



EUROPEAN COMMISSION
EUROPEAN RESEARCH EXECUTIVE AGENCY

REA.B – Green Europe

B.4 – Agri-Food promotion, Environmental Observation and Innovative Governance

GENERAL PROJECT REVIEW CONSOLIDATED REPORT

Grant agreement (GA) number:	101000613
Project¹ Acronym:	FOODSAFETY4EU
Project title:	FOODSAFETY4EU - MULTI-STAKEHOLDER PLATFORM FOR FOOD SAFETY IN EUROPE
Type of action:	CSA
Start date of the project:	01/01/2021
Duration of the project:	36
Name of primary coordinator contact and organisation:	Veronica LATTANZIO (CNR)
Period covered by the report:	from 01/01/2021 to 30/06/2022
Periodic report/Reporting period number:	1
Date of first submission of the periodic report (if applicable):	26/08/2022
Amendments (latest AMD concerning description of the action)²	30/11/2020 (AMD-101000613-3)
Date of meeting with consortium (if applicable):	19/09/2022
Name of project officer:	Astrid GUIFFART
Name(s) of monitors:	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> – THEODOROS VARZAKAS <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • UNIVERSITY OF THE PELOPONNESE • HELLENIC FOOD AUTHORITY • CHIPITA INTERNATIONAL – Jean Ann Dillon <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Devenish Nutrition • Alltech • European Food Information Council (EUFIC)

¹ 'Project' means the same thing as 'action'.

² Only amendments to the description of the action (DoA; AT21) are relevant for general project reviews since they always have to be carried out against the latest version of the DoA

1. Overall assessment

1. Overall assessment
Project has achieved some of its objectives and milestones; however, corrective action will be required.
2. Significant results linked to dissemination, exploitation and impact potential
<p>Project will likely provide results with significant immediate or potential impact in the next reporting period (even if not all objectives mentioned in the Annex 1 to the GA were achieved).</p> <p>Project will likely provide results with significant immediate or potential impact in the next reporting period (even if not all objectives mentioned in the Annex 1 to the GA were achieved).</p> <p>This project aims to establish a multi-stakeholder platform for food safety in Europe by supporting exchanges between science, policy and society. In this first reporting period, the consortium has consolidated the approach for the participatory process to be used for involving food safety actors from academia to public authorities and business operators in co-creation activities. The project website aims to connect the general public, policy-makers and food safety specialists. Many outreach activities have been performed in this first reporting period to engage with stakeholders including online articles, videos, events shared on the project website. The project has teamed up with 5 other EU projects under the DISH cluster to organise joint events related to food safety.</p> <p>The project has achieved some of its objectives and milestones. However, more work needs to be done towards addressing some KPIs. Looking at the yearly report D7.3 some KPIs have been achieved and some of them are still in progress. Regarding awareness raising campaign no polls have been realised, no food facts, no video pills. However, the authors state that strategy has been revised.</p> <p>Presentations at EFSA have exceeded the target of 1, as 3 have been carried out so far.</p> <p>Publications at EC channels and scientific publications are lagging behind the target probably because it is too early and results have not come yet/preliminary.</p> <p>Food safety 4EU communication kit has been released which is very important for the project. The platform will be of interest to those at the communication intersection between risk assessment and risk management.</p>
3. General comments
<p>Overall, the project is going quite well. Relationships with key stakeholders such as EFSA are being developed and need even more emphasis.</p> <p>The main achievement and impact will be the FS4EU platform and the outputs from the 4 Food Safety Operational Lab (FSO labs). These are social labs gathering food safety actors from different perspectives to discuss food safety related topics in a co-creative manner. Combining workshops with pilots for experimentation and communities of practices, the FSO Labs facilitate collective thinking on food safety knowledge and practice at European level.</p> <p>The contribution to the state of the art will be a platform that synchronizes food safety research strategies, increases availability of knowledge and data and boosts cooperation across stakeholders.</p> <p>However, the website should be easier to navigate – the landing page could be tailored to each type of 'impact level' for example. Website contents are reviewed by PMT regarding SEO (Search Engine Optimisation) best practices for better indexing and accessibility of the project. Additionally, the project will use Google Analytics.</p> <p>The scientific quality of the results is robust for the majority of deliverables. They show the preparatory work performed for setting up the project activities such as the digital tools, the food safety operational labs, the mapping of food safety system involving science, policy and society interactions, the co-creation of a European-level food safety research and innovation agenda, the awareness-raising on food safety issues and the development of a sustainable food safety platform. Further work is required on data integration and operability.</p> <p>The strategy to deal with 'sustainability' should be clearly defined.</p> <p>It is positive that the consortium has attended and presented work in 6 conferences. Contents are published by APRE and/or other partners involved in the communication & dissemination activities core group (ILSI EU, IFA, EUFIC, CNR), that have been trained by PMT during a dedicated webinar on how to use the Wordpress platform.</p>
4. Recommendations concerning the period covered by the report
<p>It should be emphasized that while sustainability of the project beyond the lifetime of the project will be very beneficial the main impact should be in the lifetime of the project</p> <p>Fact sheets still need to be produced. The partners are already working on a factsheet using the surveys' outcomes.</p>
5. Recommendations concerning future work, if applicable
<p>DoW. For example: the communication space between risk assessment and risk management at an EU scale should be fully characterized for the different target groups.</p>

