Scientific Network for Zoonoses Monitoring Data
Minutes of the 35th meeting

Held on 18-19 October 2017, Parma
(Agreed on 15 November 2017)

Participants

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

Country	Name
Austria	Peter Much
Belgium	Katie Vermeersch
Bulgaria	Svetoslav Stoev
Croatia	Dražen Kneževic
Czech Republic	Marie Bleierova
Denmark	Birgitte Helwigh
Estonia	Jelena Sõgel
Finland	Saara Raulo
France	Jean-Baptiste Perrin
France	Pascal Hendrikx
Germany	Bernd-Alois Tenhagen
Germany	Antje Schonsky
Greece	Myrsini Tzani
Hungary	Katalin Jókay
Ireland	Kilian Unger
Ireland	Fidelma Farrell
Italy	Simona Iannetti
Italy	Veronica Cibin
Latvia	Tatjana Ribakova
Lithuania	Ausra Lescinskaite Petrauskiene
Netherlands	Mauro de Rosa
Netherlands	Johan Bongers
Poland	Anna Trepkowska
Portugal	Maria Helena Pinto
Romania	Ioana Neghirla
Slovakia	Marta Bedriova
Slovenia	Maja Kokalj
Spain	José Luis Sáez Llorente
Spain	Emma Martín Denia
Sweden	Elina Lahti
United Kingdom	Andrew Frost
United Kingdom	Annemarie Green
Iceland	Vigdís Tryggvadottir
Norway	Merete Hofshagen
Switzerland	Jürg Danuser

- **Hearing Experts:**

NA

- **European Commission:**

NA

- **Others:**

Renis Maçi (Albania), Emir Konjic (Bosnia and Herzegovina), Blazho Janevski (FYRepublic of Macedonia), Verica Gomilanovic (Montenegro), Tatjana Labus (Serbia) Guzin Sahin (Turkey).

- **EFSA:**

Biological Hazards and Contaminants (BIOCONTAM) Unit: Frank Boelaert (co-chair), Valentina Rizzi and Yves Van der Stede.

Evidence Management (DATA) Unit: Anca Stoicescu (co-chair), Doreen Dolores Russell (Scientific secretary), Mary Gilsenan*, Stefano Cappe*, Simona Fusar Poli*, Valentino Avon*, Alessandro Carletti*, Mario Monguidi* and Luca Pasinato*.

Advisory Forum and Scientific Cooperation (AFSCO) Unit: Nicoline Le Gourierec*.

Animal Health and Plant Health (ALPHA) Unit: Frank Verdonck*.

(attended for specific items)*

1. Welcome and apologies for absence

The Chairs welcomed the participants to the 35th meeting of the Scientific Network for Zoonoses Monitoring Data. Apologies were received from the representative of Luxembourg.

2. Adoption of agenda

The agenda was adopted with an additional item: 'Update on the Joint EFSA-ECDC molecular typing database' requested by Sweden.

3. Minutes of the 34th meeting of the Network held on 13-14 October 2016

The minutes had previously been agreed by written procedure on 16 November 2016 and subsequently published on the EFSA website on 18 November 2016. The pending actions from the meeting were presented together with the status of their progress. The overall comments arising from the survey carried out at the last Network meeting were presented.

4. Topics for discussion (first day)

4.1. Simplification of EU Summary Reports production

Frank Boelaert presented a proposal for simplifying the EU Summary Reports (EUSRs) production. For more than 10 years, the EFSA has been tasked with the European Union (EU)-wide data collection on zoonoses, zoonotic agents, antimicrobial resistance and food-borne outbreaks. EFSA produces, jointly with the European Centre for Disease Prevention and Control (ECDC), annual EUSRs that integrate all information along the food chain. The data obtained in the EFSA Data Collection Framework (DCF) vary according the level of data quality and harmonisation. Therefore, the type of data analyses suggested by EFSA strongly depends on this level of harmonisation and can be a descriptive summary, or trend watching, or a full trend analysis of the monitoring data, suggesting a way forward for the mentioned simplification.

Switzerland agreed that it would be better to have less zoonoses in category 3 and to improve planning and surveillance for better data analysis. EFSA is looking at how data in this category can be improved and it was clarified that it is up to the risk managers to decide which combinations of zoonotic agent/matrix to prioritise and propose improvements for. Denmark asked how *Listeria monocytogenes* data could be reported for compliance with microbiological criteria verification at batch compliance. EFSA replied that an improvement of this verification would need the reporting of data at sample-based level.

