

SETAC Globe – Article Structure for GU Annual Meeting Session Summaries

General Guidance:

Overall the article should be no more than 2000 words. The author of the Session Article for the *Globe* should structure their article more like a newspaper or magazine article and not like a scientific paper or abstract. One major recommendation is don't bury the lead of what was the relevance of the session and important discussions/conclusions.

We have found that articles around 1000-1500 words work best. However, remember, space is always at a premium and we may need to edit your article to fit the overall space and theme of the *Globe*. We will attempt to minimize the overall editing and if major editing is needed, we may return the article to make sure our edits didn't greatly change the article content.

Articles should be written in a balanced format that gives the reader an overall impression for the Session. Remember, SETAC strives to have a tripartite presentation of our programing and outputs.

Structuring the Article:

Title of the Featured Session

Author(s) of Session Summary Article and Affiliation of Author(s)

Overview of Session

- Brief description of session and the relevance of session
- What was the major theme of the Session
- Session talks - This is the part of the article that tells the reader-who gave the talks and their brief conclusions/important findings summary. ***Note: Some session summaries (like the example below) do not go presentation by presentation, but rather present an overall summary of the session presentations. We believe this is the best approach, but if you choose to go presentation by presentation you can, this is largely up to you as the *Globe* article author because it will be session dependent.
- The summary of each talk should be no more than 1-2 sentences.
- What were the major overarching themes from the Session?
- Is another session planned as a continuation of dialogue at another SETAC meeting, workshop, etc.?

Author(s) contact information: Author(s) email address

Please see attached article from SETAC's Vancouver meeting which is a good go-by for the authors to structure their *Globe* Article.

Submission Date:

We would like to get session submissions as soon as possible after the sessions conclude. We have found that it is easiest to put these together if the information is fresh on your minds. One suggestion would be to take a few notes during each talk so that you capture the relevant items. That will make it easier to create the summary of the talks. You can certainly send your session summary's while you are still at the meeting if that is convenient, but we would like to get all session summary submissions **by July 15, 2016**.

If you have any questions please feel free to reach out to us at Globe@setac.org. Thank you for your interest in putting together an article for your SETAC *Globe*!

Best regards,

Bill Goodfellow globe.goodfellow@gmail.com

Tim Canfield globe.canfield@gmail.com

Editors in Chief, SETAC *Globe*

Example from January 22, 2015 SETAC *Globe* article

(Please check out other articles in the *Globe* on SETAC's website for additional examples)

**Towards Realistic and Landscape-based Prospective Ecological Risk Assessments:
Mapping Variability and Diversity**

Mark Egsmose, Franz Streissl and Jose V. Tarazona (European Food Safety Authority)

Scientific knowledge and regulatory requirements have progressed immensely and today more information is available on ecological, biological and physiological variability. Knowledge on different stressors and how they interact is growing. Challenges exist on what to protect in a heavily modified agro-ecosystem.

There is a high complexity in defining what is an "environmental harm" and what are environmental values to be protected. What are acceptable levels of changes in locations and over time? Therefore, a dialogue among risk assessors and risk managers is needed for defining the Specific Protection Goals, and how to present the risk assessment outcome.

What can be attributed to natural vs. anthropogenic changes (spatial and temporal) and what are the expected consequences of these changes? The purpose of this special session was to raise awareness of these challenges and to provide examples on landscape-based effects and exposure assessment approaches that are already available.

A high interest for the session was expressed through the lively and interactive discussion among the 200 participants.

The session covered views from different experts and stakeholders from the Joint Research Centre (JRC), an EU Member state, industry and the European Food Safety Authority (EFSA) followed by an interactive plenary discussion.

The key points for the five presentations included:

- Jose Tarazona (EFSA) introduced the session by setting the scene on how to move to landscape-based assessments ensuring that risk assessment supports risk management.
- Landscape-based perspective in integrated environmental assessment was presented by Serenella Sala (JRC). The JRC science hub is available in support of mapping environmental and ecological variability across Europe. Examples were presented on how integrated environmental landscape assessments with land use modeling platforms (LUIA) can be applied, e.g. for Life Cycle Assessments of substances.
- Linking the assessment of pesticides under Regulation (EC) 1107/2009 and the information collection and assessment requirements under the Directive 2009/128/EC on sustainable use of pesticides was presented by Veronique Poulsen (Anses). Landscape risk assessment could be a way forward for pesticide authorization, for example to be used in refined risk assessments and to evaluate and propose risk mitigation measures. Landscape modeling may address parts of uncertainty related to multiple use of plant protection products. The level of complexity of approaches needs to be discussed with risk assessors to be applicable for regulatory use.
- An industry view on landscape risk assessment, scientific needs, examples of landscape risk assessment, state of the art and the way forward was presented by Anne Alix (ECPA). Industry sees the improved equity in the outcome of a risk assessment and decision making when applied to landscape approaches. However, concerns were raised that more conservatism is introduced compared to lower tiers because of uncertainties.
- “Towards realistic and landscape-based prospective ecological risk assessments: Mapping variability and diversity” was presented by Franz Streissl (EFSA). Examples of scientific opinions and guidance from EFSA where tools and methodology are already available were presented. The benefit of using landscape approaches for identifying vulnerable areas where risk mitigation may be needed was highlighted.

Conclusions from the session:

The session made clear that some important aspects need consideration when moving to landscape approaches.

Landscape risk assessment is a way forward for risk assessment for pesticide refinement, mitigation measures, and can also address parts of uncertainty. For example, one can locate species in the landscape and mitigate their exposure to pesticides, refine a risk assessment, and estimate the effectiveness of risk mitigation measures identifying areas that may be at risk. It was emphasised that having robust and validated methods and models are key to support the landscape level risk assessment approaches. Practical examples showed that information and scientific tools are already available.

Tools and data are more advanced on exposure aspects and geographical data, compared with species populations, ecology and ecosystem services.

For a progressive transition to landscape risk assessment the landscape scale(s) need to be defined and the level of complexity needs to be discussed. Commitment from data holders to collect and make data and information available, is essential. Many data, models and maps are available. Collective efforts are needed to move from data to knowledge.

There is a need to look at the approaches and tools available and discuss them for what they bring to risk assessment and to support decision making of risk managers.

Authors' contact information: mark.egsmose@efsa.europa.eu, Franz.Streissl@efsa.europa.eu, Jose.Tarazona@efsa.europa.eu