acid	1		
Citric acid	1		
Sweeteners	1		
Neotame (E961)	1		Neotame (E961) is an artificial sweetener with E-number.
Morpholine	2		Morpholine is a non-authorized additive, which is used as an emulsifier and wax carrier for surface treatments of fruit. Also used as a corrosion inhibitor for steam. Not especially toxic in itself, but in the presence of nitrite it is converted into N-nitrosomorpholine, a genetic toxic carcinogen.
Allergens			
Celery allergens	2		
Shellfish allergens	3		
Lupin allergens	2		
Mollusc allergens	3		
Mustard allergens	2		
Walnut allergens	2		
Fish allergens	2		
Sesame seed allergens	2		
Miscellaneous			
Asbestos	4		
Carnitine	1		Carnitine is present in muscle tissue. Used in supplements.
Cocaine	3		
Melamine	3		Melamine is nephrotoxic.
Carbon monoxide (CO)	3		
Ethylene oxide	4		Ethylene oxide is used to sterilise many products, such as medical equipment. It is carcinogenic (categorised in group 1 by IARC). Ethylene oxide is a gassing agent and is toxic but unstable, and reacts with the formation of toxic reaction products.
Parameters chemical mains water	2		
<i>Pinus armandii</i>	1		
Unwanted plants - <i>Senecio vulgaris</i>	3		Alkaloids
Propylene glycol	3		
Bromides	1		
Chemical elements			
I-131	4		Appears a second time in the list of radioactive elements.
Silver (Ag)	2		

Tin (Sn)	2		
Dicalcium phosphate	1		
Monocalcium phosphate	1		
Fats and fatty acids			
Trans-industrial fatty acids	2		To be added to the list.
Hormones			
Androgen esters (screening multi residues)	2		
β-agonists	3		
Hydrocarbons			
Benzene	3		
Sum PCDD/PCDF and DL PCB's via Calux	4		
Hydroxymethylfurfural (HMF)	2	2	Ongoing research refers to low sensitivity of bees to HMF. According to the currently available, experimental studies, it is not clear that HMF has carcinogenic or genotoxic effects for humans, or that HMF has a specific toxic potential.
Tetrachloroethylene	3		
Trichloroethylene	3		
PCB 105	3		This concerns a mono-ortho dioxine-like PCB with a TEF-value of 0.00003.
Medicines			
Antibiotics (multi residue screening)	3		Given the antibiotic resistance against quinolones.
Erythromycin	2		
Macrolides (multi-residue screening)	2		
Tilmicosin	2		
Nitrofurans: (multi residue screening)	4		
Quinolones (multi residue screening)	3		Given the antibiotic resistance.
Doramectin	2		
Eprinomectin	2		
Ivermectin	2		
Moxidectin	2		"Moxcidectin" to be replaced by "Moxidectin".
Banned additive A/D/J	3		See also Recommendation 40-2005.
Migration			
Migration analysis of terephthalic acid	2		
Migration analysis of 1-hexene	2		
Migration analysis of 1-octene	2		
Migration analysis of 1-octene	3		The analysis of migration of organic tin appears twice in the list.
Migration analysis of octadecyl 3-(3,5-di-tertbutyl-4-hydrophenyl)propionate	2		
Migration analysis of amines	3		
Migration analysis of Antimony	2		
Migration analysis of Arsine	3		
Migration analysis of Cobalt	2		
Migration analysis of Copper	2		

