

Network on Chemical Occurrence Data Minutes of the technical meeting on data quality and data sharing

Held on 18-19 October 2016, Parma

(Agreed on 19 December 2016)

Participants

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

Country	Name ¹
Austria	Josef Wolf
Belgium	Kathy Brison (first day)
Bulgaria	Emil Simeonov
Cyprus	Eftychia Christou
Croatia	Sandra Bašić
Czech Republic	Irena Rehurkova Jiří Vysloužil
Denmark	Jens Hinge Andersen Louise Grønhøj Hørbye Jensen
Estonia	Kadi Padur
Finland	Apologies
France	Jean-Cédric Reninger
Germany	Eva Scharfenberg Michael Jud (second day, via web-conference)
Greece	Apologies
Hungary	László Mészáros
Ireland	Eileen O'Dea
Italy	Michele De Martino Augusto Alberto Pastorelli
Latvia	Dzintars Zacs (first day)
Lithuania	Agnetė Grušauskienė (first day)

Luxembourg	Apologies
Malta	Apologies
Netherlands	Rob Theelen
Poland	Andrzej Starski
Portugal	Luisa Oliveira
Romania	Apologies
Slovakia	Angela Světlíková
Slovenia	Marko Luci
Spain	Maria José Rubio Victoria Marcos Suárez (via web-conference)
Sweden	David Foster
United Kingdom	Adam Locker Sian Thomas
Norway	Per Bratterud

- **European Commission**

Thomas Wenzl (European Commission Joint Research Centre – Institute for Reference Materials and Measurements (Directorate Health Consumers and Reference Materials))

- **EFSA:**

Evidence Management (DATA) Unit: Francesco Vernazza (Chair), Doreen Dolores Russell (Scientific Secretary), Mary Gilsenan, Enikő Varga, Stefano Cappè, Ilaria Magliano, Adriano Di Pasquale*, Mario Monguidi*, Valentina Bocca*, Jane Richardson*, José Gomez Ruiz*.

(*attended for specific agenda items)

- **Others (pre-accession countries):**

Merjem Bushati (Albania)
Dinhaida Tahirovic (Bosnia-Herzegovina)
Biljana Markovska (FYR of Macedonia)
Danijela Sukovic (Montenegro)
Separ Hanci (Turkey)

Day 1: 18 October 2016

1. Welcome and apologies for absence

The Chair welcomed the participants to the technical meeting on data quality and data sharing of the Network on Chemical Occurrence data.

Apologies were received from the Finland, Greece, Luxembourg, Malta and Romania representatives.

2. Adoption of agenda

The agenda was updated with additional points shortly before the meeting. The updated agenda was adopted without changes.

3. Agreement of the minutes of the 10th meeting of the Network on Chemical occurrence data held on 7-8 April 2016, EFSA - Parma

The minutes were agreed by written procedure and published on the EFSA website on 20 May 2016.

4. Topics for discussion

4.1. Confirmation of terms of reference of the Network

Francesco Vernazza (DATA Unit) outlined the legal basis for establishment of Networks and how the Network fits with EFSA strategic objectives in the EFSA Strategy 2020 – trusted science for safe food. In particular he highlighted that in order to ensure the relevance of the Network and the alignment with the evolving needs, the terms of reference of on-going Networks are reviewed every three years.

In relation to the composition of the network it was highlighted that the original schema of having a member and an alternate has been extended to include more alternate members in line with the topics and scope of the meetings.

The specific tasks foreseen in the present terms of reference of the Network were described and the participants were asked if any tasks should be added, modified or deleted.

The Netherlands asked if there are different terms of reference for other networks such as zoonoses which were confirmed to be the case. Referring to the task 'Acting as national reference point for planning (including mid-term planning) and organising of data collections (including annual and ad-hoc ones) for the occurrence of chemical substances in food and feed' Germany requested clarity on the meaning of 'mid-term planning reference point'. EFSA clarified that the discussions regularly taking place in the Network meetings on the different aspects of the data collections (e.g. deadlines, adoption of updated standards or tools) are included in this task.

Following the discussion the Network confirmed the terms of reference as presented.

4.2. Revision of business rules and implementation on the data provider side

Enikő Varga (DATA Unit) informed the network of the enhancements and changes to the new data workflow (workflow 2, WF2) in the Data Collection Framework (DCF). It was highlighted, that for data providers the main changes are that only XML files can be uploaded into the DCF in WF2, and the XML schema has been slightly modified to improve its functionality; additionally, once the data are valid a button is now available to the data provider to confirm the submission of the data. An important improvement is that in WF2 it is possible to replace or delete a single row of a dataset, without the need of re-submitting the entire dataset (as it was necessary in the old workflow). Enikő also highlighted

that EFSA shared a tool, which converts the old XML schema into the new one. The tool is available in the DMS².

By the end of 2016, cleaning/validation reports will be available in the DWH enabling visualisation of data summaries.

To support WF2 the business rules have been re-written and the new version has been implemented in the DCF. Specific requirements specific business rules have been already implemented in the DCF for some contaminants in particular acrylamide and furan, but implementation of further specific requirements in the DCF is on-going. Error and warning messages related to the business rules will be also improved. Planned new business rules will deliver warnings also in the event that high level (Level 1) parameter (e.g. "Dioxins") or matrix (e.g. grains) groups are reported. EFSA intends to clean the reporting catalogues to deprecate the use of high level codes and duplicate catalogue entries will also be deprecated. The process for this involves the consultation of the EFSA scientific units (on-going).

The opinion of the Network was requested to help defining the date when the major update of the catalogues should be available.

Ireland and Norway advised that publication before the end of the year (to allow alignment of national systems to EFSA's) is their preference while Germany's preference was June, though end of the year before the reporting season was also acceptable (allowing enough time to adopt national mapping tables). Italy suggested October so that the catalogues are available not just for reporting but also for sampling officers taking samples. EFSA highlighted the advantage of aligning the major release for all the EFSA data collections. Considering the suggestions of the Network, EFSA will further consult internally with data stakeholders regarding the major release of the catalogues.

The outcome of the consultation and the timeline for the update of the catalogues will be shared with the Network.

Action: EFSA to consult internally with EFSA data stakeholders keeping into account the suggestions of the Network and to inform the Network as soon as an agreement on the timeline for the major release of the catalogues has been reached.

In response to questions from Norway, Ireland, Portugal and Sweden about the availability of the catalogues and business rules, EFSA clarified that the latest versions both of the catalogues and the business rules are already available in the DCF. It was also highlighted, that the catalogues are amended (e.g. new PARAM codes added) continuously, but there is only one official update annually. The Network requested to make the annual update of the catalogues publicly available also in Excel format on the EFSA homepage. EFSA confirmed that the catalogues will be available in Excel format once per year after the annual update.

² Available at <https://dms.efsa.europa.eu/otcs/cs.exe/open/15934073>

Ireland and the Czech Republic requested to develop a tool to detect in the Excel catalogues (in particular PARAM) the deprecated terms. EFSA said that this request will be taken into account while building the structure of the Excel file.

Denmark asked whether the SAS codes used by EFSA for checking business rules can be shared with data providers. EFSA confirmed that these could be provided. The United Kingdom pointed out, that these codes should be made publicly available to all countries, preferably coded in “open source” software. EFSA explained that this suggestion will be taken into consideration and might be addressed in a procurement project. It was also highlighted that the business rules are already available in a platform free, XML format in the DCF³.

Action: EFSA to follow-up on the initiative of making the business rules SAS codes available to the data providers.

In relation to WF2 the Czech Republic welcomed the changes and requested to be notified when some Matrix codes are deprecated and also asked if testing the files is possible in WF2. EFSA confirmed that the test folder will be created. France asked whether it would be possible to automatically create the acrylamide code starting from the FoodEx1 or FoodEx2 codes. EFSA explained that unfortunately it's not possible to do this automatically, only at high level, which is not sufficient to reach the level of detail needed for the acrylamide data assessment.

4.3. Presentation on the Data quality framework partnership agreement – pilot study

Francesco Vernazza (DATA unit) introduced the discussion on data quality and the planned data quality Framework Partnership Agreement (FPA) pilot study scheduled to start in 2017 with five Member States (MSs) who provide monitoring data to EFSA. He advised that data quality relates to fitness for use of the data. The pilot FPA aims to define data quality requirements (data quality objectives, DQO) and tests to evaluate the extent to which requirements are met (Performance Indicators, PI). The background concepts underpinning the FPA were presented, namely to have more stable funding to support co-ordination at country level, monitor and improve data quality and to provide long-term funding to data providers. Participating MSs will be required to develop and test the following actions: enhancing data co-ordination at national level, providing data stewardship for quality monitoring/improvement and for implementation of system enhancements in data collection. A co-financing scheme (50% EFSA, 50% MSs) will be applied. The pilot's timetable was outlined to the meeting.