Finland and Sweden suggested a fourth category of data collected within a well-designed survey/data collection (by academics/Competent Authorities): however, it is impossible to report the results within the established deadline. Spain mentioned that the categorisation is in principle good, however, there might be different targets/objectives for each Member State (MSs) for the same zoonoses - for example, Rabies and West Nile Virus (WNV) can be under control in one country, but at the level of detection in another country - therefore not comparable. The Netherlands suggested that three to five areas for improvement should be selected, as it is a very wide field. EFSA agreed with all the above comments.

4.2. Main findings of EUSR 2016

Frank Boelaert, Valentina Rizzi and Yves Van der Stede presented the main findings of the draft EUSR 2016.

Germany commented that the sample size summary table for *Campylobacter* displays rows for aggregated food categories that do not make sense, from an epidemiological viewpoint, as meat types are combined that typically have very different detection rates for *Campylobacter*. EFSA will consider this comment. Denmark queried the increasing trend in WNV. EFSA replied that, according to the ECDC, the number of cases of West Nile fever (WNF) in humans increased recently and is now comparable with the situation before 2014. At that time there was a sharp decrease in WNF human cases. ECDC are keeping this under surveillance. In addition, in southern Europe, WNV outbreaks and positive animals were detected and reported by 13 MSs in recent years. Norway appreciated the presentation of the 2016 main findings as, due to lack of time, the full report was not read.

Regarding the results on the harmonisation of the analytical methods used for STEC in the last two years Sweden mentioned that this is probably due to the implementation of the business rules and not to the harmonisation of analytical methods in laboratories. Denmark flagged that the deadline for commenting on the draft 2016 EUSR is too short and kindly requested that EFSA extends the deadline. EFSA agreed to this. Austria asked how to count multi-country outbreaks. EFSA mentioned that this depends on how the MSs report, but clear specifications on how to report one case involved in multi-countries outbreak will be proposed.

4.3. Feedback on 2016 data reporting

Feedback received from the reporting countries in relation to the 2016 data reporting was presented by Anca Stoicescu.

Specific achievements of 2016 data reporting were shared with the participants and EFSA acknowledged the considerable effort made by reporting countries to report for the second year all zoonoses data in electronic format. The face-to-face trainings in five pre-accession countries and the training via Web conference in three MSs were highlighted as very successful. The efforts of the pre-accession countries to set up the national reporting team and to report for the first time the available zoonoses data were acknowledged. EFSA highly appreciated the efforts of Croatia who reported for the first time all prevalence data at sample-based level. Therefore, EFSA analysed prevalence sample-based data from Croatia and included them in the 2016 EUSR.

Based on an analysis of the answers and suggestions from a survey of Network members, the solutions/improvements proposed for the next reporting period were presented.
EFSA proposed creating a mailing list for national experts to ensure that communication between EFSA and reporting officers on deadlines, reporting manuals etc., reaches the national experts involved in data reporting. The Network members did not agree with this proposal, underlining that this is a task of the reporting officer (RO). The tasks of the RO were highlighted as follows:

- RO plays the role of national coordinator of the data collection, reporting and validation;
- RO nominates the national experts involved in data reporting and validation;
- RO ensures the communication between EFSA and national experts (data providers);
- RO is the only person who can see all the data reported by all national organisations;
- RO decides the access rules for Microstrategy reports for other experts than the data providers (e.g. Focal point).

Additionally, two dashboards were presented, summarising the incoming 2016 data and highlighting that the some peaks of data reporting were outside the legal deadline due to corrections needed to the data.

Greece thanked EFSA for its support in data reporting and requested that the changes in the catalogues be also implemented in the Excel mapping tool. EFSA confirmed that the new Excel mapping tools will contain the new terms added in the DCF catalogues. Denmark also mentioned that the catalogue updates are problematic for the data providers. EFSA will provide instructions on how to get the updates in the catalogues versions using Web Services interacting with DCF.

Italy asked which sample-based data were collected and how these data were aggregated. EFSA answered that Croatia reported all prevalence data at sample level, and that it was challenging to aggregate the data. All countries are welcome to take part in sample-based reporting of prevalence data.

Sweden mentioned that there were discrepancies in the manuals and the XML schema, and that the catalogues included deprecated terms. EFSA answered that the deprecated terms cannot be deleted but can be hidden. The United Kingdom thanked EFSA for their support and underlined the difficulties of reporting text using the Excel mapping tool and that the *Salmonella* data reporting was challenging. Norway and Sweden requested a short overview from EFSA of the whole reporting process and thanked EFSA for their support.

