Network on Chemical Occurrence Data
Minutes of the 11th meeting (2nd day)

Held on 05 May 2017, Parma

(Agreed on 30 June 2017)

Participants

- **Network Representatives of Member States (including EFTA Countries):**

Country	Name[1]
Austria	Josef Wolf (via web-conference)
Belgium	Valerie Vromman
Bulgaria	Emil Simeonov
Cyprus	Despo Louca Christodoulou
Croatia	Sandra Bašić
Czech Republic	Irena Rehurkova
Denmark	Pernille Bjorn Petersen
Denmark	Jens Hinge Andersen
Estonia	Kadi Padur
Finland	Johanna Suomi
France	Jean-Cédric Reninger
Germany	Michael Jud (via web-conference)
Germany	Eva Scharfenberg
Greece	Maria Gaspari
Greece	Leonidas Palilis
Hungary	Kata Kerekes
Ireland	Eileen O'Dea
Lithuania	Agnietė Grušauskienė
Luxembourg	Fabienne Clabots
Netherlands	Rob Theelen
Poland	Andrzej Starski
Portugal	Maria Antónia Calhau
Romania	Oana Stroie
Slovakia	Angela Světlikova
Spain	Victoria Marcos Suarez
Sweden	David Foster
Sweden	Petra Fohgelberg
United Kingdom	Adam Locker

Norway	Inger Halle Skagen

- **Observers from other countries:**

Albania	Merjem Bushati
Bosnia and Herzegovina	Dragen Tomovic
FYR of Macedonia	Zhaneta Mijovska
Montenegro	Danijela Sukovic
Serbia	Lidija Ristic Matijevic
Turkey	Serap Hanci

- **EFSA:**

Evidence Management (DATA) Unit Francesco Vernazza (Chair), Doreen Dolores Russell (Scientific Secretary), Mary Gilsenan, Stefano Cappe, Davide Arcella (agenda item 3.2), Zsuzsanna Horvath (agenda item 3.2), Giuseppe Triacchini, Claudia Cascio, Valentina Bocca (agenda item 3.1)

LA Unit: Luisa Venier

5. Introduction to the 2nd day of meeting

5.1. Welcome and apologies for absence

The Chair welcomed the participants. Apologies were received from Italy, Latvia, Malta and Slovenia

5.2. Adoption of agenda

The agenda was adopted with some modifications in order to accommodate a short continuation of the discussion on PAD requests from the previous day.

6. Topics for discussion

6.1. Data Collection 2017 (2016 data): Timelines and Specific Requirements (new business rules for data submission)

Valentina Bocca (DATA Unit) provided details of the timeframe and requirements for the chemical contaminants and food additive data collection during 2017. Data can be sent in either SSD1 or SSD2 format and EFSA will convert from SSD2 to SSD1. She emphasised that it is only possible to report data using one of the data models, thus each country needs to inform EFSA in advance if they wish to use SSD2. The participants were advised that data will be available in the SDWH (Scientific Data Warehouse) the day following the transmission for the SSD1 data. She clarified that all statistics and feedback reports of data delivered in SSD2 will be produced from the SSD1-converted database. The conversion SSD2 to SSD1 will start from 1 July; therefore, the feedback to SSD2 data providers will also be available but only from the 1 July 2017. Several specific requirements generally applicable to the 2017 data collection on contaminants and food additives (but not necessarily to other data collections), were presented; in particular it was highlighted that the 'resLOQ' has become a recommended rather than mandatory data element (as it was so far). In addition to the above mentioned generally applicable specific requirements, those requirements applicable only to particular contaminants or food additives,

were described. Examples of these requirements are the reporting of legislative classes for Acrylamide, Furan or Food additives.

For all contaminants and food additives, EFSA warned not to select the generic entry 'Not in list' in the case of missing parameters in the catalogue: instead a request to the EFSA (catalogues@efsa.europa.eu) should be made to include the missing term. It was also remarked that substances should be reported at the most detailed level.

A specific syntax to be used in the PRODCOM field in SSD1 for reporting specifically required information (e.g. acrylamide code) was explained.

Spain asked additional clarification about the syntax to be used in PRODCOM in SSD1. EFSA explained that this field is not mandatory in SSD1 so in order to extract meaningful information from the text a standardised syntax is needed if this information has been included. Spain highlighted that this might create additional work because they have already received the data from data providers which had not used the suggested syntax.

Luxembourg agreed with not reporting the 'not in list' option for the substances but asked how a newly created PARAM code can be made available for all Member States (MSs) because all MSs should receive all the revisions; furthermore, this should be consistent among all the data collections (pesticides, contaminants etc.). EFSA stated that the main catalogue revision is implemented annually and is also published in Knowledge Junction (Zenodo) while the DCF (Data Collection Framework) catalogues contain all versions, including additional updates requested outside the annual update; the DCF should be the main reference. Mary Gilsenan suggested the opportunity to set up a mechanism to alert MSs of the updates. Ireland observed that in case of frequent additions (as it happened in the past) it would be advisable to access the shared copy in the DCF to extract the changes when needed; Croatia asked if the date of catalogue changes can be tracked and this was confirmed by EFSA. The Netherlands expressed a preference for an automated, accessible catalogue system rather than receiving emails. EFSA remarked that the catalogue system contains the master versions of the catalogues accessible also through web services. EFSA is also working on a catalogue browser (directly using the web services), to guarantee a user-friendly access to the catalogue database. EFSA informed also that detail on all changes performed in every release is available in the release note downloadable from the DCF.