EFSA will share the updates from the pilot project with all MSs.

4.4. Presentation, discussion and agreement of the draft data quality performance indicators

³ From the DCF data provider starting page : data collections-Chemical Contaminants-CHEM_OCC_SSD1_WF2- button 'download BRs'

Francesco Vernazza presented a draft proposal for evaluating data quality objectives related to completeness, timeliness, validity, consistency, accuracy and uniqueness, as well as possible PIs that could be used by the data providers and EFSA to measure them.

In the discussion which followed, MSs provided constructive feedback on the draft objectives and proposed ways to measure them.

There was general agreement on the need to ensure good quality of the data for use in risk assessment and in view of a more open approach to data.

Some network members were in favour of establishing PIs because these contribute to having/using/sharing good data. They suggested to carefully considering the implementation of PIs, taking into account the possible influence of factors, such as catalogues, business rules and a possible temporary unavailability of the EFSA transmission system. Other network members expressed a preference for a compliance/non-compliance approach. Others suggested defining standard levels for the different data quality aspects but also measuring the progress with respect to them, putting emphasis on continuous improvement.

Some network members highlighted the importance of representativeness of data and suggested to take it into account in the quality framework. Regarding timeliness, opinions ranged between supporting early delivery of data and even measuring the 'freshness' of the data with respect to the sampling date to acknowledging compliance with the deadline (on-time/not on-time approach).

EFSA acknowledged the different positions and highlighted that it is important that the data arrives on time both for efficiency in the data management process and for the availability of data for use. Answering to a specific request on timeliness objectives for the FPA pilot EFSA said that data should be transmitted as normal for the annual data collection and that responses to clarification requests should be within the 10 working days deadline. Answering to a proposal of considering timeliness from the point of sampling to the availability of the analytical results in the national database, EFSA recognised the importance for some MSs of having a quality objective on this and encouraged participants to find ways of gathering this specific information for an additional quality objective.

EFSA also informed the Network that there will be further discussion with the countries participating in the FPA pilot (see point 4.3) and that the pilot will involve three other data collections in addition to chemical contaminants (Pesticide Residues, Zoonoses and Veterinary Medicinal Product Residues).

Taking into account the comments received and given the lack of alignment of the Network on some questions, EFSA proposed the following approach which the Network agreed.

A starting list of priority data quality objectives is defined:

- 1. Respect of the deadline of the data collection and possibilities for early availability of data;***
- 2. Freshness of the data (time between sampling and availability of the data for analysis in the national or EFSA database) (proposal from Ireland- feasibility to be checked);***

- 3. Quickness in answering to requests for changes, clarifications of confirmation;**
- 4. Early identification and resolution of potential problems of duplication of records or inconsistencies ;**
- 5. Completeness of the dataset with respect to the multi-annual national control plan (proposal from Ireland) and to the inclusion of all results (detected and not detected);**
- 6. Early identification and management of potential outliers (for VAL, LOD or LOQ) or mistakes in the unit of measurement;**
- 7. Identification of the matrix (e.g. Food) at detailed level and respecting the rules for the use of the matrix catalogue (e.g. FoodEx2);**
- 8. Precise identification of the Parameter (analyte) not using generic browsing terms;**
- 9. Pertinence of the combinations parameter-matrix in the data;**
- 10. Use of non-generic descriptors for mandatory catalogue-based elements.**

It is premature to precisely define PIs and ways of measuring them. Therefore, it was suggested to include in the tasks of the FPA pilot:

- 1. focus on selected qualitative aspects of particular importance for the use of data (e.g. the above list);***
- 2. identification of possibilities of optimising data quality on these aspects and***
- 3. development of monitoring tools for these aspects.***

EFSA proposed to test the quality concepts in the pilot and then report back to the Networks on the findings with a view to shaping a future data quality framework.

Action: EFSA to update the tasks of the data stewards in the FPA pilot with the quality objectives and the proposals for optimising and monitoring the achievement of the quality objectives.

4.5. How to indicate countries in WHO data reporting

Enikő Varga presented the background to raw chemical (contaminant and food additive) data sharing with the WHO (World Health Organisation) as a continuation of the discussion on this subject during the November 2015 and April 2016 meetings. An e-mail consultation followed the meetings and two-thirds of the Network agreed - with certain caveats such as indicating sampling country as EU – to raw share data.

The Netherlands stated that in accordance with Codex considerations EU can only be used in case of harmonised sampling but if it is not harmonised then the country of sampling should be reported. Norway asked if the country of sampling will be masked (Enikő confirmed that this is the case) and remarked that Norway is part of the EEA and not the EU.

Among countries not having answered to the consultation, Cyprus responded that in-house discussion is needed before providing an answer, while Estonia has no problem with data sharing with country name. Denmark added that for data on the WHO website it has no objections to show the country but does not want to be the only country doing so.

Finally, EFSA agreed to check with other countries that have not yet given agreement for data transmission to WHO and emphasised the advantage of EFSA submitting data to WHO on behalf of the MSs in preventing the need of double reporting by MSs.

Day 2: 19 October 2016

4.6. Presentation and discussion of LOQs in dioxins

Thomas Wenzl (JRC) presented the background to the protocol for calculating censoring limits (limit of detection, LOD and limit of quantification, LOQ) in dioxins. Different methods are used in practice to estimate the limits for different substances. In particular there are two different practices in place: one for heavy metals, polycyclic aromatic hydrocarbons and mycotoxins, and the other for dioxins. For dioxins, the legislation prescribes to estimate the LOQ and sets provisions for the approach to estimate LOQ, which is for estimation based on signal-to-noise ratios of analyte signals. The LOD is not considered important in the area of dioxins and PCBs. Consequently, reported left-censored data are likely to represent estimates of the LOQ. Further harmonisation through the European Union reference laboratories is expected in this area and it is possible that in the future the revised approach for calculating the censoring limits being defined may become mandatory for all substances.

Denmark questioned if censoring limits in dioxins reported as LOD instead of LOQ would need to be amended. EFSA clarified that for data reported as below the LOD no impact is expected in the exposure assessment; however, replacement of the entries in the database with LOQ may be considered in due course. EFSA also suggested include the LOQ reporting requirement in next update of the EFSA specific requirements document⁴. EFSA emphasised that based on the clarifications provided the data may be checked by the data provider before sending them to EFSA.

Denmark supported the inclusion of a clear reference for LOQ for dioxins in the specific requirements document while Germany said this should be reflected in the scientific opinion on dioxins in preparation at EFSA. EFSA confirmed that it is carefully evaluating the data and that MSs have been contacted to provide clarifications.

⁴Available at : <https://www.efsa.europa.eu/en/supporting/pub/833e> - <https://www.efsa.europa.eu/en/supporting/pub/921e>

Action: EFSA to add the LOQ requirement for dioxins in the next version of the specific requirements.

4.7. Ex-ante clearance in the context of requests for public access to documents (PAD requests)

The Chair informed the network that at the recent EFSA Pesticides network meeting an ex-ante agreement between MSs and EFSA on information to be shown or masked in the context of requests for public access to documents according to Regulation (EC) No 1049/2001 of the European Parliament and of the Council (PAD requests) has been proposed to avoid contacting MSs each time EFSA receives a PAD request. EFSA proposes to adopt the same approach in the chemical occurrence data domain. The Chair explained that a presentation of the proposal will be tabled on the agenda of the next network meeting early next year for a decision.

4.8. Presentation, discussion and agreement of the updated draft proposal for data sharing

In relation to the open data proposal (data proactively made public in the EFSA DWH) the data fields that -based on discussions in previous network meetings- could be suitable for publication were presented and a final view of the Network was sought on those data elements. Two options were proposed, one with 39 data elements of the Standard Sample Description (SSD) and one with 53 SSD data elements. The network members expressed the wish not to (potentially) damage commercial interests and EFSA reminded that the chosen fields were already selected with this in mind. EFSA asked whether agreement could be found on either of the two proposals. EFSA also asked which MSs have an open data portal and only two MSs confirmed this though others indicated that it was planned for the future.

In the conclusion of the discussion, some network members highlighted the need for involving higher decisional levels at country level and gathering agreement even for the 39 data elements proposal.

EFSA made the following proposal that was accepted by the Network:

- EFSA will prepare a document which will be sent to the Network Members to get the formal agreement of the competent entities in the country to share 39 elements (of SSD; equivalent ones if passing to the updated version SSD2) that were considered by the Network as not creating particular concern if shared;
- For the countries that agree with the proposal, the data will be made available on the EFSA web-site under the conditions established in the document. The data from countries not reaching an agreement at national level will not be included in the dataset.

