



13 October 2021

(21-7765)

Page: 1/8

Committee on Sanitary and Phytosanitary Measures

**REPORT
SPS COMMITTEE WORKSHOP ON RISK ANALYSIS:
RISK ASSESSMENT, RISK MANAGEMENT, AND RISK COMMUNICATION**

MONDAY, 12 JULY – TUESDAY, 13 JULY 2021

**WTO, CENTRE WILLIAM RAPPARD, GENEVA
PARTICIPATION VIA ZOOM**

NOTE BY THE SECRETARIAT¹

The Secretariat of the World Trade Organization (WTO) organized a workshop on risk assessment, risk management, and risk communication on 12-13 July 2021, based on a proposal submitted by Canada in the context of the Fifth Review of the Operation and Implementation of the SPS Agreement ([G/SPS/GEN/1769](#) and [G/SPS/GEN/1769/Rev.1](#)). The programme was circulated in document [G/SPS/GEN/1911/Rev.2](#).

The workshop was held via Zoom, with interpretation in the three official languages of the WTO. Mr Gregory MacDonald, Chairperson of the SPS Committee for the period 2020-2021, moderated the workshop.

A [dedicated webpage for the workshop](#) had been made available ahead of the event, with logistical information, the programme, background information on the speakers, and a [catalogue of relevant resources](#) to support governments in building and operationalizing risk analysis frameworks. This catalogue included international standards, guidelines and recommendations, presentations, handbooks, guides, tools, links to previous events, and online courses that participants could consult ahead of the workshop.

Close to 1,300 participants registered, including interested stakeholders from Members, the private sector, academia, and civil society. Through roundtable discussions, presentations, case studies, video clips, poll questions, and Q&A sessions, the workshop generated exchanges on SPS risk analysis, experience sharing, and discussions on challenges, best practices, and emerging issues. Participants also benefitted from informal side sessions, which offered opportunities to interact informally with speakers.

Presentations and videos from the workshop are available on the [workshop's dedicated webpage](#) and can be accessed from the "Events, workshops and training" section under the WTO SPS Gateway (http://www.wto.org/english/tratop_e/sps_e/events_e.htm).

1 OBJECTIVE OF THE WORKSHOP

1. The objective of the workshop was to foster discussions on all aspects of SPS risk analysis – risk assessment, risk management, and risk communication – building on the [Thematic SPS Workshop on Risk Analysis](#), held on 13-14 October 2014, and the [SPS Thematic Session on Risk Communication](#), held on 15 July 2015. The first day of the workshop covered opening remarks (session 1), risk assessment (session 2), and risk management (session 3). The second day of the workshop covered risk communication (session 4) and case study presentations (session 5).

¹ This document has been prepared under the Secretariat's own responsibility and is without prejudice to the positions of Members or to their rights and obligations under the WTO.

2 WORKSHOP SESSIONS

2.1 Opening session (Session 1)

2.1. The opening session of the workshop began with a short video clip featuring **Mr Robert Griffin** (former National Coordinator for Agriculture Quarantine Inspection and former Director of the Plant Epidemiology and Risk Analysis Laboratory at the United States Department of Agriculture (USDA)) and **Ms Gretchen Stanton** (former Secretary of the WTO SPS Committee). Mr Griffin and Ms Stanton provided a few introductory remarks on risk analysis and the SPS Agreement, looking at some of the discussions in the WTO over the years. Providing insight on the negotiations leading up to the SPS Agreement, Ms Stanton observed that the concepts of scientific justification and risk assessment had been discussed since the early stages of negotiations and played a critical role in the SPS Agreement. Mr Griffin recalled discussions in previous WTO workshops, noting that discussions had first been focused on risk assessment and had later evolved to include topical issues such as uncertainty in risk assessment and risk management. Mr Griffin also observed that there was room for further development and evolution, in particular in the area of risk management.