At the end of the second day Anca Stoicescu demonstrated to new reporting officers from Poland, Portugal and Hungary how to upload data to the DCF and how to check the Microstrategy reports.

4.4. Improving scientific data characteristics

Frank Boelaert presented the main ways of 'Improving scientific data characteristics' regarding *Salmonella* data. With regard to the 2016 *Salmonella* data reporting, specific quality and reliability issues were raised with the MSs. First, in poultry, some possible discrepancies in reporting of *Salmonella* data were disclosed prior to the 2016 reporting period and addressed with MSs. Secondly, in poultry, for broilers and turkeys specific legal requirements prescribe that data shall be reported to EFSA separately for three schemas: a) food business operators and competent authorities, b) food business operators, and c) competent authorities. Thirdly, with regard to pigs, and in order to fulfil the legal reporting requirements of annex I, section IV, chapter IX of the Regulation (CE) No 854/2004, MSs shall report to EFSA *Salmonella* monitoring data on carcases of pigs for verifications done by the competent authority for the correct implementation by food business operators of the annex I, point 2.1.4 (process hygiene criterion for

Salmonella on pig carcases) of Regulation (CE) No 2073/2005. These two latter points have been specifically addressed during the 2016 reporting period.

Yves Van der Stede presented the ways of improving scientific data for *Listeria monocytogenes*, *Trichinella* and *Echinococcus.* For reporting of *Listeria monocytogenes* some examples were given and it was stressed that MSs should report as much as possible the specification 'Ready-to-eat'. For reporting of *Trichinella* in domestic animals – obtained from slaughterhouse surveillance – it was stressed that 'animal population' should be used rather than 'meat from XXX'. In addition, the specification of the 'housing conditions' of pigs for each MSs would be appreciated. For the reporting of *Echinococcus* spp. in case of positive results, it was agreed that Level 2 of *Echinococcus* spp. should be specified (*E. multilocularis* or *E. granulosus*) as this is important for further analysis. For WNV it was agreed that in domestic solipeds (horses, donkeys) the variable 'Vaccination' will be used in case the samples are reported as positive using indirect diagnostic assays. In general, the case definition of WNV should be well described by MSs in the text forms.

Greece mentioned that data from food business operators on pig carcasses are not collected by the competent authority, but these data result from official sampling. EFSA advised that, based on Regulation No 218/2014, the competent authority should report data resulting from official sampling, and/or collect data taken by food business operators.

Norway and Finland mentioned that, to report the control housing condition for *Trichinella,* it is necessary to officially apply for controlled housing conditions and it should be defined if the controlled housing condition is the official status or epidemiological status. Sweden highlighted the difficulties of reporting *Listeria monocytogenes* and the fact that sample-based reporting could be a possible solution. Austria stated that there are not many cases due to *Echinoccocus*; therefore, it is very important to define the host. Denmark mentioned that it is not possible for all matrices to report 'ready to eat', which is important when reporting data on *Listeria monocytogenes*. EFSA will add 'ready to eat' to the relevant terms.

4.5. Data collection on animal populations and on animal disease outbreaks

Frank Verdonck gave a presentation on the data collection on animal population and animal disease outbreaks. He indicated the mandates received from the European Commission (EC) on disease outbreaks, a workflow proposal for a future *ad hoc* outbreak, the tools for descriptive analysis and the analytical epidemiological analysis. Discussions with MSs regarding the common understanding of terminology, resolution of the data, frequency of data submission/retrieval and electronic format of data submission/retrieval were also given. The benefits for MSs, the EC and EFSA of the implementation of a harmonised data collection on animal population and animal diseases outbreaks were highlighted, including improvements of the comparability of epidemiological data across MSs which assists national risk assessments, the availability of key information on risk factors which hints at how to face present/future threats, high quality and up-to-date data and the shorter timelines to produce scientific outputs. The need to work across EFSA regarding the control of terminologies was also indicated.

Germany mentioned that the definitions of holding types are fixed in the legislation and this is already harmonised across the EU. EFSA answered that EFSA should be able to use the data for different purposes. Finland, Spain and Sweden underlined challenges at country level depending on animal populations, data sources, the dynamic of the animal population data and the difficulties to estimate the densities of wild animals. Frank Verdonck acknowledged that are many challenges, but EFSA is supporting the reporting countries (e.g. developing protocols, organising webinars).