Action: EFSA to draft the document on proactive data sharing (39 SSD elements) and circulate it to the Network.

Action: Network members to liaise with the national competent authorities seeking the agreement on the proposal and reporting back to EFSA if the agreement is reached.

4.9. Discussion on the use of collaborative tools (like Yammer) and a community of expertise

The usefulness of the social media tool Yammer as a co-operation platform for sharing information and receiving notifications from the group was highlighted as was its potential use in the pilot FPA and in the discussion on data quality.

France pointed out the limitations of the tool such as the missing versioning of the shared files while Norway advised that using a work email was problematic in some cases. EFSA said that to be useful the platform should be used by everyone in the Network; EFSA will provide support to address access issues. Testing whether using links to the EFSA document management system (DMS) can be used to manage different versions of the documents might improve the ease of use.

4.10. Publications related to the Circle of Trust

EFSA reminded the Network of the Terms of Reference for the Circle of Trust (CoT) and the conditions governing sharing⁵. A central foundation of the CoT initiative was the agreement that the data available could be used in publications and for data analysis. EFSA encouraged the (possibly joint) publication of studies by the members of the CoT. In relation to this, Denmark asked about possible publication of a study on Arsenic that was shown at the last network meeting. In relation to this wish France asked if Denmark required permission to share the Arsenic data shown previously. Denmark clarified that the study was only a test on the use of the data and was not used or published; therefore, as part of the agreement permission from the other MSs was at that stage not required. For the present request, the conditions of the CoT will be followed.

Ireland informed to have experienced problems when using Microstrategy and also highlighted that CoT members should be kept informed of how the data is shared.

Cyprus stated that membership of the CoT has tangible benefits such as finding information on use of new analytical methods.

5. Any Other Business

5.1. Date for next meeting

EFSA proposed to hold the 11th Network Meeting on Chemical Occurrence Data in 2017 in the week of 24-28 April 2017.

Post meeting note: at a later stage, after the meeting, the proposed date was changed into 4-5 May 2017, to allow a shared session with the Pesticide Network on subjects of common interest.

⁵ <https://www.efsa.europa.eu/sites/default/files/assets/CircleOfTrust.pdf>

5.2. Data validation report

Adriano di Pasquale gave the Network information about the new automated validation reports which will replace the current system of manual production of reports. The present system is resource intensive and has the potential to generate errors. The new system will allow data providers to confirm validation reports directly from Microstrategy. The deployment of the new automated validation report feature is on-going and the Network will be notified as soon as it is available. The Chair asked to clarify how the data provider will know when the online validation report is ready. The speaker replied that once data is included as 'valid' in the DCF the validation report will be available the following day in Microstrategy. The data provider can ask EFSA to reject the data in the DCF if issues are found in the report in Microstrategy.

Denmark asked about running the validation report in the test system (a specific area of the DCF for testing the files without actually delivering them). EFSA agreed to investigate and possibly implement this feature.

A live demonstration of how to access and run the validation report using Microstrategy was performed. For those not yet having access it was reminded that it should be requested by sending a message to data.collection@efsa.europa.eu

Action: EFSA to inform the Network as soon as the new automated validation report generation is activated.

5.3. AOB

Poland asked if in 2017 data can be sent with SSD2 (e.g. for the countries in the SSD2 pilot project); EFSA confirmed that it is possible specifying that the data will be stored in the DCF as SSD2 but will be converted in SSD1 format in the EFSA Data Warehouse. The conversion will be done by EFSA.

With regard to the deadlines for the contaminants data collection, the usual deadline (1 October 2017) will apply while the opening of the data collection will be established taking into account the requirements of the legislation for certain contaminants. Sweden and Norway asked about aligning SSD2 for pesticide residues and contaminants which is not yet possible but is under discussion in the Pesticide Network.

Norway asked about reporting requirements for Veterinary Medicinal Products Residues. EFSA confirmed that Veterinary Medicinal Products Residues will start as an SSD2 data collection and that MSs sending data in simplified format can send it even before the DCF data collection is open, as such files require additional time to be separately converted to the standard format.

Action: the Chair asked those countries that failed to meet the 1 October deadline to send by e-mail a forecast of what is pending and when EFSA can expect to have the data.

Croatia asked about the acrylamide deadline which EFSA confirmed is June. If this causes problems in MSs the Network was invited to bring the problem in the EC meetings in an attempt to have a single deadline for all contaminants.

Finally, Norway asked for the pesticides network meeting to be in the same week as the chemical network to ease travel and suggested a joint meeting. As specified in section 5.1, the request was positively addressed with Pesticides after the Network and resulted in a new proposed date for the first meeting in 2017.

The wish for background information on the network and training was expressed by Albania; EFSA assured that possibilities in this direction will be investigated.

6. Closure of the meeting

The meeting was closed at 13:00 as planned.

The participants were thanked for their active participation and contribution to the meeting and advised that the draft minutes would be circulated to the network for their comments and endorsement.

Draft list of the action points agreed at the meeting

Agenda Point	Action point	Deadline	Status
4.2	EFSA to consult internally with EFSA data stakeholders on the timeline for the major release of the catalogues keeping into account the suggestions of the Network and to inform the Network as soon as an agreement has been reached.		Pending
4.2	EFSA to follow-up on the initiative of making the business rules SAS codes available to the data providers		Pending
4.4	EFSA to update the tasks of the data stewards in the FPA pilot with the quality objectives and the proposals for optimising and monitoring the achievement of the quality objectives.		Done
4.6	EFSA to add the LOQ requirement for dioxins in the next version of the specific requirements.		Pending
4.8	EFSA to draft the document on proactive data sharing (39 SSD elements) and circulate it to the Network.		Pending
4.8	Network members to liaise with the national competent authorities seeking the agreement on the proposal for proactive data sharing and reporting back to EFSA if the agreement is reached.		Pending
5.2	EFSA to inform the Network as soon as the new automated validation report generation is activated.		Pending
5.3	The Chair asked those countries that failed to meet the 1 October deadline to send by e-mail a forecast of what is pending and when EFSA can expect to have the data.		Done

Network on Chemical Occurrence Data Minutes of the 10th meeting

Held on 7-8 April 2016, Parma

(Agreed on 20 May 2016)

Participants

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

Country	Name ¹
Austria	Elke Rauscher-Gabernig
Belgium	Apologises
Bulgaria	Emil Simeonov
Cyprus	Eftychia Christou
Croatia	Sandra Bašić
Czech Republic	Irena Rehurkova
Denmark	Jens Hinge Andersen Louise Grønhøj Hørbye Jensen
Estonia	Kadi Padur
Finland	Johanna Suomi
France	Jean-Cédric Reninger
Germany	Eva Scharfenberg
Greece	Leonidas Palilis
Hungary	László Mészáros
Ireland	Eileen O'Dea
Italy	Michele De Martino
Latvia	Dzintars Zacs
Lithuania	Agnetė Grušauskienė
Luxembourg	Nathalie Welschbillig
Malta	Apologises
Netherlands	Jacqueline Castenmiller
Poland	Andrzej Starski
Portugal	Maria Antónia Calhau

Romania	Ioana Madalina Georgescu
Slovakia	Angela Světlikova
Slovenia	Marko Luci
Spain	Victoria Marcos Suárez (via web-conference)
Sweden	David Foster Petra Fohgelberg
United Kingdom	Rob Woods Alan Dowding
Norway	Per Bratterud

- **Hearing Experts**

Mafalda Filipe: DTU (on web-conference for item 4.5), Eleni Ioannou-Kakouri (for items 4.6, 4.8)

- **EFSA:**

Evidence Management Unit: Francesco Vernazza (Chair), Doreen Dolores Russell (Scientific Secretary), Enikő Varga, Stefano Cappè, Ilaria Magliano, Adriano Di Pasquale (participated in agenda points 4.2 and 4.3), Francesca Riolo (participated in agenda point 4.9), Alessandro Carletti (participated in agenda points 4.10, 4.11 and 4.12), Mario Monguidi (participated in agenda point 4.17), José Ángel Gómez Ruiz (participated in agenda point 4.19).

Legal and Regulatory Affairs Unit: Citlali Pintado (participated in agenda point 4.7).

Finance Unit: Sosanna Tasiou (participated in agenda point 4.13).

Day 1: 7 April 2016

1. Welcome and apologies for absence.

The Chair welcomed the participants to the 10th meeting of the Network on Chemical Occurrence data. As a number of attendees were attending this network for the first time a short tour de table was undertaken.

Apologies were received from the Belgium and Malta representatives and from Thomas Wenzl of the JRC-Geel.

2. Adoption of agenda

The agenda was adopted without changes.

3. Agreement of the minutes of the 9th meeting of the Network on Chemical occurrence data held on 11-13 November 2015, EFSA - Parma

The minutes were agreed by written procedure and published on the EFSA website on 19 February 2016.