2.2. **Ms Camille Fléchet** (WTO Secretariat) provided an overview of the provisions of the SPS Agreement relating to risk assessment, risk management, and risk communication. Ms Fléchet outlined the risk assessment obligations in Article 5 of the SPS Agreement and related definitions in Annex A of the Agreement. Ms Fléchet also provided an overview of key takeaways from WTO dispute settlement reports on risk assessment, and provisions of the SPS Agreement that incorporate risk management and risk communication principles.

2.2 Risk assessment (Session 2)

2.3. The workshop continued with two roundtables to explore the concept of risk assessment and how to operationalize risk assessment from a trade policy perspective and to share experiences on building technical capacities, including currently available training tools to help participants understand and manage some of the challenges associated with risk assessment.

2.4. The first roundtable was moderated by **Ms Marlynn Hopper** (Secretariat of the Standards and Trade Development Facility (STDF)). In this roundtable, **Mr Tom Heilandt** (Codex), **Dr Francisco D'Alessio** (OIE), **Dr Sophie von Dobschuetz** (FAO), and **Dr Magda Sachana** (OECD) discussed relevant international standards and selected international tools, with reference to the [workshop's catalogue of relevant resources](#).

2.5. Mr Heilandt presented the Codex general guidance on risk analysis, as well as Codex specific guidance to help countries in their risk assessment activities in particular areas. In this context, Mr Heilandt reminded participants that risk assessments conducted by FAO and WHO were reflected in Codex standards, but that Codex had also developed guidance to help countries conduct their own risk assessments. Dr D'Alessio presented OIE standards on import risk analysis in the OIE Terrestrial and Aquatic Codes, which include principles and recommendations to conduct risk assessments, and other relevant OIE guidance on import risk analysis. Dr D'Alessio underlined the importance of the OIE list of diseases and OIE reporting obligations in the context of hazard identification, as well as the importance of OIE specific standards on animal health surveillance and status, regionalization, and general measures for disease control and prevention in the context of risk assessments. Dr von Dobschuetz discussed the FAO-OIE-WHO tripartite on One Health, focusing on the [FAO-OIE-WHO Tripartite Joint Risk Assessment Operational Tool](#) to address health risks arising from animal diseases in an interdisciplinary manner. Dr von Dobschuetz also presented the new One Health High Level Expert Panel and its advisory role to support the provision of evidence-based scientific and policy advice to address the challenges raised by One Health. Finally, Dr Sachana presented SPS voluntary guidance developed in the areas of chemicals and pesticides, and how they can assist in risk assessment activities.

2.6. The speakers also discussed risk assessment challenges in the context of the COVID-19 pandemic, and more generally emerging diseases. In addition, new trends and developments in risk assessment were outlined, such as enhanced coordination and collaboration among sectors and agencies. Finally, the speakers highlighted available support to help developing countries implement existing guidance and tools, and facilitate SPS risk assessments.

2.7. The second roundtable focused on Member perspectives on risk assessment. The roundtable was moderated by **Ms Lucy Namu** (Kenya Plant Health Inspectorate Service (KEPHIS)) and included the following speakers: **Ms Anastasia Alvizou** (European Commission Directorate General Health and Food Safety), **Dr Knut G. Berdal** (Ministry of Agriculture and Food, Norway), **Ms Alison Neeley** (USDA), **Dr Lei Zhang** (China National Center for Food Safety Risk Assessment), and **Dr Karima Zouine** (Risk Assessment and Legal Affairs Directorate, Morocco).