4.6. 2017 data reporting period: new terms in catalogues, reporting manuals, timelines and improving compliance with timelines

Anca Stoicescu presented the changes to the reporting of 2017 data. Most of the improvements were described in the presentation on the feedback of 2016 data reporting when solutions to solve the issues identified were proposed. No changes are envisaged in the DCF, data models and Excel mapping tool. Improvements will be inserted in the reporting manuals, business rules, catalogues and the Microstrategy reports. More examples will be added in the reporting manuals. Sample-based reporting guidelines will be published at the end of February 2018.

The Network members agreed with the addition to the sampling context catalogue of the new term: 'Surveillance, based on Regulation 2073', to the sampler catalogue of the new term: 'Private sampler' and to the analytical method catalogue of the term: 'Visual inspection'.

The milestones of 2017 data collection were agreed:

- Requests for proposals of new terms to be added in the catalogues: 10 November 2017;
- Publication of the supporting manuals: 31 January 2018;
- Opening of the reporting period 1 April 2018;
- Closure of the reporting period on 31 May 2018. Data sent in after 31 May (new data) will not be scientifically validated;
- First validation period: 1–15 June 2018;
- 5 June 2018: EU summary tables displayed in the DMS (Document Management System) covering data submitted by 31 May;
- 16 June 2018: letters requesting scientific clarifications and/or amendments (if needed) sent to the MSs;
- First data correction: 15 June – 6 July 2018
- Final validation period: 7 – 14 July 2018
- Final data correction: 14 – 24 July 2018
- 25 July 2018: EFSA validates the final submitted and corrected data (against a number of criteria). After 25 July 2018, data cannot be changed, as the data extracted on this date will be used to draft the report. Wrong data (combination of matrix/pathogen) will not be included in the analysis;
- Amendment of 2017 data and historical data can be carried out between 1 and 30 November 2018. These data will be used in the National reports and in the scientific data warehouse (DWH) and will not be included in the analysis of EUSR 2017.

The Network agreed to the timelines proposed but requested EFSA to adhere strictly to these timelines to enable MSs to plan their work at national level. The reporting officers were requested to clearly communicate to the national experts the deadlines for 2017 data reporting and validation.

In the discussions which followed, Greece, Norway, Germany and Finland flagged that it is important to have a clear definition of when the 'private sampler' should be used, and that the combination of sampler and sampling context is essential for data analysis. France explained the context of their request for the addition of the term 'private sampler'. It was agreed that EFSA should provide definitions and the context in which 'Surveillance, based on Regulation 2073' and 'Private sampler' should be used.

Spain highlighted that the analytical method is very important when analysing a positive result and that positive results obtained using analytical method with different sensitivity should not be compared; therefore, it is essential to provide a clear case definition.

Regarding the timelines proposed by EFSA for data reporting, Denmark suggested that, to improve the quality of data available in the EFSA database, it would be better to be able to update or insert new data at any time of the year, even if these data are not

included in the EUSR. EFSA explained that this is not feasible because EFSA also manages several other European data collections from other data domains, also with legal deadlines, and that human and IT resources need to be allocated in specific periods of time, accordingly. EFSA stressed that good quality data submitted within the deadlines is crucial for increasing the efficiency of the data reporting process. EFSA assured that data submitted after deadlines will be used in the trend of the next reports and will be also included in the National reports. Denmark stressed that any change to the data models no matter how small from EFSA point might potentially be a very big change nationally; e.g. the fact that EFSA just deleted the flags from the catalogues in 2016 without warning. Any inclusion of new BR should also be included in document EFSA provide with the changes to the reporting.

4.7. Text forms revision

Anca Stoicescu informed the Network of the background to the need for revising the structure and the reporting tool for text forms.

From the survey sent to the Network regarding feedback on the 2015 and 2016 zoonoses data collection, it was evident that members were not pleased with the current structure of text forms and with the available tool to report narrative text accompanying zoonoses, food-borne outbreaks and antimicrobial resistance data.

A proposal for the revised structure was sent to Network members suggesting a reduction of the number of paragraphs and the number of sub-paragraphs. Eleven reporting countries sent comments/suggestions/questions regarding the structure proposed. EFSA answered all the questions and tried to include in the second proposal as much as possible the suggestions received. The second proposal was sent to MSs on 8 October, to be discussed and agreed in the Network meeting.

Mario Monguidi presented the technical background of the proposal to adopt Word templates and disable submission of text forms in the DCF. Negative feedback was received from countries that already developed a system to produce XML files (without using the Excel-based tool). EFSA explained that it cannot maintain two different systems (one based on a Word template, and another relying on the DCF).