4. Topics for discussion

4.1. The EFSA Scientific data warehouse: status update and the 2016 implementation plan

Stefano Cappè (DATA Unit) updated the Network representatives on the state of play with respect to the EFSA S-DWH (Scientific Data Warehouse). He indicated

that 2016 represents the final phase of the project and updated the network on the status in relation to the implementation plan for 2015. He added that in 2016 an important development envisaged in the S-DWH would be the capability to track the data used in EFSA scientific opinions. However, as a cautionary note, he advised that a feasibility study will be also performed to verify to what extent this requirement can be supported since certain technical issues are already known. He advised that the network will be kept up to date on the progress of this task.

4.2. The EFSA Scientific data warehouse: needs for refresher training

Adriano Di Pasquale (DATA Unit) introduced the network to the logical architecture and the main functionalities of the S-DWH.

4.3. The EFSA Scientific data warehouse: managing data access

Adriano Di Pasquale updated the network representatives on the current situation with regard to the access rules to the S-DWH, explaining the main stakeholder groups and their rights with respect to data visibility. In particular, he reminded the network of the Circle of Trust pilot initiative: namely those members of the Circle of Trust are data providers who have agreed to share their occurrence data with the other Circle of Trust members.

A live demonstration of the S-DWH was conducted, aimed at providing refresher training for the network representatives. The WEB interface was presented to the network and its main functionalities demonstrated. Referring to this demonstration and in order to gauge the extent of the networks' familiarity with the tool the Chair asked the participants for their experience of navigating the system. Most of the participants indicated that they have already accessed the S-DWH WEB interface.

EFSA then demonstrated how to export data in Excel format or in plain format and also how to perform customised elaborations with the data. A new functionality was presented, the "Microstrategy Microsoft Office plugin" to illustrate how this tool can be used to link reports directly into Excel or PowerPoint.

The importance of using the S-DWH to test and improve the robustness of the system was highlighted by France, with examples of possible needs for improvement. Italy asked about extending some of the functionalities of the system. EFSA responded to this request saying that other features can be added but more time will be needed to enable some configuration of the system. At present, the priority is to complete the scheduled implementation plan before considering the addition of further functionalities to the S-DWH.

Cyprus encouraged all the network members to start using the S-DWH to gain experience of using the system. EFSA emphasised this point reminding the network that data in S-DWH can be accessed in three main ways:

- utilising the S-DWH WEB interface,
- utilising the "Microstrategy Microsoft Office plugin" and
- utilising the "export in text plain format" functionality to perform customised elaborations at data providers' access level.

Denmark asked if the S-DWH can conduct data cleaning: EFSA said that there is a way to export the cleaning codes but it would need to employ the DCF (Data

Collection Framework) in this activity. Denmark also raised a question about the frequency of data uploads in the system. EFSA informed the network that it plans a new release which is expected to result in daily uploads.

4.4. Sharing raw chemical contaminant and additive data with WHO

Enikő Varga (DATA Unit) explained the background to the data cooperation agreement between EFSA and WHO. She described how the sharing of data is realised through this cooperation framework, the changes that are now in place compared to the original agreement and also described the current procedure for submitting the data to WHO. The most recent requests for data from EFSA concern Marine Biotoxins and Pesticides.

All network representatives were asked in turn to provide the position of their respective MS on sharing data on Chemicals and Additives. A number of the representatives indicated that they would need to go back to the data owners to provide an answer to the question. The feedback from this initial consultation will be sent to the network. Ireland asked for further information about the data elements that can be shared emphasising that manufacturers and brand names should not be disclosed. Ireland also made a request for the creation of a general agreement about data sharing.

EFSA also displayed the template used to share data with the WHO and the elements (around 20) included, also highlighting that aggregated data is not shared. Cyprus asked for the template to be provided to the Network and EFSA agreed to circulate it with the draft network minutes.

4.5. Exploiting the EFSA Scientific data warehouse for data to support scientific projects

Mafalda Filipe from the DTU (Danish Technical University) joined the meeting by teleconference to present her work in relation to arsenic. She explained the health risks of organic and inorganic arsenic, the foods that can be contaminated and sources of contamination and the associated diseases together with an estimate of the health burden. The use of data available for this project as a consequence of the Circle of Trust initiative was highlighted.

Cyprus asked for further information about the model that was used to conduct the exposure assessment. The Chair requested that an update on the progress of the study could be presented at a future network meeting and encouraged the network to disseminate information to their own networks and contacts about how data available in the S-DWH can be a source of information for research projects.

4.6. Data Access: Proposals and discussion on data elements that could be made public

Eleni Kakouri, who was invited as hearing expert to support the discussion on data-sharing, introduced the discussion on those reported data elements that could be made public as a matter of routine, within the scope of open data. She indicated that there are several legal and transparency reasons why relevant data should be opened up to all public stakeholders. As part of this effort to identify the data elements that could be routinely available she conducted a written consultation with the network to obtain their views and opinions. The responses and comments expressed by 20 network countries who expressed an opinion were reported back to the meeting to enable the network to formulate

their views in preparation for the breakout session to further consider this issue – see agenda item 4.8.

4.7. Data Access, on-going PAD (public access to documents) requests

Citlali Pintado (LRA Unit) provided an update on the PAD requests received by EFSA. The network was reminded of the legal background and framework to the access to documents requests. The status of a current PAD request for which a consultation with Member States data providers was launched, was also mentioned together with a similar new request.

EFSA clarified that the public access to documents Regulation (EC) No 1049/2001 applies to all the institutions, agencies and bodies of the EU, while individual MSs have their own legislation regarding freedom of information. EU institutions, agencies and bodies are required to provide compelling justifications, such as commercially sensitive information, to support their decisions not to share data.

MSs commented on deadlines in addressing received PAD requests as need to consult with the national data providers. EFSA acknowledged the necessity of taking MSs' time constraints into account adding that the PAD Regulation requires a request to be responded to in 15 working days.

4.8. Breakout session: viable solutions for data access

In order to further consider possible resolutions for data access the network were divided into 3 groups to discuss the data elements and identify a draft structure for a possible public database.

The outcome and recommendations of the discussion groups was summarised and presented by Enikő Varga. While a set of data fields was common to all breakout groups, for other fields no agreement was reached for their inclusion in the database.

The focus of discussion was mainly on the opportunity to include fields that are rarely filled, as they are not representative or misleading in the interpretation of the data. In relation to this, a specific discussion was on the dates: the sampling year is always present while the production date and the expiry date are very rarely reported leading to one of the groups to propose to use the sampling date only. Regarding the text fields in the datasets and in line with the result of the consultations previously carried out with the MSs, the starting proposal was to exclude all of them because they potentially undermine the protection of commercial interests of natural or legal persons. EFSA suggested sharing all the data fields used in the production of EFSA's scientific output and include also the other fields where the information is normally reported and unambiguous. The sampling year should be present, while the other non-filled dates might be initially excluded so as not to populate the database with empty fields.

Ireland suggested that all suspect sampling records should also be removed to avoid distorted statistics. Norway suggested an alternative approach and to consider what to exclude from the full data rather than what to include. Guessing what data could be of public interest is not feasible since the use the public will make of the data is not known a priori. Denmark added that there are two questions to be addressed: what data owners say we can share and how to decide on what to share with the public. Ireland added that open data is the future and it is a positive aim but lack of in-place data quality could potentially

be commercially harmful. The UK indicated that including the year of production can be interesting for samples with high levels of contamination and Cyprus noted that it is important to consider which fields contain sensitive information. As the conclusion of the discussion, EFSA proposed to compile the common proposal resulting from the discussion groups and submit it to the network together with a more extended proposal. The network will then be asked to choose the draft proposal to submit for the approval in their respective Member State.

4.9. New workflow for data approval and the new business rules engine based on GDE2: what's changing from last reporting season

Francesca Riolo (DATA Unit) presented an overview of the new GDE2 (Guidance on Data Exchange version 2) workflow in the DCF. She described that in the new workflow, messages replace what were formerly DCF transmissions and the process of file format checks and metadata validation together with the enhancements to the business rules. She showed the steps to data becoming valid, submitted and accepted in the DWH. The new workflow, via the unique identifier, enables the amendment/correction of individual data elements without the need to upload a complete new file.

EFSA agreed to allow Norway access to the pilot data submission in SSD2. Ireland asked for the location of the business rules for each data domain. EFSA replied that once the business rules are available they can be downloaded from the DCF, and demonstrated this using the example of zoonoses business rules available in workflow 2. EFSA confirmed that the new workflow for chemical contaminants will be implemented in 2016.