2.8. The speakers shared experiences on risk assessment, the use of international standards to assist in risk assessment activities, and reliance on international and regional risk assessments. In particular, Ms Neeley discussed relevant IPPC standards as used in the United States, such as ISPM 2 which provides a framework for pest risk analysis, ISPM 11 and ISMP 26 on how to conduct pest risk analysis and describing various stages of pest risk analysis, and ISPM 5, a glossary to help countries understand and use key terms and assist in communication within domestic agencies as well as with trading partners. Dr Berdal then presented the Norwegian Scientific Committee for Food and Environment's use of risk assessment principles and methodology as reflected in international standards (including those from Codex, IPPC, and OIE), and Norway's use of international and regional assessments. Dr Berdal also discussed Norway's reliance on risk assessments conducted by other countries, highlighting the importance of harmonization in risk assessments in different areas (e.g. micro-organisms, pesticide residues, genetically modified organisms (GMOs), food additives, and natural toxins). Dr Zouine highlighted the need for increased regional cooperation and for additional regional risk assessments, in particular to assist developing countries make use of existing skills and resources.

2.9. The speakers also shared experiences on building capacity and discussed challenges in risk assessment activities pertaining to the availability and quality of data as well as those relating to evaluating uncertainty. In particular, Dr Zhang described efforts in the field of food safety to promote the sharing of data among departments and existing guidelines in China regarding the collection of data, evaluating data quality, and evaluating uncertainty. Dr Zhang also discussed certain measures taken in China to ensure the independence of risk assessments. Dr Zouine subsequently highlighted restructuring efforts in the field of food safety for the deployment of independent risk assessment processes in Morocco. Ms Neeley stressed the importance of transparency and sharing information among trading partners to facilitate pest risk analysis and address some of the risk assessment challenges. Ms Alvizou followed to discuss the new Regulation (EU) 2019/1381, which aims at: increasing the transparency of EU risk assessment in the food chain; strengthening the reliability, objectivity and independence of studies used by the European Food Safety Authority (EFSA – the EU risk assessment body); ensuring engagement of stakeholders early on in the risk assessment process; and addressing resource constraints through the promotion of partnerships between national risk scientific organizations and EFSA.

2.10. Following these two roundtables, participants had an opportunity to interact informally and raise follow-up questions with speakers on the topic of risk assessment in two informal one-hour Zoom side sessions. One side session was made available to exchange with the relevant international organizations and a second side session to exchange with Members that participated in the second roundtable.

2.3 Risk management (Session 3)

2.11. Through two roundtables, this session explored the concept of risk management, including the evaluation of risk management options, implementation, monitoring and review, and related issues concerning the implementation of relevant provisions of the SPS Agreement. Additionally, challenges with risk management were explored, such as identifying and evaluating risk management options.

2.12. The first roundtable, which was moderated by **Dr Delia Grace** (International Livestock Research Institute, Kenya), focused on the perspectives of the international standard-setting bodies. **Dr Hilde Kruse** (Codex), **Mr Masahiro Sai** (Ministry of Agriculture, Forestry and Fisheries (MAFF), Japan and Steward of the IPPC Standards Committee), **Ms Joanne Wilson** (Ministry for Primary Industries, New Zealand and Steward of the IPPC Standards Committee), and **Dr Francisco D'Alessio** (OIE) shared information on international standards and guidance developed by the international standard-setting bodies on risk management and support provided to Members. Ms Wilson addressed existing IPPC guidance for pest risk management, including general and specific guidance, and introduced the IPPC e-learning module on pest risk analysis. Mr Sai discussed how

IPPC standards could be used to guide an efficient risk management process, in particular looking at commodity-specific standards. Mr Sai also presented current IPPC work to develop new guidance on pest risk management in order to harmonize risk management options and additional commodity-specific standards. Dr D'Alessio discussed the horizontal chapters in the OIE Terrestrial and Aquatic Codes, as well as disease-specific chapters which provided the OIE standard framework for risk management. Dr D'Alessio also provided information on OIE programmes to help countries implement standards and OIE capacity building activities, discussing the OIE Performance of Veterinary Services pathway, strategies to work on priority topics, the OIE World Animal Health Information System (OIE-WAHIS), and the Global Burden of Animal Diseases programme. Dr Kruse then detailed Codex food standards and related texts, highlighting the scientific-based process leading up to the development of Codex standards.