Migration analysis of Selenium	2		
Benzophenone	2		
ITX (2-isopropylthioxantone)	2		
Methylbenzophenone	2		
Migration v 2.4 toluenendiamine (2.4-TDA)	3		
Migration of aniline	3		
Migration of 2.2-dimethoxy-2-phenylacetophenone	2		
Migration of primary aromatic amines	3		
Migration of benzyl butyl phthalate (BPP)	2		"Benyl butyl phthalate" to be replaced by "benzyl butyl phthalate". Given a score of 2 is allocated to BPP.
Migration of bisphenol F(bis(4-hydroxyphenylmethane))	3		Research <i>in vitro</i> has shown genotoxic and oestrogenic effects.
Migration of di-2-(ethylhexyl)adipate (DEHP)	3		Given a score of 3 is allocated to DEHP (di-2-(ethylhexyl)adipate).
Migration of dibutyl phthalate (DPBP)	2		Given a score of 2 is allocated to DPBP.
Migration of diisonyl-1, 2-cyclohexaandicarboxylate (DINCH)	2		Given a score of 2 is allocated to DINCH.
Migration of ethylbenzene	3		
Migration of melamine	3		
Migration of methylbenzophenone	2		Appears twice in the list.
Migration of pentachlorophenol	3		
Migration of volatile components	2		In the French version, "components" to be replaced by "composés".
Quality parameters			
Specific weight			Cf. collective general comment above in relation to 'quality parameters'.
Freezing point			
BIRB-analyses butter			
Dry matter			
Pesticides			
Pentachlorophenol	3		
Proteins and amino acids			
Hydroxyproline	1		Hydroxyproline is an amino acid that is usually present in gelatine and is a measure for the value of a protein.
Whey protein	1		
Radioactivity			
Alpha activity	4		
Beta activity	4		
Iodine 131	4		Appears a second time in the list of chemical elements.
Toxins			
Shellfish poisoning toxins (ASP-DSP-PSP)	4		

3.3 Partim 'Plant health'

3.3.1. General recommendations

The Scientific Committee recommends to adapt the list of selected phytosanitary hazards according to the future evolution of European and Belgian legislation (cf. the collective,

general comments above), as well as to adapt the scores allocated to the significance of the economic damage that could be associated with their presence in Belgium, according to the results of future PRA's (Pest Risk Assessment) conducted by EFSA.

Specific parameters correspond with generic parameters of the type 'Fungi - import' and 'Insects - internal market'. The details of these generic parameters will evolve over time. The Scientific Committee therefore recommends to allocate a score of 4 to these generic parameters, given the fact that their composition can change and the presence of a hazard with very serious consequences cannot, therefore, be ruled out.

3.3.2. Specific recommendations

The Scientific Committee has also formulated the following specific recommendations:

Parameter	Score		Comment/Notes
	Public health	Plant health	
Parameters for which there is no score			
Export shallots/onions Israel		4	Given that later a score of 4 is proposed for the individual parameter ' <i>Globodera</i> spp.', which forms part of this profile.
Potato bacteria		4	Given that a score of 4 is allocated to the individual parameter ' <i>Ralstonia solanacearum</i> ', which forms part of this profile.
Plant bacteria Import		4	
Plant bacteria internal market		4	
Plant bacteria - Monitoring v contamination		4	Given that a score of 4 is allocated to the individual parameter ' <i>Ralstonia solanacearum</i> ', which forms part of this profile.
<i>Erwinia amylovora</i>		4	
<i>Pseudomonas syringae</i> pv. <i>Actinidiae</i>		2	
<i>Xanthomonas arboricola</i> pv. <i>pruni</i>		3	
Plant fungi - Monitoring v contamination		4	Given that later a score of 4 is proposed for the individual parameter ' <i>Synchytrium endobioticum</i> ', which forms part of this profile.
Plant fungi import		4	
Plant fungi internal market		4	
<i>Phytophthora lateralis</i>		3	
<i>Sclerotium cepivorum</i>		3	
<i>Tilletia controversa</i>		3	
<i>Verticillium</i> spp.		2	
Pear decline mycoplasma		3	
Tomato yellow leaf curl virus		4	
Plant viruses import		4	
Plant viruses internal market		4	
Plant viruses - Monitoring v contamination		3	Given that a score of 3 is allocated to the individual parameter 'Chrysanthemum stunt viroid', which forms part of this profile. + replacement of parameter 'Potato spindle tuber viroid' in the profile by