4.10. The concept of providing feedback in data collection; the new SOP and feedback report

Alessandro Carletti (DATA Unit) explained what happens to data after it is in a valid status in the DCF. He described the procedure of asking for feedback from data providers on the validation reports and data overviews that are sent by EFSA when the data has been subject to the second validation performed by EFSA. He introduced the concept of the validation reports being available in Microstrategy.

Enikő Varga presented some proposals for the data elements to be included in the validation reports. These proposals will be circulated to the network with the draft minutes but she welcomed preliminary opinions on the proposals from the network.

Ireland asked for the inclusion of high level information by occurrence group and by year. A further suggestion was to receive information on the files that never reach the accepted status and also reports on the data that has been excluded. The importance of data quality was strongly emphasised. EFSA clarified that decisions on the exclusion of data are made by the scientific working groups and are outside the remit of data management.

4.11. Status report on the SSD2 pilot projects

Alessandro Carletti updated the network on the progress of the SSD2 (Standard Sample Description version 2) pilot project. He also presented a data comparison between SSD1 and SSD2 using comparable data. This exercise indicated a high level of consistency among the data elements.

Germany asked how the comparison between FoodEx1 with FoodEx2 was performed. EFSA replied that it is currently done by hand adding that EFSA is finalising work on mapping FoodEx2 to FoodEx1 and vice-versa.

A number of the countries participating in the project contributed to the progress report. Spain gave a presentation to the network on the implementation of a computer application fulfilling SSD2, general plus specific requirements and data exchange rules. The main issues encountered during this work were outlined to the meeting as well as the progress made. Cyprus presented the work conducted to date in its progress report. The challenges they encountered included the additional elements needed for reporting VMPPR (Veterinary Medicinal Products Residues) mandatory and dependant mandatory fields. In addition the overlap between data reported for VMPPR, chemical contaminants and pesticides was indicated. EFSA confirmed that for the purposes of the pilot project it is acceptable to have the overlap and thus double transmissions are not erroneous. Germany gave a progress report on its involvement with the pilot project and also the main issues and challenges met. Some recommendations/requests were made including the distribution of SAS data validation procedures, updating and early publication of documents and establishment of a working group on data management. Norway and Sweden strongly supported the idea of creating a data manager's working group. EFSA was in favour of a proposal though it could be difficult to realise at present taking into consideration that the different data domains are not fully aligned and some data collection networks have a greater scientific emphasis while others are more focused on data management. Croatia asked clarifications about the advantage of using compound fields (such as FoodEx) instead of different hierarchies. EFSA explained that compound fields allow flexibility in the use of the terminology while keeping all the terms in a single catalogue.

Denmark presented a progress report on SSD2 VMPPR pilot and main challenges. This covered the background to the arrangements for data reporting at national level, organisational structure reporting, data extraction and transformation of data from LIMS to EFSA language. The main difficulties were also reported including moving from SSD1 to SSD2 data. A recommendation is that EFSA improves coordination in relation to the catalogues such as the PARAM catalogue of substances from chemicals, pesticides and VMPPR as well as the MATRIX catalogue. Croatia requested a database containing all the MRLs (maximum residue limits) to be made available. On this latter point EFSA said that each network country should request the EC to share this information with EFSA so that a database can be created and maintained.

4.12. The process of monitoring data quality

Alessandro Carletti provided the network with an update on data quality. He said that draft KPIs (key performance indicators) have now been developed for certain areas. He also said that data quality objectives have been defined for certain data collections and the timelines for the data quality report and dashboard on Microstrategy agreed. The proposal for quality KPIs will be available by June 2016.

EFSA proposed to create an electronic working group of the network to discuss and revise the quality KPIs with respective data managers in each data domain. The outcome of this cooperative effort would be a final proposal of quality KPIs to be discussed and endorsed in the October meeting of the Network. The following participating countries offered to be part of the group to look at KPIs

from June 2016: Cyprus, Austria, Denmark, Germany, Ireland, the Netherlands Norway, Portugal, Poland, Romania, Sweden, Italy, France, Spain and the United Kingdom.

Day 2: 8 April 2016

5. Welcome and apologies for absence

The Chair welcomed all participants to the second day of the meeting

6. Topics for discussion

6.1. Improving Data: From contracts to partnership

SosannaTasiou (FINANCE Unit) outlined the background to this innovative proposal, which is to establish a strategic partnership agreement with each MS, and how this resonates with the EFSA 2020 Strategy. The mutual benefits of the proposal were described particularly the role of the data steward in each MS and their contribution towards data quality improvements.

If the proposal receives the green light a pilot phase will be launched late in 2016 for a 12 month duration and involving five MSs. The outcome of pilot phase will be vital in defining and refining the project terms of reference.

Norway welcomed the proposal adding that it reflects what they are trying to do. Norway's point was endorsed by Ireland who asked about for a clarification on the co-financing arrangements and limits. The proposal to include a role for the EFSA FP (focal points) as coordinators of the partnership was also explored, and EFSA concurred that the function of this role would need to be refined. One idea was linking the focal point function with each data steward, which could be complemented by linking to a data management network. Ireland asked about the creation of regional consortia which EFSA confirmed it had discussed. Further clarifications were sought such as the necessity for all the national partners to be on EFSA's Article 36 list and the costs to be detailed or not. EFSA responded that details of costs will not be requested and the grant value will be linked to data quantity and cost of living indicators. Ireland asked if a minimum level of KPIs intend to be specified in the agreements and EFSA responded that these will be selected and prioritised in the contracts.

Cyprus welcomed the role of the FPs in the proposal as a positive for the co-ordination role as well as providing a linkage between data collection and the Advisory Forum. On this point, Portugal was concerned that neither the FP nor the Advisory Forum member are responsible for data transmission so practically how can the FP oversee this activities. EFSA replied that the aim of the project is to create a consortium at national level which would be co-ordinated at national level. EFSA also emphasised that the role of data transmission will be a competence of the data steward, a role different from the focal point. In addition, EFSA also anticipate this as a good opportunity for improving coordination activities within each of the MSs.

6.2. Support for using FoodEx2 in the reporting of SSD1 data

Mario Monguidi (DATA Unit) described the progress made on the objective of reporting products from the FoodEx2 catalogue into SSD1, including the timeline for introduction. He elaborated that in order to use FoodEx2 in SSD1 data a mapping was needed and this activity is now complete. Where there is a perfect

match available this was done when possible but when it has not been possible additional rules have been introduced. Examples of each of these scenarios were presented to the participants to illustrate direct and indirect mapping. To progress this proposal of a hybrid SSD1 – FoodEx2 data model was outlined. The network members were asked to contact EFSA in case they would want to use FoodEx2 in SSD1.

Denmark asked EFSA if it would be possible to distribute updates when a new FoodEx2 release is done and EFSA suggested subscribing to the community or request to be included on the distribution list. Ireland also noted that it finds it difficult to keep informed of the annual updates and asked if reported data should include both the FoodEx1 and FoodEx 2. EFSA replied that it should only be one of the FoodEx versions but suggested that even though the mapping has been done it is better to report FoodEx1 when using SSD1.

6.3. SSD2 data reporting – Proposed timetable for moving to SSD2 from SSD1

Stefano Cappè presented the proposed roadmap for moving from SSD1 to SSD2 advising that the guidance on SSD2 stated that for parallel reporting the timeframe should have been as brief as possible. Specifically in the guidance on SSD2 a specific recommendation stated that SSD2 should be implemented by 2018. This schedule had to be revised after the presentation of the SSD2 to the networks in 2013 as some networks asked to start a pilot to evaluate the impact of the updated standard. The pilot was started in 2014 but it is still running. He presented how the data collections should have been performed in 2016, where SSD2 was requested only for the data collection involved in SSD2 pilot and the prospective timetable for 2017, where he anticipated that data in SSD2 could be accepted. He emphasised that in 2017, whether using either SSD1 or SSD2, it will be incumbent on the data providers to transmit all their data for that data collection using the same data model.

Acknowledging 2018 as the date for reporting all data in SSD2 as an ambitious objective EFSA strongly recommended that the roadmap should be shared and discussed at MS level so that feedback can be provided on the timetable.

Spain asked what would happen to those reporting data using the simplified format but who are in the SSD2 pilot. EFSA explained that it will do the conversion and thus can use simplified format for 2016 and then move to using SSD2. Ireland asked if there would be any additional financial assistance to support the implementation of SSD2 and EFSA answered that financial support can be available only through different types of projects e.g. framework partnership agreement on data quality. Denmark and Norway favoured the proposal for using SSD2 in all data collections. EFSA indicated that the roadmap has to be agreed with all the networks involved and well as the relevant EFSA units while the requirements of the different legislations will also have to be taken into account.