Exploitation plans: The exploitation plans should be realistic and feasible. If for example the expert finder is considered to be an exploitable outcome- who owns the IP? Etc etc

Communication material: The communications should be aligned to the specifics of the project – are the winter campaigns helping to achieve the objectives of the project – improve trust/transparency? For example, a campaign to explain the difference between an EFSA risk assessment and EC management of that risk (legislation) – GM is the obvious example from a few years ago when EFSA was reporting that GM did not pose a risk yet legislatively it was not approved at EU level – would be useful.

2. Objectives and workplan

1. Is the progress reported in line with objectives and work plan as specified in the DoA? If there are significant deviations, please comment.	Partially
<p>The project is making good progress and much work is left to do to fulfil the ambition as described in the DoWs.</p> <p>WP1: FOODSAFETY4EU digital tools</p> <p>T1.1: Analysis of research infrastructures and networks & food safety data.</p> <p>D1.1: Landscape and gap analysis and strategic planning: At a minimum, a concluding paragraph is needed about the gap in the landscape within which the FS4EU platform fits (as per above). There is a requirement for an analysis of the operability of the data available. The younger generations get their information frequently from TikTok, Twitter etc – it is suggested that these should be included in the analysis by region – this should be mirrored in the Communications WP.</p> <p>WP2: WP2 Food Safety Operational Labs: co-creation processes in social labs</p> <p>A lot depends on this WP – it is difficult to assess the potential likelihood of achieving overall objectives since one FSOLab feeds into the next. However, the theoretical aspects of this WP are of value. The methodology of the social labs has been adapted to the new context on online meetings due to the COVID-19 pandemic.</p> <p>WP3: Improvement of roadmaps for the future FSS- integration and forecasting</p> <p>Interviews were performed to assess current and future food safety issues which led to the selection of two case studies: mycotoxins and food contact materials in the circular economy. A mapping of science-policy-society networks in different EU countries for these two food safety issues provided input for the FSOLab 1 on co-creation of roadmaps for harmonisation and integration through forecasting.</p> <p>The methods described in Task 3.1 should be clarified. In the deliverable report (D3.1), the terms ‘risk analysis’ and ‘risk assessment’ seem to be used interchangeably. It would be interesting to know or have access to the results of the interviews.</p> <p>Its not clear if the difference in legal enforcement is an objective matter – written in legislation, or a subjective matter with regional differences.</p> <p>A preliminary assessment of the survey results would be helpful.</p> <p>WP4: Definition of the Research & Innovation framework for the future policies</p> <p>Two online questionnaires were distributed to FS4EU supporting partners for data gathering. Two FSOLabs have been set on research programmes and funding opportunities (FSOLab 2) and food safety strategic research agenda (FSOLab 3). It may be useful to compare the FS4EU SRIA to others.</p> <p>WP5: Strategies to improve public awareness of Food Safety and civil society engagement</p> <p>Food safety stakeholders provided input to online survey on the current food safety communication mechanism with over 200 replies. In addition two pilot actions targeting food safety authorities and the food industry have been performed in Tunisia and Czechia. These activities fed into the FSOLab 4 on developing innovative approaches and models to inform civil society about food safety research and the risk assessment process.</p> <p>It is not clear how the survey led to the topic choice. The model(s) to inform civil society about science-based risk assessment is required.</p> <p>WP6: Co-design of the platform strategy and business model for long-term cooperation</p> <p>The structure of the platform has been co-designed with stakeholders through a platform design webinar and a WP6 pre-meeting. Stakeholders, divided into four categories, macro, meso, micro and platform shapers, have been mapped in clusters according to their roles in the food safety system. The analysis of their motivations and interests informed the platform design and business model.</p> <p>This WP needs much thought/consideration. A clear and precise plan is required. For example, could this be a useful tool for EFSA/EC to jointly manage for the purpose of jointly communicating about the rationale for food safety rules?</p> <p>WP7: Dissemination, Communication and Exploitation</p> <p>The communication kit is impressive. The project made an active use of social networks, monthly newsletters, awareness campaigns and online events involving food safety experts to reach out to stakeholders. Synergies have been developed with related projects and initiatives to achieve a greater impact.</p> <p>The communication material should be specifically made to achieve the objectives of the proposal.</p>	
2. Are the objectives of the project still scientifically and /or technologically relevant?	Yes
Yes	
3. Are the critical implementation risks and mitigation actions described in the DoA still relevant?	Yes
<p>Yes. A risk is that key stakeholder engagement is not adequate for the platform to fully realize its potential.</p> <p>Lack of proactivity by partners, who were not regularly reporting news items for inclusion in the bulletin. However,</p>	