In the discussions that followed, MSs expressed their views on the Word template. A subsequent survey was created during the meeting to collect views of the reporting countries regarding the two options. The advantages and the disadvantages of these proposals were presented. In the first option, EFSA continues to collect text forms data through XML data files to be uploaded in the DCF. For option two, EFSA provides a Word template reflecting the new national report structure. MSs fill in this Word document and, once completed, they save as a PDF file and they upload the file on DMS. A second PDF file is created by Microstrategy and will only include the data tables. EFSA generates the national report for the publication by merging the two PDF documents. The PDF file with data tables is automatically generated, but the entire national report (including text forms) needs to go through a manual process.

Representatives of 27 reporting countries expressed their preference for using the Word template, five reporting countries preferred the use of XML files and for one country, both solutions are acceptable.

Denmark, Sweden and Finland mentioned that it is important to be very clear which are the mandatory text sub-paragraphs to be reported every year and which are relevant for EFSA analysis. EFSA underlined that, based on Directive 99/2003 and Decision 652/2013, certain sub-paragraphs are mandatory to be reported and that colleagues involved in drafting the EUSR chapters are checking the information reported in the text forms related to a specific zoonoses/disease.

4.8. Update on data reporting on the EU Transmissible Spongiform Encephalopathies (TSE)

Yves Van der Stede presented the results and update on future data reporting of TSE. This report of EFSA presents the results of surveillance activities on animal TSE in bovine animals, sheep, goats and deer, as well as genotyping data in sheep, carried out in 2016 in the EU and in three non-MSs according to Regulation (EC) 999/2001. EFSA will organise a hands-on training for TSE data reporters on 13–14 November 2017. Data will be reported to EFSA in Standard Sample Description, version 2 (SSD2) format from 2018. To facilitate data reporting a submission tool was developed by EFSA.

Romania asked if TSE data are to be reported monthly to EFSA as is currently done to the EC. EFSA answered that the legislation regarding the monthly reporting was not changed. Norway presented some information about CWD. Denmark asked about reporting deadlines and who will confirm the data submitted on TSE. EFSA replied that the legal deadline for reporting the TSE in the database is 31 March. The Network on zoonoses monitoring data will be kept informed of all communication with the Network on TSE data collection who will be responsible for submitting the TSE data. The United Kingdom asked if in future the results of TSE could be integrated in the zoonoses EUSR. EFSA confirmed that in the long term the intention is to integrate the TSE report into the EUSR on zoonoses and FBO. Sweden expressed their satisfaction that it will be a sample-based reporting data collection.

4.9. Presentation of the Catalogues Browser

Valentino Avon demonstrated the Catalogue browser to the Network participants. The Catalogue browser is an online tool to navigate EFSA catalogues, which were previously only downloaded from the DCF. EFSA will provide the Catalogue Browser and documentation by the end of January 2018.

Denmark asked if it is possible to see when a catalogue was last updated. EFSA replied that, if the catalogue is downloaded from the catalogue browser and the catalogue is subsequently updated, the browser would give a warning that there is a new version of the catalogue available. EFSA will provide instructions on how to get updates on catalogue versions using the Web Services interacting with the DCF.

4.10. Discussion on Data reporting-exercise

Some scenarios relating to reporting *Campylobacter*, Histamine and *Listeria monocytogenes* were presented and discussed. EFSA will contact the EC in order to know which specific data should be collected in the legal framework 2017/1495 to assess compliance for *Campylobacter* in fresh broiler meat. EFSA will subsequently provide the details to the Network on how to report data.

5. Welcome and apologies for absence

The Chairs welcomed the participants to the second day of the 35th meeting of the Scientific Network for Zoonoses Monitoring Data. Apologies were received from the Luxembourg representative.

6. Topics for discussion (second day)

6.1. Data Quality Assessment in the context of the DATA Framework Partnership Agreement

Stefano Cappe and Alessandro Carletti informed the meeting about the Framework Partnership Agreement (FPA) which aims to improve data quality. Data quality assessment is the measure of the level of fitness of data for a specific purpose. Good

data quality is important to improve the overall quality of risk assessments in EFSA. The pilot project aims at supporting MSs in improving the quality of the data in comparison with baseline requirements in the EU legislation. Currently the project involves five countries (Cyprus, Denmark, France, Germany, and Slovakia) covering the data quality aspects in four data domains (Zoonoses, Pesticides, Contaminants and additive occurrence, and Veterinary Medicinal Product Residues). This meeting is an opportunity to discuss a set of data quality objectives and respective KPIs (key performance indicators), and possibly have volunteers wishing to join teleconferences dedicated to the topic. Anca Stoicescu presented the specific objectives proposed for zoonoses and a description of the specific KPIs (mandatory or additional) together with the corresponding threshold reference values (in %). In preparation of the discussion on this agenda point, the objectives and the related KPIs were sent in advance to the Network members.