6.4. FoodEx2 update: annual maintenance report and on-going activities

Francesco Vernazza (DATA Unit) advised the network representatives of the on-going improvements to the FoodEx2 browser. He indicated that the improved version of the browser is under testing and not yet ready for release; it is easier to install and use and the search functions have been significantly improved. A memory function has been added that allows opening the browsers in the same

point where it was closed while the configuration is more user friendly as the dimensions of the browsing windows are more flexible. The new package can be shared upon request. France and Norway expressed their interest in the new package.

Ilaria Magliano (DATA Unit) presented the updates made as part of the maintenance undertaken by the working group. She outlined how proposals and requests provided by the users were evaluated. As a result new terms have been added, while the names of some existing terms were changed to better specify the scope or to expand their scope. In addition, three terms were dismissed and some terms were changed to 'optional' to address inconsistencies within the logic of the system. Major changes were done in the sections related to tea and herbal/fruit infusions in order to align them with the related regulations and guidelines.

6.5. Development of a new catalogue browser : an introduction

The presentation on this item was included in the previous point.

6.6. Sharing experiences in the use of EFSA catalogue web services

The discussion on this point did not take place due to time constraints.

6.7. The use of data provided by the Member States in recently published/upcoming EFSA opinions and the sharing of information from ad-hoc calls for data

José Angel Gómez Ruiz (DATA Unit) provided an overview on EFSA opinions adopted and to be adopted where data provided by the Member States were used. This included the adopted opinions on 3-MCPD, deoxynivalenol, nitrates and nitrites, erucic acid, dioxins and dioxin-like PCBs and pyrrolizidine alkaloids. Information was also presented on assessments in preparation as well as expected requests for scientific reports on alternaria toxins, ergot alkaloids and perchlorate as well as a new opinion on furan. For alternaria toxins and furans, calls for data have been issued and the respective deadlines were highlighted. The network was reminded of the commission recommendation for the monitoring of acrylamide level in food and call for data on food additive usage levels.

Denmark remarked that it is difficult to manage the varying deadline dates so the data will arrive together. With respect to deadlines EFSA advised that MSs liaise at EC level to discuss the deadlines when attending EC committees, in order to align the different deadlines as suggested by Denmark. Sweden asked for more information on the deadline for perchlorates, EFSA replied that its preferred option would be to include perchlorates in the continuous call for data.

6.8. Next steps in the Total Diet Study exposure project

The Portugal representative presented the TDS (total diet study) exposure project on chronic dietary exposure to chemicals funded by DG Research and recently concluded. The partners in the project together with the terms of reference of the project were explained to the participants. The aim of the project is to test and refine a methodology and deliver a pilot database for use by risk assessors and risk managers. The key results of the pilot study were shared and the usefulness of the project in exposure assessment emphasised to the network members.

EFSA added that the SSD2 is designed to support also the collection of TDS data; therefore the submission of these data is encouraged. .

7. Any Other Business (If applicable)

7.1. Date for next meeting

EFSA proposal to hold the next meeting (focused on data quality) on 17-18 October 2016 was accepted. The 12th Network Meeting on Chemical Occurrence Data will be in 2017 in the week of 24-28 April.

The participants were thanked for their active participation and contribution to the meeting and advised that the draft minutes would be circulated to the network for their input.

8. Closure of the meeting

The meeting was closed at 13:00 as planned.

Scientific Network on Chemical Occurrence data Minutes of the 10th meeting: Technical meeting on data submission

Held on 12-13/11/2015, Parma
Meeting room: M08/09 Time: 9:00-first day – 13:00 last day
(Agreed on 29 January 2016)

Participants

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

Country	Name
Austria	Josef WOLF
Belgium	Kathy BRISON
Bulgaria	Emil SIMEONOV
Cyprus	Eleni IOANNOU KAKOURI Eftychia CHRISTOU PAPACHRYSTOS
Croatia	Sandra BASIC
Czech Republic	Irena REHURKOVA
Denmark	Jens Hinge ANDERSEN Louise Grønhøj Hørbye JENSEN
Estonia	Kadi PADUR
Finland	Niina PAJALIN-MYLLYNEN
France	Jean-Cédric RENINGER
Germany	Apologies
Greece	Leonidas PALILIS
Hungary	Krisztián VARGA
Ireland	Eileen O'DEA
Italy	Michele DE MARTINO Augusto PASTORELLI
Latvia	Dzintars ZACS
Lithuania	Agnietė GRUŠAUSKIENĖ
Luxembourg	Elisa BARILOZZI
Malta	Apologies
Netherlands	Rob THEELEN
Poland	Andrzej STARSKI
Portugal	Luisa OLIVEIRA
Romania	Ioana Madalina GEORGESCU
Slovakia	Angela SVETLIKOVA
Slovenia	Marko LUCI
Spain	Victoria MARCOS (by tele-conference) Petra FOHGELBERG
Sweden	David FOSTER
United Kingdom	Azmi SBAITI
Norway	Inger HALLE SKAGEN

■ EFSA:

DATA Unit: Francesco VERNAZZA (Chair), Mary GILSENAN (HoU)*, Valentina BOCCA*, Stefano CAPPE*, Alessandro CARLETTI*, LLOYD Isabelle*, Simona FUSAR POLI*, Mario MONGUIDI*, Davide GIBIN*, Enikő VARGA, LRA Unit: Luisa VENIER*

(* attended for specific agenda items)

1. Welcome and apologies for absence

The Chair welcomed the participants.

Apologies for absence were received from Günter SOMMERFELD (Germany) and Ingrid BUSUTTIL (Malta).

2. Adoption of agenda and administrative notes

The agenda was adopted without changes.

The administrative aspects of the meeting were presented by Simona Fusar Poli.

3. Topics for discussion

3.1. General presentation on Standard Sample Description 2 (SSD2) usage and FoodEx2 reporting

Enikő Varga summarised the main differences between the new data collection standard (SSD2) and the current one (SSD1) with regard to contaminant occurrence data reporting from Member States to EFSA. Francesco Vernazza gave a presentation about FoodEx2 food classification and description system; he presented the major features of the system and the tools developed to facilitate the use and the quality control of the coding process. He also presented the Technical report on FoodEx2 revision 2¹ published in April 2015 which is based on the outcome of the FoodEx2 pilot studies with Member States and represents a comprehensive reference for FoodEx2. Finally, he outlined the importance of following the coding rules developed by EFSA and the Member States during the pilot phase in order to guarantee a harmonised coding.

Croatia commented that the SSD2 doesn't fully cover food contact materials. Francesco Vernazza confirmed that FoodEx2 included food simulants for migration testing, however all the different chemicals listed as food contact materials are presently out of the scope of FoodEx2.

Italy raised the question of reporting the presence of allergenic food, which may be present as ingredients in other food, such as nuts in chocolate. EFSA agreed to develop a proposal advising how to report food as a contaminant (source of allergens). Denmark requested EFSA to share the validation rules for FoodEx2, in order to introduce them in their national system. It was also requested by Denmark to implement the FoodEx2 validation rules in the SSD2 business rules and make them available to the data providers. EFSA clarified that this work is currently on-going; some more time is required to finalise it, but finally the validation rules will be shared with the Member States.

¹ <http://www.efsa.europa.eu/sites/default/files/assets/804e.pdf>

3.2. Reporting results of pilot on SSD2

Alessandro Carletti presented the scientific cooperation activities with the MSs regarding the testing and implementation of the Standard Sample Description version 2 (SSD2) the aim of which is to have one common data model to submit data electronically to EFSA. Ireland suggested making a comparison between the interpretations of FoodEx2 codes by food classes by different data providers.

In response to a question from Croatia regarding the correct EFSA contact person in case of FoodEx2 coding difficulties; data providers were informed that in case of FoodEx2 coding problems data.catalogues@efsa.europa.eu should be contacted.

Croatia asked a question about the possible starting date of the SSD2 data submission on residues of Veterinary Medical Products. Alessandro Carletti replied that the SSD2 project participants will be informed as soon it will be technically possible.

3.3. Sharing of experience by the participants of the pilot

Five participants (Denmark, Cyprus, Lithuania, Poland and Portugal) of the SSD2 pilot project presented their national data collection and reporting systems, and summarised their experience implementing SSD2 reporting requirements in their national systems.

Sweden asked for clarification about changes in FoodEx2 codes. France also noted changes in food codes between FoodEx2 revision 1 and 2. Francesco Vernazza clarified that during the FoodEx2 revision some food codes needed to be changed because of e.g. duplicate codes for the same term. EFSA reassured that given the comprehensive revision of FoodEx2 that has just taken place² no further changes in the classification requiring re-coding are foreseen.

Denmark requested to report the data in 2016 in SSD2 format only, and highlighted the difficulties and resource demand to maintain two parallel systems. Mario Monguidi replied that some technical work is still needed to configure the Data collection framework (DCF) for accepting and validating data in SSD2 format.