APRE, overcame this obstacle by preparing a list of sources from which to find useful news, events, funding opportunities and relevant news from the project itself.	
4. Have the pilots/case studies started to showcase innovative results as described in the DoA?	Partially
The project has piloted social labs in the food safety area using social sciences techniques to address food safety challenges. A FSOLab manual has been developed presenting the tools for co-creation. The four FSLabs finished their first learning activities and data was gathering in reporting templates.	
5. Have the ethics deliverables due for the current period been adequately addressed and approved?	Yes
Principles and responsibilities are described, as well as the ethics review process and practical tools for managing ethics issues at work package and task level. The document structure for ethics is the following: - introduction to ethics principles - legal framework according to official EU documents, - FoodSafety4EU ethics management and monitoring including non-EU-Countries Ethics requirements	
6. Have the comments and recommendations from previous project reviews been taken into account?	Not applicable
This is the first report.	

3. Impact

1. Does the work carried out contribute to the expected impacts detailed in the DoA?	Partially
<p>Expected impact difficult to predict at this stage since website/platform is not clear and FSO labs (on time but) not complete.</p> <p>Main impact areas include scientific, technological, economic, social, educational, and environmental impacts. Impact pathways and main methodologies for impact analysis and monitoring are also identified. A set of Key Performance Indicators (KPIs) for the six impact areas is listed, to support the quantitative evaluation and monitoring of the impact of the FS4EU platform.</p>	
2. Does the work carried out follow the plan detailed in the DoA to enhance innovation capacity, create new markets opportunities, strengthen competitiveness and growth of companies, address issues related to climate change or the environment, address industrial and/or societal needs at regional level or bring other important benefits for society? Give information on the relevant innovation activities carried out (prototypes, testing activities, standards, clinical trials) and/or new product, service, reference materials, process or method (to be) launched to the market, if any.	Partially
<p>Among the the relevant innovation activities carried out are 1) platform and 2) output from FSOlabs etc</p> <p>High level of commitment of the partners involved in the team responsible for communication and dissemination activities, with the support of the whole consortium, shows that some tools and activities are becoming a benchmark in the food safety sector. Instead, some others require a revised strategy to reach the specific objective settled for them, for example, the activities foreseen in task 7.3.</p>	
3. Does the work carried out contribute towards European policy objectives and strategies and have an impact on policy making?	Partially
<p>Food safety scenarios based on global challenges were selected based on the in-depth expert interviews. Pilot workshops with FS4EU consortium partners were held, enabling further refinement of the protocol. The final protocol has been made publicly available through the FS4EU website and can be applied in many other contexts. Next, four Net-Map workshops were carried out in the respective home countries of the HUB leaders.</p> <p>The workshops resulted in complex Net-Maps, visualizing how the Science-Policy-Society (SPS) collaboration system regarding risk analysis of the aforementioned food safety issues is set up in each country. Many linkages between stakeholders were revealed, going from information sharing (legally required or voluntary), data requesting or communicating to the public. A Net-Map guidance protocol, including a standardized data reporting format, was distributed among the food safety hub (HUB) leaders to analyze the Science-Policy-Society (SPS) collaboration.</p>	
4. Does (or will) the work carried out have an impact on SMEs?	Partially
<p>The project is contributing to public awareness of food safety and sustainability by informing consumers about healthy food choices and supporting trust in the EU food safety system. By identifying food safety scenarios, it helps the food industry adapting to global challenges connected to food safety in the context of climate change and circular economy.</p>	
5. Have the beneficiaries reached gender balance at all levels of personnel assigned to the action? If not, have the reasons been explained in the periodic report?	Yes
<p>Yes, beneficiaries have reached gender balance. However, report is pending in 2023 on the issues faced.</p>	