2.13. In addition to presenting existing Codex, IPPC, and OIE guidance on risk management, the speakers explored areas for further work as well as innovative approaches in risk management, and emerging issues. In this context, food fraud, climate change, e-commerce, novel foods (such as alternative protein sources), and new technologies were discussed. For example, IPPC efforts in the area of e-commerce were detailed, including its informal network of e-Commerce experts, the interagency network involving CITES and WCO, and the development of a new IPPC guide on e-Commerce. Finally, speakers discussed efforts to enhance country participation in their activities, including the Codex Trust Fund to boost knowledge and skills, and build strong national capacity to engage in Codex work; OIE trainings and network of focal points; the OIE observatory to provide insight on how countries implement standards; the Global Burden of Animal Diseases programme; and IPPC regional workshops and innovative approaches in virtual meetings.

2.14. The session concluded with a roundtable on Member perspectives to share successes, challenges, considerations, impacts and best practices related to risk management. The roundtable was moderated by **Professor Steve Hathaway** (New Zealand Food Safety) and included the following speakers: **Mr Kuan-Yu Lin** (Ministry of Health and Welfare, Chinese Taipei), **Mr Johnny Marchan Peña** (National Fisheries Health Agency, Peru), and **Mr TaluÍ Espíndola Zanatta** (Ministry of Agriculture, Livestock and Food Supply, Brazil).

2.15. The roundtable began with short video clips to provide a private sector perspective on risk management and experience with public-private cooperation. In the first video clip, **Dr Ludovica Verze gnassi** (Nestlé) highlighted the important role of the private sector to help risk managers gather evidence to assess the feasibility of different management options. Dr Verze gnassi invited governments to define, within Codex, a process for transparent consultations with the private sector to support a faster development of feasible and applicable risk management options for existing products, as well as for innovative food products responding to new consumer trends. In the second video clip, **Dr Chagema Kedera** (COLEACP Coordinator for the New Export Trade Programme, Kenya) discussed the importance of transparency and close cooperation between public and private stakeholders to ensure effective risk management and foster better compliance with SPS requirements. Dr Kedera referred to the experience of Kenya's National Taskforce in Horticulture, which brought together competent authorities and businesses at CEO level to manage risks in value chains. Dr Kedera also highlighted the need for capacity building among private and public sectors.

2.16. Following these video clips, Mr Lin, Mr Marchan Peña, and Mr Espíndola Zanatta shared experiences on risk management and discussed challenges and strategies. They highlighted the importance of transparency and cooperation in risk management, the role of various stakeholders, including the private sector, harmonization based on international standards, and innovation. In particular, the speakers recognized the private sector as an important source of information for risk managers. Mr Lin highlighted the need for a clear allocation of responsibilities between risk assessors and managers, as well as the importance of effective channels of communication between risk assessors and managers, and with all relevant stakeholders. For example, reference was made to posting on social media to monitor the feedback from the public on risk management decisions, and guidelines to food business operators to facilitate implementation of SPS requirements. Mr Marchan Peña discussed the review of Peru's risk management processes, which included the introduction of technological solutions and strengthening the capacity of technical staff. Mr Marchan Peña also highlighted modifications to Peru's certification models to make them more agile. Mr Espíndola Zanatta followed to address pesticide monitoring programmes in Brazil and the relevance of Codex guidance in this context. In addition, Mr Espíndola Zanatta identified certain gaps in existing international standards, addressing the issue of maximum residue levels (MRLs).

2.17. The speakers recognised that risk managers face various challenges at the domestic level, such as dealing with uncertainty, building risk management decisions on SPS risk assessments while incorporating other inputs, and engaging relevant stakeholders in an efficient manner. The speakers discussed best practices and success factors to help address some of these challenges. The need to improve technical capacity and increase the use of technology were highlighted. The speakers also stressed the importance of transparency, cooperation among government agencies and with other stakeholders, independence of risk managers, using international standards to improve risk management at the domestic level, and incorporating inputs other than SPS risk assessment results in risk management decisions, such as economic considerations or consumer habits and culture.