Ireland requested the possibility to report in SSD1 but using FoodEx2 for the food code.

Francesco Vernazza clarified that according to the current procedure SSD2 data can be reported inside the SSD1 format, entering the FoodEx2 codes in the field of "Product comment (S.21)" but the product must be also classified according to FoodEx1.

3.4. Catalogue management process

Mario Monguidi presented an update on the management of the catalogues including the coding scheme used. He advised the meeting participants that the catalogues will be updated in early 2016 and that a new mailbox

² Technical report on 'The food classification and description system FoodEx2 (revision 2)' accessible at <http://www.efsa.europa.eu/sites/default/files/assets/804e.pdf>

data.catalogues@efsa.europa.eu should be used when making requests related to catalogues.

3.5. Web Services and catalogue management, and new workflow for data acceptance

Davide Gibin informed the participants about the new functionalities of the Data Collection Framework (DCF) web interface for transmission of data to EFSA, like partial replacement and partial deletion.

He also presented Web Services, for catalogues, for data uploading and for retrieving information from DCF. A live demo was performed including the operations of downloading an entire catalogue or a predefined hierarchy, uploading a dataset and retrieving acknowledgement message related to a selected message ID.

Italy requested clarification about the criteria for file rejection in the DCF. Stefano Cappé explained that a file will be rejected in the DCF even if it contains only one incorrect record; however the new feature of “partial replacement” will allow the data provider replacing the incorrect record only, instead of replacing the whole file.

Denmark asked whether it is necessary to keep in the DCF the current classification of the occurrence groups (Occurrence group 1-5) or would it be possible to remove them and have only one folder for chemical occurrence data in every year as in the pesticide data collection. EFSA agreed to consider this proposal during further development of the DCF system.

Denmark welcomed the improvement of the notification e-mails automatically generated by DCF and also suggested inserting the text of the acknowledgement message in the body of the notification e-mail, instead of attaching it to the e-mail. EFSA agreed to consider this in further development of the DCF system. Portugal asked to receive PowerPoint slides which describe the steps shown in the live web services demonstration. EFSA agreed to provide these.

Austria questioned whether the current web service for file upload is a new system or an updated version of the old one. Mario Monguidi confirmed that it is a completely new system. The new web system was developed to receive data in SSD2 format.

3.6. Validation rules

Valentina Bocca presented the validation rules for incoming contaminant occurrence data in the Guidance on data exchange version 2 (GDE2)³. She explained that the business rules are implemented in XML format; an example of XML file was given to clarify the new syntax. She pointed out that these files are not directly executable and that EFSA implementation is based on SAS program. The output of the validation process was also shown.

France welcomed the idea to share the business rules with the data providers also in SAS format and asked about the timing. EFSA explained that the revision

³ Guidance on Data Exchange version 2.0 available at http://www.efsa.europa.eu/sites/default/files/scientific_output/files/main_documents/3945.pdf

of the business rules will be finalised by beginning of 2016 and they could be shared with interested data providers in SAS format thereafter.

Spain asked whether the business rules contain the specific reporting requirements for contaminant occurrence data⁴. Mario Monguidi replied that currently the specific reporting requirements are not included in the business rules, but they will be included in the future.

Portugal asked whether the new business rules apply to data in SSD2 format only or also to data reported in SSD1. Portugal added that data providers need a clear set of business rules, in an easy-to-implement format, to validate the data submission models in use – both SSD1 and SSD2. EFSA confirmed that business rules cover both SSD1 and SSD2 data model.

3.7. Data quality and defined Key Performance Indicators

Alessandro Carletti presented the key performance indicators (KPIs) proposed to assess the quality of incoming occurrence data and described the main issues, which EFSA has to face during the quality check of the contaminant occurrence database. Alessandro informed the members of the network that a list of KPIs will be circulated to the network, after internal consultation between different units inside EFSA.

Ireland welcomed the list of KPIs and expressed interest in participating in the work of developing KPIs.

As a response to a question raised by Cyprus about KPI evaluation, Alessandro explained that the KPIs will be assessed automatically and linked with the data in the Data Warehouse (DWH). Alessandro highlighted that main goal of this project is to improve the quality of the data for dietary exposure.

Portugal also welcomed the new approach to assessing data quality and suggested sharing the “scores” based on the KPI calculation with other Member States. Alessandro agreed to consider this proposal.

3.8. Update on FoodEx2 use – discussion

Francesco Vernazza summarised the main rules to be applied during FoodEx2 coding, focusing on a clear distinction between raw commodities, derivatives/ingredients and composite food. He also introduced the updated “FoodEx2-interpreting and checking tool”⁵.

Portugal commented that there is the need to include in the next FoodEx2 maintenance some food groups currently not covered by FoodEx2, for example, bread-based composite dishes. The Netherlands asked about the possibility to develop an online tool to support FoodEx2 coding. Francesco Vernazza confirmed that this is also EFSA’s wish and the feasibility of introducing this type of tool will be considered further.

Francesco also informed the members of the network that an algorithm is being developed by France trying to reach automatic FoodEx2 coding. Ireland informed that a system for simplifying the coding activities has also been developed in Ireland. In this context, experiences and suggestions will be shared with other

⁴ Available at: http://www.efsa.europa.eu/sites/default/files/scientific_output/files/main_documents/833e.pdf

⁵ Available at: <http://www.efsa.europa.eu/en/data/data-standardisation>

members of the network. The Netherlands mentioned that a project on developing an automatic FoodEx2 coding system is on-going also in the Netherlands and the network will be informed as soon as the project will be terminated.

3.9. Update on public access to documents

Luisa Venier of the EFSA LRA Unit - in charge of the EFSA centralized handling of public access requests - presented the Regulation (EC) No 1049/2001⁶, which describes the right of public to access documents held by institutions and lays down the general principles and exceptions. It was explained that the Regulation also applies to data owned by EFSA when falling under the conditions detailed in the European Union case law relating to the accessibility of databases. The participants were informed that EFSA received from an NGO a public access request on the control programme monitoring data on chemical substances and microbiological agents submitted by Member States to EFSA as part of the multiannual EU coordinated control programme from 2011 to 2014 and that a consultation process foreseen by the Regulation will be triggered with the Member States with regards to this request.

A round table discussion followed. Several Member States (NL, IR, CY, PT) asked clarifications on the pending request for data, as well as on the applicability of the Regulation and on the extent of the exceptions to disclosure set out by the Regulation which include, among others, protection to be granted to personal data as well as to commercial interests. Finally HR and DK asked clarifications on EFSA's replies to access requests, on whether EFSA contextualizes them and accompanies disclosure with information with a view of avoiding any misunderstanding of the documents/data disclosed.

3.10. Access rights to the Data Warehouse

Mary Gilsean presented a brief overview of the EFSA scientific data warehouse data access rules which were published as an EFSA technical report in February 2015⁷. Mary explained that the access rules underwent a series of consultation steps with the EFSA data networks as well as the relevant committees of the European Commission Standing Committee on Plants, Animals, Food and Feed (PAFF) as well as DG SANTE. Mary also explained that the DWH access rules are not applicable to the current procedure for transmitting contaminant occurrence data from EFSA to the World Health Organisation (WHO) for use in JECFA (Joint FAO/WHO Expert Committee on Food Additives and Contaminants) risk assessments, as agreed in 2010 by the former European Commission Standing Committee on the Food Chain and Animal Health (SCFCAH)⁸. The Netherlands asked whether the data transmission between EFSA and the WHO works in two directions. Mary explained that European data are transmitted from EFSA to WHO only and that EFSA generally uses European data in its exposure assessments. In this context, Mary informed the group about the WHO FOSCOLLAB platform⁹ (Global Platform for Food Safety Data and Information)

⁶ Available at: http://www.europarl.europa.eu/RegData/PDF/r1049_en.pdf

⁷ Available at: http://www.efsa.europa.eu/sites/default/files/scientific_output/files/main_documents/768e.pdf

⁸ Available at: http://ec.europa.eu/food/committees/regulatory/scfcah/toxic/summary19052010_en.pdf

⁹ Available at: <http://www.who.int/foodsafety/foscollab/en/>

which integrates and provides access to data from several sources including WHO Gems/Food database.

Cyprus asked whether raw contaminant data transmission from EFSA to WHO pertains solely to data which have already been used in an EFSA opinion. Mary informed the network that most of the data requests which EFSA receives from WHO pertain to contaminants already worked on by EFSA, but that this is not always the case.

Mary also informed members of the network that the former SCFCAH meeting agreement in 2010 does not specify that data transmitted from EFSA to WHO should only pertain to data already used in EFSA opinions.