4. Implementation

1. Has the project been efficiently and effectively managed?	Yes
Project has been effectively managed in spite of unexpected changes required by the COVID-19 outbreak. All events and co-creation activities involving food safety actors were organised online. Internal meetings of the project have been performed as planned to ensure a close connection with EU food safety institutional actors. Continuous interaction between consortium members through the Humhub platform ensured a timely delivery of project deliverables and tasks.	
2. Is the management of the project in line with the obligations of beneficiaries (including ethics and security requirements, risk and innovation management if applicable)?	Yes
Innovation management should be informed about implications for exploitation of using software that already exists (e.g. expert finder) for a new topic (i.e. food safety) Ethics guidelines, including an informed consent template, any authorization, and certificates have been incorporated.	
3. Is the contribution of each beneficiary in line with the work committed in the DoA? (applicable only to multibeneficiary projects)	Yes
The contribution of each partner is clearly reported per task in the periodic report.	
4. Have the beneficiaries disseminated project results (foreground) in scientific publications as planned in the DoA (including the deposition of publications in open access repositories)? Do they include a reference to EU funding?	Yes
Scientific publications have not been seen yet.	
5. Have the beneficiaries disseminated and communicated project activities and results by other means than scientific publications (social media, press-release, the project web site, video/film, etc) as planned in the DoA? Do they include a reference to EU funding?	Yes
Social Networks (SNs) represent the main tools to engage society at large and to inform stakeholders and the general public about the communication and dissemination activities of the project. During the first year, FS4EU has opened 4 channels to reach different target groups which are well aligned with KPIs. FoodSafety4EU produces graphic and attractive cards to be posted on social networks in order to explain, easily and briefly, the main terminology used in the sector. The definitions are enriched and rephrased avoiding technical jargon by a scientific committee. In addition, potential influencers/content creators were contacted by e-mail. Out of the 15 contacted influencers, only 1 declined the invitation to establish the collaboration.	
6. Has the plan for the exploitation and dissemination of the results (if required) been updated and implemented as described in the DoA, in particular as regards intellectual property rights? Is it appropriate?	Partially
The plan includes 44 exploitable products/services. This is not likely to be feasible. A thorough examination of fewer exploitable outputs would be more beneficial.	
7. Has the data management plan (DMP) (if required) been updated and implemented? Is it appropriate?	Yes
yes	
8. Have the proposed institutional changes been appropriately promoted?	Yes
Yes, they have been promoted.	

5. Resources

1. Were the resources used as described in the DoA and were they necessary to achieve its objectives? If there are deviations from planned budget, have they been satisfactorily explained? Have they been used in a manner consistent with the principle of sound financial management (in particular economy, efficiency and effectiveness)?	Yes
An explanation of the resources and Person months has been given along with the associated WPs.	