2.4 Risk communication (Session 4)

2.18. This session explored the concept of risk communication, including developing the goals for a risk communication plan, how to develop a risk communication plan, how to ensure through internal and external communications that the results of the risk assessment, risk management options, and assumptions and uncertainty of the risk assessment are clearly communicated to internal and external audiences/stakeholders. It also covered the importance of forming trust; working with transparency and developing confidence in regulatory decisions; implementing strategies to overcome challenges associated with significant institutional capacity and technical constraints; and related issues concerning the implementation of relevant provisions of the SPS Agreement.

2.19. A first set of presentations explored relevant Codex, IPPC, and OIE international standards, guidelines or recommendations relating to risk communication and the role of the international standard-setting bodies in risk communication. Other available international and regional guidance on risk communication were also discussed.

2.20. **Dr Sarah Cahill** (Codex) presented on developing standards and the importance of building communities in risk communication. The presentation explored available Codex guidelines and procedural manuals, including the Working Principles for Risk Analysis for Food Safety. Listening to the concerns of Members and particular stakeholders, as well as maintaining a reciprocal communication were also highlighted as important elements of risk communication. Dr Cahill concluded by exploring the advantages of building engagement with countries, such as increasing awareness and understanding of the work of Codex and building the trust and confidence needed for effective risk communication.

2.21. **Ms Sarah Brunel** (IPPC) presented on phytosanitary risk communication and the importance of having an interactive process with relevant stakeholders. The objectives and different components of pest risk communication were presented, as well as the principles of a good pest risk communication which included aspects related to cooperation, transparency, respect, responsiveness, and commitment. Key factors of a successful risk communication were also discussed. These included planning, understanding the nature of the risk, identifying the needs of stakeholders, and understanding the responsibilities of National Plant Protection Organizations (NPPOs). In concluding, Ms Brunel shared information on IPPC tools, such as the International Phytosanitary Portal.

2.22. **Dr Francisco D'Alessio** (OIE) presented on risk communication and OIE international standards, activities, and tools. Dr D'Alessio shared information on the principles of risk communication reflected in the risk analysis chapters of the OIE Terrestrial and Aquatic Codes. The participation of the private sector and relevant stakeholders in risk communication activities was outlined as a critical element in the process. The OIE-WAHIS and the OIE Animal Health Status portal were presented as two key initiatives in the context of import risk analysis. Dr D'Alessio concluded by presenting OIE capacity building activities, which included training of national focal points and e-learning modules.

2.23. **Dr Markus Lipp** (FAO) presented on the challenges posed by risk communication for food safety. Dr Lipp highlighted that food safety risks existed along every step of the supply chain, and that the audience for risk communication therefore included consumers, media, risk managers, assessors, and producers. The complex aspect of food safety was also highlighted. This was due to the different sources of hazards, which included chemical, microbiological, physical and radiological sources. Dr Lipp stressed the need to continue to use science as the foundation for

risk communication and further noted that risk communication should not rest solely on the idea that scientific facts would convince an audience, but should also take into consideration the emotional aspect of food.

2.24. **Dr Hong Jin** (Food Standards Australia New Zealand) shared information on APEC's project to develop a Food Safety Risk Communication (FSRC) Framework. The project identified the challenges faced by competent authorities in risk communication, reviewed the recent communication efforts developed by competent authorities and converted international best practices to principles of effective food safety risk communication. The APEC FSRC Framework included a series of guidelines covering aspects related to implementation, monitoring and review, crisis food safety risk communication and social media engagement.