			parameter 'Pospiviroids'.
<i>Anoplophora chinensis</i>		4	
<i>Ceratitis capitata</i>		2	
<i>Diaphania perspectalis</i>		3	
<i>Drosophila suzukii</i>		4	
<i>Dryocosmus kuriphilus</i>		2	
<i>Epitrix</i> spp.		4	
Citrus long-horned beetle		4	Given that later a score of 4 is proposed for the individual parameter ' <i>Anoplophora chinensis</i> ' and ' <i>Anoplophora glabripennis</i> ', which form part of this profile.
Plant insects import		4	
Plant insects internal market		4	
Plant insects - Monitoring v contamination		4	Given that a score of 4 is allocated to the individual parameter ' <i>Diabrotica virgifera virgifera</i> ', which forms part of this profile.
<i>Keiferia lycopersicella</i>		3	
<i>Leucinodes orbonalis</i>		3	
<i>Monochamus</i> spp		4	
<i>Neoleucinodes elegantalis</i>		3	
<i>Nysius huttoni</i>		1	
<i>Opogona sacchari</i>		4	
<i>Rhynchophorus ferrugineus</i>		3	
<i>Tachypterellus quadrigibbus</i>		2	
<i>Thaumetopoea processionea</i>	3	3	Processionary caterpillars can cause serious allergies in humans.
<i>Tuta absoluta</i>		3	
<i>Meloidogyne enterolobii</i>		3	
<i>Meloidogyne ethiopica</i>		3	
Carrot root-knot nematodes		4	Given that later a score of 4 is proposed for the individual parameter ' <i>Meloidogyne chitwoodi</i> ' and ' <i>Meloidogyne fallax</i> ', which form part of this profile.
Plant nematodes - Monitoring v contamination		4	Given that later a score of 4 is proposed for the individual parameter ' <i>Meloidogyne chitwoodi</i> ' and ' <i>Meloidogyne fallax</i> ', which form part of this profile.
<i>Xiphinema americanum sensu lato</i>		2	
<i>Xiphinema bricolense</i>		2	
Parameters for which there is already a score			
<i>Clavibacter michiganensis</i> subsp. <i>michiganensis</i>		3	+ Add 'subsp.' for the second ' <i>michiganensis</i> '
<i>Clavibacter michiganensis</i> subsp. <i>sepedonicus</i>		4	Add 'subsp.' for ' <i>sepedonicus</i> '
<i>Colletotrichum acutatum</i>		2	+ Falls under the heading 'Fungi' rather than 'Bacteria'.
<i>Xanthomonas fragariae</i>		3	
<i>Claviceps purpurea</i>	4		Given the synthesis of alkaloids.
<i>Gibberella circinata</i>		2	
<i>Guignardia citricarpa</i>		2	
<i>Melampsora medusae</i>		2	
<i>Phytophthora kernoviae</i>		3	Replace ' <i>Phytophthora</i> ' by ' <i>Phytophthora</i> '.

<i>Phytophthora ramorum</i>		3	Replace 'Phytophthora' by 'Phytophthora'.
<i>Synchytrium endobioticum</i>		4	
Plum pox virus (Sharka)		4	
Tomato spotted wilt virus (TSWV)		3	Cf. recent PRA from the EFSA (2012).
<i>Anoplophora glabripennis</i>		4	
<i>Thripidae</i>		4	
<i>Bursaphelenchus xylophilus</i>		4	
<i>Ditylenchus dipsaci</i>		4	
<i>Globodera</i> spp.		4	
<i>Meloidogyne chitwoodi</i>		4	
<i>Meloidogyne fallax</i>		4	
Nematodes (general)		4	
Leaf and stem nematodes import		4	
Nematodes internal market		4	
Suggestion to add the following parameters to the list			
<i>Xanthomonas axonopodis</i> pv. <i>begoniae</i>		3	
<i>Meloidogyne artiellia</i>		3	Recently detected for the first time in Belgium.

4. Conclusion

The current advice processes the evaluation of the allocated score according to the seriousness of the detrimental effects of the hazards (in relation to food safety, animal health and plant health) in the context of programming official controls for the FASFC, for the purposes of detecting a hazard in the food chain. The Scientific Committee has formulated multiple general and specific recommendations.

For the Scientific Committee,

Prof. Dr. Ir. André Huyghebaert
Chairman

Brussels, 24/01/2013

References

FAVV, 2005. Advies 40-2005 van het Wetenschappelijk Comité van 6 oktober 2005. *Evaluatie van de waarden die worden toegekend aan de ernst van de schadelijke gevolgen die verbonden zijn aan de aanwezigheid van gevaren m.b.t. voedselveiligheid en/of dierlijke en plantaardige productie (dossier Sci Com 2005/24)*. Available on: http://www.favv-afsc.fgov.be/home/com-sci/doc/avis05/ADVIES_40-2005_NL_DOSSIER_2005-24.pdf