Finland expressed their view that this project is of more interest for those MSs who have an automated system in place rather than for those who aggregate data manually. EFSA replied that data management systems in some countries are not in place; in this case the respective country creates the business case for having an automated system.

EFSA underlined that they would like to have more countries involved in setting up baseline data quality criteria. France said that the baseline should not be too ambitious, such as containing too high reference values, and that it should indicate a clear separation between the mandatory and additional KPIs. Greece mentioned that they are not in favour of a league table of performance. EFSA underlined that the confidentiality should be discussed within the FPA countries and the volunteer countries. The United Kingdom thanked EFSA for setting the KPI on achieving the deadlines for data submission set in legislation rather than the previously proposed earlier dates. The United Kingdom reported that it is impossible, using the system in place in the United Kingdom, to ascertain the total of the samples tested, and therefore that countries should not be seen to fail to achieve a KPI in relation to data fields that were not themselves mandatory. Regarding the accuracy objective and the KPI on reporting similar figures as compared to previous year reports, it is important that EFSA should consider the data reported after the November correction deadline for providing updated data when assessing accuracy of returns between years.

Sweden asked if EFSA considered the cost–effectiveness of the project and, similar to Germany, considered that the non-mandatory data elements should not be included in the KPIs. Sweden expressed concern that smaller countries cannot fulfil all the KPIs. Denmark recommended to have the objectives and the KPIs discussed internally by the MSs. EFSA will consult the Network members about the final KPIs to be applied in the pilot project. MSs not participating in the pilot study were invited to express their interest in participating in the KPIs discussions.

6.2. What kind of data should be collected, as some requirements are legal while others are not

Saara Raulo, the Finish representative, presented a number of topics regarding 'Administrative' versus 'Scientific' reasoning of data collection at national level versus data reporting to EFSA. The points for discussion presented were mainly related to the balance of the mandatory 'official' reports on control programmes versus epidemiological data collection for risk profiling and risk assessments, criterion for suitable data sets, the ownership and data availability, data management processes versus content relevance.
Frank Boelaert underlined that, with data of good scientific quality, we can go further with the data analysis and data mining. Switzerland mentioned that administrative legislation has a basis in science. Sweden underlined that the focus is on national issues and that these are not always conveyed in the EUSR. Denmark flagged that these needs have to be brought to the attention of the EC by the Network. EFSA will take into account the topics for discussion proposed for the next Network meetings and re-iterated

that proposals should come from MSs representatives of this Network. Proposals for amending the legislation as regards more harmonised sampling and reporting for zoonoses would need to be tabled by the MSs with the EC and using the appropriate channels (i.e. EC Standing Committee on Plant, Animals, Food and Feed (PAFF committee).

6.3. Update on the EFSA's EU-FORA fellowship programme

Nicoline Le Gourierec gave an update on the EFSA's EU-FORA fellowship programme. EU-FORA is an opportunity for early to mid-career scientists from EU national risk assessment authorities or for any other Article 36 organisation. The programme offers motivated candidates to increase their knowledge and hands-on experience in food safety risk assessment. The programme will run for a one-year period using the concept 'learning-by-doing'. Fellows will be placed in a European food safety risk assessment organisation outside their home country. At the hosting sites, they will be fully integrated, participate in the organisation's work, gain first-hand experience, and increase their knowledge of many scientific aspects relevant to food safety risk assessment.

Denmark asked if it is possible to create a consortium between national organisations either within the same MS or between different MSs. EFSA confirmed that a consortium can apply for hosting a fellow, but it is a condition that the fellow cannot relocate during the year. The United Kingdom asked if is it possible to have a fellow taking post graduate research for a qualification. EFSA answered that currently it is not possible, but is looking to get the programme certificated in the future.

EFSA will send an e-mail including the link to the calls on the EFSA website and a text/message for publication on national websites. Network members are requested to disseminate the information on the upcoming programme.