Expert opinion on deliverables

Deliverable number	Deliverable name	Status	Comments
D1.1	Landscape and gap analysis and strategic planning	Request for revision	Needs a section that clearly identifies the gaps in the landscape. This is very important since it should define what is both in and out of scope of the project for all other WPs. Currently page 24 is only theoretical. Also, not enough of specific information about interoperability of data or strategies for integration. Twitter and Tiktok should be included - or justification for why not.
D1.2	Platform user requirements and impact assessment	Request for revision	This deliverable presents the definition of the user requirements associated to the implementation of the FoodSafety4EU digital platform as digital container, enabling the access and efficient use of resources and data, knowledge sharing and experience exchange and acting as aggregator among the Food Safety System (FSS) actors from all the macro- , meso- and micro-level. Furthermore, it reports about the platform impact assessment examining the main impact areas and their KPIs as follows: scientific, technological, economic, social, educational, and environmental impact. Minor revisions needed: Methods and approach: how many inputs collected? How were categories decided? Need some text on emerging uses and behaviors in food safety data.
D2.1	FSOLab Manual including compilation of tools	Accepted	This deliverable is a manual implemented in the FoodSafety4EU project. It provides a summary on the concept of social labs, which the FSOLab approach builds on and outlines the concept for experiential learning and the FSOLab process. Staff competences, skills and duties of FSOLab managers, facilitators and participants are described clearly. Guidelines for disseminating the FSOLab processes and the evaluation of the FSOLab processes and the reporting are also outlined.
D2.2	Cross learning report 1	Accepted	One major activity of WP 2 – Food Safety Operational Labs: co-creation in social labs, and in particular of task 2.4 – Inter FSOLab learnings and cross- fertilisation has been reported. This first one carried out online has the FSOLab methodology in focus.
D3.1	Report on map and gap analysis of procedures and enforcement and guidance documents for FSAs - input for FSOLab1	Request for revision	A concluding paragraph on the map and gap analysis of risk analysis procedures and enforcement/unregulated issues would be helpful.

Deliverable number	Deliverable name	Status	Comments
D3.2	Report on Science-Policy-Society (SPS) collaboration systems analysis - input for FSOLab1	Accepted	Deliverable report 3.2 describes the findings on the analysis of the Science-Policy-Society (SPS) collaboration system on specific cases through a Net-Map analysis. Net-Map is an interview-based mapping tool to visualize implicit knowledge and understand the interplay of complex formal and informal networks, power relations, and actors/stakeholders' goals. Food safety scenarios based on global challenges were selected based on the in-depth expert interviews. A Net-Map guidance protocol, including a standardized data reporting format, was distributed among the food safety hub (HUB) leaders.
D4.1	Report on Map and gap analysis of research programmes and funding opportunities	Accepted	An interrogative survey was conducted as part of the FoodSafety4EU project (work package 4). The report outlines the feedback collated from participants from 19 different countries who completed the interview. EU funding 'lesser extent than necessary' against what metric?
D5.1	Summary of current communication approaches	Accepted	Not complete ref. results from June onwards Simple online surveys were developed for different stakeholders: food safety authorities, industry including retailers, consumer associations, and consumers in order to identify what communication methods are currently used (if any) and how often, for sharing food safety information with the public. These surveys were widely distributed by the consortium: co-ordinator, Hub Leaders and participants.
D6.1	Portrait of the FSS-actor roles	Accepted	This deliverable aims at presenting the portrait of the Food Safety System actors, who play an active role in the system. These actors are referred to in the text as "stakeholders".
D7.1	Communication & Dissemination Plan	Accepted	This deliverable presents the dissemination and communication plan as well as the associated actions that will be implemented during the FoodSafety4EU project. The Communication and Dissemination Plan presents: 1. strategy objectives; 2. main target audiences; 3. main activities and tools to implement; 4. target audiences addressed by each tool and activity foreseen; 5. timeline for activities and tools implementation; 6. communication and dissemination management structure; 7. a set of Key Performance Indicators (KPIs), namely the criteria that will be used for assessing and review the plan; 8. conclusions and next steps.