FAVV, 2006. Amendement aan het advies 40-2005 van het Wetenschappelijk Comité van 18 september 2006. *Evaluatie van de waarden die worden toegekend aan de ernst van de schadelijke gevolgen die verbonden zijn aan de aanwezigheid van gevaren m.b.t. de voedselveiligheid en/of de dierlijke en plantaardige productie (dossier Sci Com 2005/24)*. Available on: http://www.favv-afsc.fgov.be/home/com-sci/doc/avis05/AMENDEMENT_ADVIES40-2005_001.pdf

FAVV, 2010a. Advies 13-2010 van het Wetenschappelijk Comité van 19 maart 2010. *Analyseprogramma van het FAVV: herevaluatie van de scores die zijn toegekend aan de ernst van de gevaren met betrekking tot voedselveiligheid, dierlijke productie en plantaardige productie (dossier Sci Com 2009/36A-partim microbiologie)*. Available on: http://www.favv-afsc.fgov.be/wetenschappelijkcomite/adviezen/_documents/ADVIES13-2010_NL_DOSSIER2009-36A.pdf

FAVV, 2010b. Advies 14-2010 van het Wetenschappelijk Comité van 23 april 2010. *Analyseprogramma van het FAVV: herevaluatie van de scores die zijn toegekend aan de ernst van de gevaren met betrekking tot voedselveiligheid, dierlijke productie en plantaardige productie (dossier Sci Com 2009/36B-partim chemie)*. Available on: http://www.favv-afsc.fgov.be/wetenschappelijkcomite/adviezen/_documents/ADVIES14-2010_NL_DOSSIER2009-36B.pdf

FAVV, 2010c. Advies 21-2010 van het Wetenschappelijk Comité van 24 juni 2010. *Optimalisatie van het FAVV analyseprogramma: scores voor de belangrijkheid van microbiologische kwaliteits- en hygiëne-indicatoren voor de beheersing van voedselveiligheidssystemen (dossier Sci Com 2010/17: eigen initiatief)*. Available on: http://www.favv-afsc.fgov.be/wetenschappelijkcomite/adviezen/_documents/ADVIES21-2010_NL_DOSSIER2010-17.pdf

FASFC, 2012. Advies 25-2012 van het Wetenschappelijk Comité van 14 september 2012. *Bacteriologisch vleesonderzoek en residuonderzoek naar kiemgroeiremmende stoffen bij noodslachtingen en bij andere slachtingen wanneer dit aangewezen is (dossier Sci Com 2011/09)*. Available on: http://www.favv-afsc.fgov.be/wetenschappelijkcomite/adviezen/_documents/ADVIES25-2012_NL_DOSSIER2011-09.pdf

Members of the Scientific Committee

The Scientific Committee is composed of the following members:

D. Berkvens, C. Bragard, E. Daeseleire, P. Delahaut, K. Dewettinck, J. Dewulf, L. De Zutter, K. Dierick, L. Herman, A. Huyghebaert, H. Imberechts, G. Maghuin-Rogister, L. Pussemier, K. Raes, C. Saegerman, B. Schiffers, M.-L. Scippo, W. Stevens, E. Thiry, T. van den Berg, M. Uyttendaele, C. Van Peteghem

Acknowledgment

The Scientific Committee acknowledges the Staff direction for Risk Assessment and the members of the workgroup for preparing the draft opinion.

The workgroup was composed of:

Members of the Scientific Committee	L. Herman (reporter, partim 'microbiological contaminants and animal health'), L. Pussemier (reporter, partim 'chemical contaminants'), C. Bragard (reporter, partim 'plant health'), E. Daeseleire, P. Delahaut, L. De Zutter, K. Dierick, A. Huyghebaert, H. Imberechts, B. Schiffers, M.-L. Scippo, E. Thiry, C. Van Peteghem
External experts	M. Maes (ILVO)

Conflict of interest

No conflicts of interest were noticed.

Legal framework of the opinion

The Law of 4 February 2000, on the creation of the Federal Agency for the Safety of the Food Chain, in particular article 8;

The Royal Decree of 19 May 2000, on the composition and operating procedures of the Scientific Committee, as established within the Federal Agency for the Safety of the Food Chain;

The Internal Rules as mentioned in Article 3 of the Royal Decree of 19 May 2000, on the composition and operating procedures of the Scientific Committee, as established within the Federal Agency for the Safety of the Food Chain, approved by the Minister on 9 June 2011.

Disclaimer

The Scientific Committee at all times reserves the right to modify the opinion by mutual consent, should new information and data become available after the publication of this version.