6.4. Assessment of the incidents of histamine intoxication in some EU countries

Valentina Rizzi provided an update on the assessment of the incidents of histamine intoxication in some EU countries. Upon a request from the EC, EFSA assessed the incidents of histamine intoxication in some EU countries that were linked to consumption of tuna and which were notified through the EC Rapid Alert System for Food and Feed (RASFF).[1] Epidemiological data, analytical data and tracing-back information were extracted from the notifications posted by the involved MSs in RASFF. The aim of the assessment was to evaluate all incidents of histamine intoxication to verify the possible correlation upstream in the food supply chain through one of the food business operators involved. Based on the available information, it was possible to identify correlations among some of the incidents. However, a single event at a specific point in the food supply chain that could be considered the origin of all clusters of human cases was not identified. Due to the nature of histamine and the conditions that favour its production, it is likely that several concurrent factors have occurred at several stages along the food chain.

Germany asked, whether the BfR-tool FoodChainLab had been used in the investigation. EFSA stated that it had not been used.

[1] EFSA (European Food Safety Authority), 2017. Assessment of the incidents of histamine intoxication in some EU countries. EFSA supporting publication 2017:EN-1301. 37 pp. doi:10.2903/sp.efsa.2017.EN-1301. http://www.efsa.europa.eu/it/supporting/pub/1301e

6.5. Update on the joint ECDC/EFSA Molecular Typing Database for PFGE and MLVA

In response to a request by the Network, Valentina Rizzi provided an update on the joint ECDC/EFSA Molecular Typing Database for PFGE and MLVA. Following the Enterohaemorrhagic *Escherichia coli* (EHEC) crisis in 2011, a Commission vision paper was endorsed by the MSs in December 2012[2]. Thereafter, the EC asked EFSA to provide technical support regarding the collection of molecular typing data in food, feed and animal isolates of *Salmonella*, *Listeria monocytogenes* and Verotoxigenic *Escherichia coli* (VTEC), and a similar request was made to ECDC on molecular typing data of human isolates. In addition, the Commission asked EFSA and ECDC to establish a joint database for the molecular typing data of these foodborne pathogens of human and non-human origin. The aim of the joint EFSA-ECDC database is to enhance routine surveillance and outbreak identification by enabling detection of microbiological links between isolates of human and of non-human origin. A specific Collaboration Agreement has been signed by the parties involved to address issues with regard to data ownership, availability, access, use and publication. MSs willing to participate in the data collection activities have to sign an agreement with EFSA. An update was given on the status of engagement of the laboratories in MSs and about the number of isolates received by EFSA and shared in the joint ECDC-EFSA database.

Sweden and Denmark asked for information on which isolates should be included in the joint ECDC-EFSA database. EFSA will make recommendations on the type of isolates to be submitted to the joint database. Greece asked about the procedure of data submission; EFSA answered that both Bionumerics or the DCF can be used and encouraged all countries to participate even if they do not have the data ready, or data are no longer produced - as the historical data are also accepted for inclusion in the database.

7. Any other business

Frank Boelaert presented an update on the EuroCigua project, which is implemented through a Framework Partnership Agreement and Specific Agreements, and is co-funded by EFSA. Recently, a request for information on aggregated and case-based data related to ciguatera food poisoning was sent by EFSA to the Focal Points Network. The zoonoses monitoring data Network members advised that information about this matter has been already shared through the Focal Points Network.

8. Dates for next meeting

Next meeting proposed dates – budget permitting – with AMR Network meeting back to back: 8-9/11/2018 or 13-14/11/2018. EFSA will inform the Network members on the final dates.

9. Conclusions

A summary of the main discussions and agreements reached during the meeting was presented. The Chairs informed that the list of main actions will be emailed to the Network members after the meeting. The Chairs requested the Network members to complete the evaluation form and to submit ideas for discussion at future Network meetings.

10. Closure of the Network meeting

The Chairs thanked the Network members for an intensive and productive meeting, and closed the meeting at 13:30.

[2] EC (European Commission), 2012. Vision paper on the development of data bases for molecular testing of foodborne pathogens in view of outbreak preparedness. http://ec.europa.eu/food/safety/docs/biosafety-crisis-vision-paper_en.pdf

Appendix: List of Action Points

Scientific Network for Zoonoses Monitoring Data
Minutes of the of the 35th meeting