2.25. In a second set of presentations, Members focused on exploring and discussing effective communication between and among risk assessors and risk managers. In this context, **Dr Wei-Chih Cheng** (Ministry of Health and Welfare, Chinese Taipei) shared Chinese Taipei's experience on risk communication based on scenario assumption. Dr Cheng stressed the importance of risk analysis for food safety and highlighted the different roles of risk assessors and risk managers. Hazard, probability and consequence were defined as the three key elements of risk assessment based on scenario assumption. Dr Cheng introduced the LARGE method, a five-step process for risk assessors and risk managers which consisted in listening; asking; repeating and digesting the information; gathering and transforming the information for future use; and providing examples to convey the information. Dr Cheng concluded by presenting the Plan-Do-Check-Act cycle (PDCA), employed by risk managers.

2.26. **Ms Madeline Beal** (United States Environmental Protection Agency (EPA)) introduced the SALT framework employed by EPA on risk communication, comprising four sections: strategy, action, learning, and tools. The strategy section focused on five steps: taking stock, setting goals, aligning the objectives to these goals, and matching tactics and platforms to those objectives. The action section explored factors known to impact the implementation of risk communication activities and focused on tactics for an effective communication message. The learning section relied on a reflective practice model. Lastly, the tools section supported the overall framework with available guides and trainings. In concluding, Ms Beal highlighted the importance of building trust and the key role of science in the process.

2.27. The final set of presentations on risk communication focused on Member experiences with translating risk assessment and risk management into communication messages, including communicating uncertainty and leveraging new communication tools.

2.28. **Ms Andrée-Anne Girard** (Canadian Food Inspection Agency) shared Canada's experience on African swine fever (ASF) risk communication. A risk assessment for ASF had identified five main risk pathways for the introduction of the disease, including inadequate farm biosecurity standards, international travellers, and contaminated animal feed. On this basis, different groups were targeted with risk communication messages, which had to be adapted accordingly. Employing a variety of tools to reach these groups, such as the use of social media, was highlighted as a key action taken by Canada in the process. To conclude, Ms Girard stressed the important role of collaboration and partnerships to share risk information and prevent the introduction of ASF in the country.

2.29. **Ms Yuqiong Deng** (General Administration of Customs of China) shared China's experience on risk communication and gelatin trade with the European Union. In 2012, due to reported unsanitary actions of certain domestic enterprises, the European Union had removed Chinese gelatin enterprises from the list of third-party suppliers and requested registration approval to resume exports. A consistent and effective internal risk communication between export enterprises and customs authorities was noted as an important element in restoring trade. Concerning external risk communication, bilateral consultations and the exchange of risk-related information between China and the European Union were highlighted as two of the key elements that helped restore gelatin trade.

2.30. **Ms Anastasia Alvizou** (European Commission Directorate General Health and Food Safety) presented the recent developments of the European Union's legal framework on risk communication. A new EU regulation on the transparency and sustainability of risk assessment in the food chain had been adopted in 2019 which included, for the first-time, specific provisions on risk communication.

The new law set out general objectives and principles, including those related to accurate and transparent information. Ms Alvizou explained that the risk communication plan to be adopted would identify key factors in regard to risk communication activities, appropriate tools and channels of risk communication, and the appropriate mechanism of coordination amongst risk assessors and risk managers.

2.31. **Ms Laura Whitlock** (United States Centers for Disease Control and Prevention (CDC)) explored the use of real-time data to communicate real-time risk for multistate foodborne outbreaks. Ms Whitlock explained that a set of questions were considered before releasing information to the public regarding ongoing foodborne outbreaks. The level of public health concern (low or high) and the specificity of the public health concern (low, medium, or high) were the two primary considerations in selecting the appropriate scenario and communication tools. Ms Whitlock provided further information on CDC's communication templates (food safety alert and investigation notice).

2.32. Following the set of presentations, participants had an opportunity to interact informally and raise follow-up questions with speakers on the topic of risk communication in two informal one-hour Zoom side sessions. One side session was made available to exchange with speakers from Codex, IPPC, OIE, FAO and Food Standards Australia New Zealand; and a second side session to exchange with Members.

2.5 Case studies (Session 5)

2.33. Through case studies, this session explored practical examples of experiences undertaking risk assessment, risk management, and risk communication for SPS issues, and examined how these three components of risk analysis were interlinked.