Deliverable number	Deliverable name	Status	Comments
D7.2	FOODSAFETY4EU Communication Kit	Accepted	This deliverable presents the main identity and the promotional kit produced for the FOODSAFETY4EU Project which will be used for formal communication, dissemination and promotional purposes.
D7.3	Report on communication and dissemination activities	Request for revision	<p>This report describes the dissemination and communication activities performed to implement the strategy settled up in the Communication and Dissemination Plan.</p> <p>The reporting of the communication and dissemination actions presents:</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. strategy objectives with the target audience and the context; 2. main results and KPIs' achieved; 3. analysis of tools and activities performed; 4. update of the Communication and dissemination plan; 5. timeline for activities and tools for the 2° year; 6. communication and dissemination management structure; 8. conclusions and next steps. <p>Please include press releases on the website. What does 'opportunities for you' mean – this could suggest 'job opportunities'?</p> <p>The purpose of re-analysing for the purpose of the website.</p>
D7.6	Exploitation and Sustainability Plan	Accepted	
D8.1	Project management guidelines, including administrative and financial procedures	Accepted	<p>This deliverable presents the main processes of the project management, with the aim to reach efficiently the governance of the project and its Consortium Bodies.</p> <p>The main processes for the management are:</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. COMMUNICATION 2. INFORMAL COMMUNICATION 3. INTERNAL REPORTING AND MONITORING 4. ADMINISTRATIVE AND FINANCIAL PROCESS 5. OPEN ACCESS
D8.2	Ethics guidelines, including informed consent template, any authorisation and certificates	Accepted	<p>Ethical clearance in Italian.</p> <p>The deliverable presents ethics guidelines and procedures in order to share official documents and protocols to be observed by all participants during the project's life.</p> <p>The document structure is the following:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - introduction to ethics principles - legal framework according to official EU documents, - FoodSafety4EU ethics management and monitoring.

Deliverable number	Deliverable name	Status	Comments
D8.3	Report of the Consortium bodies meetings (minutes)	Accepted	This deliverable presents the summary of the Consortium Bodies meetings held from the beginning of the project to Month 18, according to the Technical Annex, the Consortium Agreement and the guidelines for management (D8.1). All meetings have been held online.
D8.5	Data Management Plan	Accepted	This document contains the Data Management Plan (DMP) for the FoodSafety4EU project, addressing what and how data - including metadata - will be generated, collected, handled, and preserved in repositories while following the FAIR principles (findable, accessible, interoperable, and re-useable) as well as possible.
D9.1	POPD - Requirement No. 1	Accepted	The purpose of this deliverable is to evaluate the ethical issues related to the research activities involving human subjects, the collection or processing of personal data (regardless of the approach by which they are collected) and the confirmation that they comply with national and EU legislation. It includes The appointment of a Data Protection Officer by all Beneficiaries Procedures for data collection, storage, protection, retention and destruction Evaluation of ethical risks.
D9.2	H - Requirement No. 3	Accepted	The purpose of this deliverable is to evaluate the ethical issues related to the research activities of the FoodSafety4EU project involving human subjects, and the collection, and processing of personal data.
D9.3	NEC - Requirement No. 4	Accepted	This report aims to explain how the Consortium applies the ethical standards and guidelines of H2020 projects, in respect to the fair benefit-sharing principles, regardless of the country in which the research is carried out.

Expert opinion on milestones

Milestone number	Milestone name	Achieved	Comments
MS1	Beta-versions of tools from T1 to T5	Yes	yes but further work to do in remainder of project
MS3	Training for FSOLab Managers	Yes	D2.2
MS4	List and short descriptions of 4 FSOLab activities (cycle 1)	Yes	This has been described in D2.1
MS5	List and short descriptions of 4 FSOLab activities (cycle 2)	Yes	An outline has been given in D2.1
MS7	Needs defined for harmonisation and integration of procedures/ enforcement, and improvement of the SPS collaboration systems for model case, and selected food safety scenario(s) as input for the FSOLab1	Yes	D8.1 PROJECT MANAGEMENT GUIDELINES
MS8	Pilot actions selected for FSOLab 1	Yes	D2.1
MS9	Map of gaps in current national and trans-national research programs for feeding the platform in WP1and serving as basis for the FSOLabs 2 and 3	Yes	Described in D3.1.
MS10	Pilot actions selected for FSOLab 2	Yes	D2.2
MS11	Pilot actions selected for FSOLab 3	Yes	D2.2
MS12	Map and gap surveys available	Yes	D3.1
MS13	Pilot actions selected for FSOLab 4	Yes	D2.2
MS14	Public engagement workshops	Yes	done
MS17	Project website	Yes	Referred to D1.2.
MS18	Periodic project monitoring	Yes	This report (D7.3) describes the dissemination and communication activities performed to implement the strategy settled up in the Communication and Dissemination Plan submitted at M4 and carried out under WP7-Dissemination, Communication and Exploitation
MS20	First annual meeting with the Commission services (European Commission and REA)	Yes	Has been reported