Held on 18-19 October 2017, Parma

Draft list of the action points agreed at the meeting

Agenda Point	What	Agreement/Comment	Deadline
4.2	Extending deadlines for consultation of EUSR on zoonoses and FBO 2016	MS to send their comments to zoonoses@efsa.europa.eu	3 November 2017
4.3	Issues encountered during 2016 reporting period	EFSA to implement the solutions presented during the meeting	31 January 2018
4.3	Rejection of the file in 'submitted' status	EFSA to explore the possibility to implement the rejection at the data providers level (currently is done only by the reporting officer)	30 March 2018
4.3	Final acceptance of the national report	EFSA to explore the possibility to implement the acceptance of the national report by the reporting officer using just one click	30 March 2018
4.3	The tasks of the reporting officers (RO)	Network members to communicate any additional task of reporting officers (RO). The actual tasks of the reporting officers are listed below: - National coordinator of the data collection, reporting and validation - RO nominates the national experts involved data reporting and validation - RO ensures the communication between EFSA and national experts (data providers) - RO is the only person who can see all the data reported by all national organisations - RO decides the access rules for Microstrategy reports for other experts than the data providers (e.g. Focal point)	30 November 2018
4.3	Follow-up on the tasks of the reporting officers (RO)	EFSA to circulate the final tasks of RO for agreement by the network members	8 December 2017
4.6	New analytical methods proposed by Denmark	EFSA to contact the relevant EURLs and to communicate the final proposal of new analytical methods to the network members	11 November 2017
4.6	New terms proposed and agreed (**'Surveillance, based on Regulation 2073',**	EFSA to provide definitions and the context in which these terms should be used	27 October 2017

Agenda Point	What	Agreement/Comment	Deadline
	'private sampler' and '**Visual inspection'**)		
4.6	New terms to be included in the catalogues for 2017 data collection	Reporting officer to provide any new term within the agreed deadline	11 November 2017
4.6	All the documentations for 2017 data collection to be provided on time.	Reporting manuals and catalogues to be sent for consultation on 10 January 2018 (until 24 January 2018) and to be published on 31 January 2018	31 January 2018
4.6	Need for a document/guideline that summarises the process of reporting including deadlines and available tools for reporting countries	EFSA to explore the possibility to prepare this document	28 February 2018
4.6	The deadlines of 2017 data reporting and validation	Reporting officer to clearly communicate to the national experts the deadlines for 2017 data reporting and validation	27 October 2017
4.7	Text forms revision	EFSA to provide the Word template according to the 'amended' structure of the text forms	30 November 2017
4.9	EFSA Catalogue Browser (the tool to navigate EFSA catalogues)	EFSA to provide Catalogue Browser and documentation	31 January 2018
4.9	Accessing the versions of EFSA Catalogues available in the DCF	EFSA to provide instructions on how to get the updates in the catalogues versions using the Web Services interacting with DCF	15 November 2017
4.10	Data reporting on *Campylobacter* in fresh broiler meat using the enumeration method (Commission Regulation (EU) 2017/1495)	EFSA to contact the EC and clarify the details of data collected on *Campylobacter* in fresh broiler meat. EFSA to inform MS	30 November 2017
6.1	MS requested to be consulted on the KPIs established for data quality	EFSA to consult the Network members about the final KPIs to be applied in the pilot	30 November 2017
6.1	To agree on dates for Yammer meetings	EFSA to set up doodle polls for November meetings on KPIs for data quality. MS to express their interest in participating in the KPIs discussions	23 October 2017
6.2	What kind of data should be collected?	EFSA to take into account the topics of discussion proposed for the next network meetings (agenda) – Proposals for amending the legislation as regards more harmonised sampling and reporting for zoonoses would need to be tabled by the MS with the EC and appropriate channels (PAFF Committee)	continuous
6.3	Update on the EFSA EU-FORA	EFSA will send an e-mail including the	30 October

Agenda Point	What	Agreement/Comment	Deadline
		link to the calls on the EFSA website and a text/message for publication on the national websites. Network Member to disseminate the information on the upcoming programme	2017
6.5	Joint ECDC-EFSA Molecular Typing database	EFSA to make recommendations on the type of isolates to be submitted to the joint database	30 November 2017
7	Allow MS access to additional analysis features tools in Microstrategy	EFSA to take into consideration the requests of the MS and plan accordingly the training activities Organising webinars for Microstrategy in small groups	28 February 2018
7.1	Evaluation survey: https://ec.europa.eu/eusurvey/runner/Scientific_Network_for_Zoonoses_Monitoring_Data_evaluation_of_35th_meeting	MS to consider filling in this survey	30 October 2017
7.2	Dates for next meeting Proposal: 1,5 day meeting Option 1: Thursday-Friday: 8-9 November 2018 Option 2: Tuesday-Wednesday: 13-14 November 2018	EFSA to inform the Network Members on the final dates	30 November 2017