2.34. **Dr Alan MacLeod** (Department for Environment, Food, and Rural Affairs, United Kingdom) presented the tools, resources and key challenges regarding pest risk analysis. Dr MacLeod outlined that the pest risk analysis process started with an initiation phase identifying the organism causing the threat to the plant resources, followed by a risk assessment phase to gather evidence and interpret the results. The process continued with risk management measures detailing the different phytosanitary options considered. The tools and resources needed to conduct a pest risk analysis were also discussed. In addition, case study examples on *Thrips palmi* and *Acidovorax citrulli* were presented where different pathways and potentially affected crops were identified. In concluding, Dr MacLeod explained the challenges within the pest risk assessment process, including those related to data availability.

2.35. **Ms Amy Philpott** (Watson Green LLC, United States) discussed the public-private aspect of risk communication. Public-private partnerships referred to the collaboration between government and food industry operators to use risk communication for the protection of public health. Ms Philpott remarked on the differences in communication strategies between both sectors, but highlighted that there was a shared goal of protecting public health and relying on consumer trust. Trust was defined as a key principle in risk communication. In concluding, Ms Philpott indicated there was a potential for the public and private sectors to work together on risk communication.

2.36. **Ms Yi-Tzu Weng** (Council of Agriculture, Chinese Taipei) presented Chinese Taipei's policy for strengthening risk management measures for international mail articles of plant products. From 2016 to 2018, the growing e-commerce market had increased international mail of plant regulated articles. This represented a challenge to the prevention of entry of unauthorized goods and the spread of pest into the territory. To reduce quarantine risk, Chinese Taipei had amended in 2018 its Plant Protection and Quarantine Act. The new regulation did not allow plant regulated articles to be sent by mail, apart from recipients who had applied to the plant quarantine authority for approval of entry in advance. An online application permit system had also been established. Ms Weng explained that the measure had decreased the non-compliance rate of plant items.

2.37. **Dr Fu-Kuan Juan** (Council of Agriculture, Chinese Taipei) shared Chinese Taipei's experience on border control against ASF. Chinese Taipei's risk assessment focused on man-made factors and pathways for the introduction of the disease, such as airports and seaports. The risk pathways included inbound passengers, imported goods, and smuggling. The presentation covered the prevention and control measures of ASF. Concerning risk communication, Dr Juan explained that a

core team had been established to manage public communication, communication with international organizations, and cross-department cooperation.

2.38. **Dr Lilian de Luna** (Pest Management Regulatory Agency, Health Canada) presented the provisions of risk assessment, risk management, and risk communication in the Joint Review of pesticides, i.e. a formal pesticide registration process involving two or more countries. Dr de Luna explained that timelines were negotiated in advance, the workload was divided among the participating countries, and data evaluations were exchanged and peer-reviewed by the different jurisdictions and used as the basis for the independent risk assessment and regulatory decision. The benefits and eligibility criteria for Joint Reviews were also covered in the presentation.

2.39. **Ms Barbara Gallani** (EFSA) presented on the international initiative on trust. The initiative was an opportunity to foster cooperation between national and regional bodies to tackle the issue of trust. Ms Gallani explained that the initiative had started with a webinar in 2020 and had continued with a poster session in 2021. The webinar presentations had covered the different layers of trust, the differences between trust and confidence, and the importance of shared values in risk communication. Workshops on trust were envisioned for 2022.

2.40. The workshop closed with concluding remarks by the workshop's moderator, **Mr Gregory MacDonald**, who noted that the workshop had highlighted very clearly the links between risk assessment and risk management activities, and the need for risk assessors and risk managers to coordinate. The discussions had also made clear that other actors had key roles to play in SPS risk analysis, including other government agencies, but also private sector actors and consumer groups. Mr MacDonald noted that the importance of forming trust, working with transparency, and developing confidence in regulatory decisions had been at the heart of many of the interventions.