Luxembourg highlighted a potential problem when different results exist for the same substance in the same sample. EFSA replied that the correct way to deal with this scenario is to use sub-sample code; it was clarified that in general the confirmation samples should be managed at national level and only the confirmed result should be transmitted to EFSA. In specific cases (e.g. aflatoxins and biogenic amines) sub-sample code should be used to differentiate repeated samples.

Germany asked how EFSA handles data outside the data collection window as have concerns that some data sent outside the timeframe will not be processed. EFSA informed the Network that data sent in simplified format would be processed and uploaded once the data collection in the DCF is open.

Finally, EFSA asked the countries to express their interest/intention to transmit data in SSD2 in 2017; the answers are summarised as follows:

For this year, the folders in DCF for data upload are "CHEM_OCC_SSD1_WF2.2016" or "CHEM_OCC_SSD2_WF2.2016" for data transmission in SSD1 or SSD2 format respectively. For data concerning food additives, "CHEM" is replaced by "ADD" in the folder's name.

1. To report in SSD2 format: Denmark, Hungary, Lithuania, Croatia, Sweden and Poland.
2. Possibly reporting in SSD2 format (to be confirmed later): Cyprus, Netherlands and Norway.
3. All other countries will report in SSD1.

6.2. Resumption of PAD discussion from the joint session

Resuming the discussion of the previous day, the Chemical occurrence Network was given the possibility to further discuss the consultation approach for PAD requests introduced in the previous meeting day (joint session with Pesticide network).

A consensus was reached on a lean process to address PAD requests on contaminants' data which will be implemented for future public access requests.

6.3. Dioxins (and other substances) testing and reporting (screening methods + refined analysis)

Davide Arcella (DATA Unit) presented details about upcoming risk assessments of contaminants and related deadlines for data to be considered in reports and opinions. The opium alkaloids in poppy seeds data is the most urgent as data will be extracted from EFSA's database for use in the Opinion in mid-July 2017. In case of 'new' substance groups (e.g. chlorinated paraffins) EFSA requested the network to inform EFSA about chemical substances belonging to such families which are being analysed but are not included in the PARAM catalogue.

Regarding the dioxins opinion, the data is being cleaned and EFSA has identified that in some cases samples were initially analysed using a screening test (e.g. CALUX) and only the samples with a positive screening result were quantitatively re-analysed with GC-MS. EFSA clarified that in case of partial reporting of quantitative analytical results from positive samples in a screening test these should be flagged as 'suspect' samples. EFSA underlined the need to always know if a two steps analysis process (full screening tests followed by quantitative test only on positive results) is applied; for exposure calculation it is crucial to understand if the available analytical results correspond to the sampling plan and are representative of the contamination level in the different food groups. An email has been sent to MSs about this issue emphasising the importance of clarifying this issue with the laboratories reporting dioxins data and guaranteeing a uniform reporting of the data.

6.4. Data validation and confirmation in Microstrategy (including hands-on)

Luca Pasinato (DATA Unit) outlined the process for data to enter the SDWH (Scientific Data Warehouse) and how to execute and examine the generated validationreports. A live demonstration of this activity was given on how to access the validation report.

6.5. Data analytics and visualisation in the Scientific Data Warehouse

For data analytics Luca Pasinato explained what can be done with the data using Microstrategy once validated, including creating interactive graphical representations of the data (dashboards). It is also now mandatory for data providers to validate their reported data in Microstrategy.

Germany asked if requestors using the PAD regulation are not given access to the data in the SDWH. EFSA clarified that based on the current access rules only EFSA, the European Commission (DG SANTE) and the data providers have access to raw data in the SDWH. Data providers have access to their own data while the members of the Circle of Trust have access to Circle of Trust data. The Netherlands asked about eventual access to national data if provided by different organisations. EFSA highlighted that this level of access is not covered in the SDWH access rules. . Considering the number of requests received for this type of 'country overview' access EFSA is planning to make this feature technically available by end of 2017. EFSA clarified that if a country participates in the Circle of Trust, all data provider organisations included in the Circle of Trust have access to the shared raw data.

For these reasons, EFSA encouraged all MSs to become part of the Circle of Trust. EFSA also confirmed that it will organise trainings on visual analytics, as requested by Ireland and Germany.

Belgium requested all the data used in EFSA's Aluminium opinion made available for their scientific committee. EFSA advised that such a request falls within the scope of a PAD request.

7. Any Other Business

The United Kingdom presented information on open data and linked data (Food Standards Agency linked data) – available at: https://data.food.gov.uk – and how they manage metadata with a metadata editor and have the intention that data should be available to as many different types of users as possible. The company employed to develop the open data portal used FoodEx2 as a base for their ontology. EFSA said it would be interested in obtaining this FoodEx2-based ontology.

Regarding mycotoxin data, France asked how to transmit data on the sum of mycotoxins since -based on the revision of Regulation 1881 which says that labs need to send data in lower bound only- it can be reported as 0 but this value is presently not accepted by the business rules. It was agreed to discuss this in a future meeting.

8. Date of next meeting

The date of the next meeting will be communicated at a later stage.

9. Conclusions

The Chair thanked the network for the active participation and contributions.

10. Closure of the meeting

The meeting closed at 13:00 as anticipated in the agenda.