

# **Institutional Collaboration**

## **An Industry View**

Detlef Müller  
Procter & Gamble  
Germany

# Outline

- Example Studies
  - PASSCLAIM
  - EuroFIR
  - SAFEFOODNET
  - BRAFO
- Learning
- Conclusions

# PASSCLAIM

- Developing consensus for the scientific substantiation of health claims for foods
- Context of EU „Claims Regulation“
- Organised by ILSI Europe
- Participation of academia, government, industry – consumers as observers
- Based on preceding FUFLOSE project to understand scientific basis for functionality of foods

# Passclaim Positives

- High quality participation
- Criteria checked for broad applicability
- Excellent science base
- Reviews of „theme group“ results by larger workshops
- Definition of „Gold Standard“ for scientific substantiation of claims

# PASSCLAIM

## Negatives

- Very academic
  - Most industry experts were remote from market needs
- Consensus will rather prevent than enable claims
- Criteria difficult to work for smaller industry
- No attempt to guide „translation“ of scientific findings into consumer language

# EuroFir

- Attempt to develop a common design for food composition data bases in Europe
- Triggered by EU discussions on food based dietary guidelines
- Based on definition of gaps observed e.g. in EPIC study
- Participation mainly of academia and government institutions, little industry input in preparations and execution

# EuroFIR

## Positives

- Key step to fill major gaps
- Attempt to develop a data base with room for additional data
- Attempt to consider regional differences within a common data base
- Attempt to consider the increasing importance of industrial food products

# EuroFIR

## Negatives

- Very complex design attempted
- Little to no active involvement of industry
- Strong dominance by government users
- Due to lack of industry presence, possibly unrealistic expectations for industry input
  - Restricted industry input might lead to a potentially irrelevant product without consideration of the real foods consumed

# SAFEFOODNET

- Co-ordination of activities of food control authorities between old and new EU member states
- Involvement of government and some academic researchers, little industry input

# SAFEFOODNET

## Positives

- Important step to harmonise concepts between old and new EU member states
- Important step for network creation within the new member states
- Identification of examples to test efficiency of inter-agency co-operation

# SAFEFOODNET

## Negatives

- Lack of involvement of industry on contents
- Missed opportunity to optimise practical working interaction between authorities and industry

# BRAFO

- Project co-ordinated by ILSI Europe
- Moving away from monodimensional approaches for risk assessments
- Integration both risk and benefit assessments
- Developing a comparative system using a „common currency“ for risk/risk and risk/benefit assessments

# BRAFO

## Opportunities

- Bringing academia, government, industry & consumers together
- Encouraging a multidimensional approach for the assessment of foods (and other products)
- Introducing a „can do“ mentality rather than „if in doubt, ban“

# Learning I

- Long experience with ILSI Europe
  - All activities based on close cooperation between academia, government, and industry, usually with consumer involvement
  - Involvement by the three parties ensures high degree of neutrality and quality
  - Focused on pre-competitive research
  - All activities supervised by Board and Scientific Advisory Committee which are composed 50:50 of industry and non-industry experts

# Learning II

- Building trust
  - Long-term co-operation between the partners
  - Co-operation also between competing groups (industry, academia)
  - Clear acceptance of an open outcome
  - Publication of all results, including those not that popular
  - Effective co-ordination of contributions
  - Recognising contributions also when they are controversial

# Learning III

- Broad contributions
  - Have several partners from each sector
  - Obtain external input as needed, also from non-participants
  - Ensure that diverging views are considered
- Relevance
  - Ensure that the results can be translated into action
    - \* translation into industry/government projects
    - \* foundation for follow-up research with practical applications

# Conclusions

- Get active people together from various backgrounds, i.e. academia, government, industry, and e.g. consumer groups.
- Ensure appropriate resources to enable active exchange
- Allow for time and continuity – a subject is not automatically completed after one project
- Make it relevant