The Netherlands sought clarification about the IPCheM project which Mary alluded to during her presentation. Mary Gilsean explained that IPCheM - Information Platform for Chemical Monitoring - is an on-going project to establish a single access point for discovering chemical monitoring data collections. It is designed as a decentralised system providing remote access to data sources and data providers. The project is funded by the European Commission DG Environment; the European Commission JRC (Joint Research Centre) is technical co-ordinator and several European data providers including EFSA have been invited to participate. As agreed during the meeting, a link providing more background information to the project is included¹⁰.

3.11. Contact details of Network members on the website

Francesco Vernazza informed the participants that EFSA would like to amend the current list of members of the "*Scientific Network on Chemical Occurrence Data*" published on EFSA's website¹¹, which includes only organisation names, by including also the names and e-mail addresses of network members. The participants agreed with this proposal.

3.12. Management of organisations and users identifier

Mario Monguidi presented the future approach for managing data provider organisations and users in the DCF.

The Netherlands asked how a DCF data provider can be identified. Mario replied that EFSA has official contact points, and also a list of the registered data providers. However, this list is not available currently in the DCF but, if requested, may be made available in the future via DWH reports.

3.13. Enhancement and innovation: Member States' views

Participants were invited to give constructive feedback on the network scope and meetings in a round table session. In general, participants were pleased about the close co-operation between EFSA and Member States and found the network meeting to be informative and comprehensive.

France and Poland were pleased to learn about the outcome of the SSD2 pilot study from the first wave of countries participating which they found to be

¹⁰ <https://ipchem.jrc.ec.europa.eu/RDSIdiscovery/ipchem/index.html>

¹¹ <http://www.efsa.europa.eu/en/networks/supportingunits>

valuable. Finland and Ireland suggested having more exchange of information and discussion about open data.

Ireland reiterated the appreciation for the on-going quality check (KPIs) on data and the wish of working together with EFSA on this topic.

Portugal suggested that if the FoodEx2 browser will be further developed, it should be considered to make it multi-lingual.

Slovakia asked EFSA's opinion about late data submission. Mary Gilsean explained that it is important for data providers to respect the deadline for data submission (1st October each year) as failure to meet it affects EFSA's work planning and allocation of resources. Mary noted that changing the deadline for annual data submission (e.g. one month later) would be possible as long as the agreed deadline is respected. In the future, EFSA will exercise a more strict approach regarding acceptance of data submitted after the agreed submission deadline.

Slovenia and Sweden highlighted again the need for clear planning about the implementation of data transmission in SSD2, because maintaining two systems in parallel (i.e. SSD1 and SSD2) is not feasible.

UK welcomed the French approach using automatic coding in FoodEx2, and was also interested in the Irish method.

EFSA informed participants that requests already arrived from the WHO to transmit raw additive occurrence data in addition to contaminant occurrence data for use in JECFA assessments. This will be included as an agenda item at the next chemical occurrence network meeting in April 2015. In the interim, members are requested to discuss this issue (i.e. sharing of raw food additive occurrence data with WHO) at national level and to come prepared to the network meeting in April 2016.

3.14. Data warehouse (DWH) chemical dashboards/analytical reports

Stefano Cappé gave a live demonstration of the scientific DWH.

The Netherlands asked whether data providers can add new chemicals for the PARAM catalogue if a term is not in the current list. Stefano Cappé clarified that it is not possible because the catalogues should be harmonised and controlled; this kind of requests should be sent to the EFSA functional mailbox of data.catalogues@efsa.europa.eu.

Denmark asked about the availability of the updated DWH user manual mentioned in Stefano's presentation. Stefano Cappé replied that it will be circulated at a later stage.

The participants agreed with a proposal from Stefano to make publicly available summary statistics (e.g. frequency distributions, percentiles) on contaminant occurrence levels by food group (e.g. up to foodex L4) using DWH dashboards at country level. Stefano invited members of the network to look at the DWH dashboards and to verify whether country specific data are correct before they will be published on EFSA's website by end of November 2015.

3.15. DWH validation reports

Alessandro Carletti summarised the scientific DWH validation rules. The existing procedure for data validation and feedback with data providers was described and a new one proposed according to the new workflow and the functionalities of the Data Warehouse.

The Netherlands asked whether validation reports will be sent only once, or after each step. It was clarified that the first (business rules) validation of the data will be generated by the DCF, which provides immediate validation and only valid data will enter the DWH. During the second validation, some standardisation will be also performed by EFSA and summary statistics will be generated on the data. The data provider will be contacted after this step for approving the data. Data will be available for analysis in scientific opinions and reports only if they are approved by the data provider.

Ireland asked whether rules for both validation steps will be available in .xml format. Stefano clarified that the vast majority of the business rules are already implemented in the new business rules, and integrating also the rules of the second validation/standardisation step is technically possible, but requires time and resources (e.g. strongly recommended fields for special chemicals in special matrices). Mary Gilsenan informed the members of the network that even after successful validation of the data during both validation steps, it is plausible that during further analysis (i.e. estimation of dietary exposure) of the data for scientific opinions, ad hoc anomalies may be identified by scientific officers; in such cases, data providers may be contacted again to verify particular aspects of the data.

3.16. Conclusions and proposals for next meetings

Date for next meeting

The Chair proposed to have the next meeting of the Network on 7-8 April 2016.

4. Closure of the meeting

The meeting was closed at 13:00, as foreseen in the agenda.

5. Table with actions

WHO	WHAT	BY
EFSA	Advice how to report the presence of allergenic food, which may be present as ingredients in other food, such as nuts in chocolate	By next Network Meeting (NWM)
EFSA	Sharing the validation rules for FoodEx2 with MSs	By next NWM latest
EFSA	Sharing the business rules with MSs also in SAS format upon request	By next NWM latest
EFSA	Informing the NWMs about the opening of the Veterinary Medical Products Residues data collection in DCF	As soon as it will be available

EFSA	Circulating the updated DWH user manual to the Network on Chemical occurrence data	as soon as finalised
MSs	Members are requested to discuss the sharing of raw food additive occurrence data with WHO at national level and to come prepared to the network meeting in April 2016	By next NWM

Document history

Document reference	Version 22
Prepared by: Enikő Varga	Name
Reviewed by	Name
Last date modified: 18/01/2016	Date: 14/12/2015

Minutes of the Scientific Network on Chemical Occurrence Data: 2nd meeting of the Circle of Trust pilot study

Held on 11/11/2015, Parma
Meeting room: M08-09
Time: 14:00-18:00
(Agreed on 29 January 2016)

Participants

■ Network Representatives of Member States (including EFTA Countries):

Country	Name
Austria	Josef WOLF
Bulgaria	Emil SIMEONOV
Cyprus	Eleni IOANNOU KAKOURI Eftychia CHRISTOU
Croatia	Sandra BASIC
Denmark	Jens Hinge ANDERSEN Louise JENSEN
Estonia	Kadi PADUR
Finland	Niina PAJALIN-MYLLYNEN Johanna SUOMI by tele-conference
France	Jean-Cédric RENINGER Marion BORDIER
Greece	Leonidas PALILIS
Hungary	Krisztian VARGA
Ireland	Eileen O'DEA
Italy	Michele DE MARTINO
Luxembourg	Elisa BARILOZZI
Netherlands	Rob THEELEN
Norway	Inger HALLE SKAGEN
Sweden	Petra FOHGELBERG David FOSTER

■ EFSA

Evidence Management (DATA) Unit: Francesco VERNAZZA (Chair), Mary GILSENAN (HoU)*, Stefano CAPPE*, Isabelle LLOYD*, Simona FUSAR POLI, Enikő VARGA

(* attended part of the meeting)

1. Welcome and apologies for absence

The Chair welcomed the participants.

No apologies were received.

2. Adoption of agenda

The objective of this specific meeting was to summarise the experience gathered so far by the participants to the Circle of Trust (CoT). The CoT is a pilot 'user community', within the framework of the Data warehouse (DWH), whereby a limited number of Member States (MS) (so far 15 MSs) could have access to each other's raw chemical contaminants data under defined conditions¹. In the 'Circle of Trust' access is significantly extended with respect to the default proposed access rules of the DWH².

The agenda was adopted without changes.

The administrative aspects of the meeting were presented and discussed by Simona Fusar Poli.

3. Topics for discussion

In the context of the pilot, the members were granted access to the DWH as an interface to the data (on February 2015) and received specific training (8 different sessions between February and June 2015). The participants were asked to test the functionality of the DWH and provide feedback.

3.1. Feedback on the Scientific Data Warehouse (DWH) and the 'data sharing experience'

Almost half of the participants of the Circle of Trust pilot study accessed the DWH; feedback on its usability was generally positive. The following bullets summarise the major feedback provided by the meeting participants in a 'tour de table':

- A more user-friendly interface to browse the system might improve the accessibility to the system;
- The time for running a query was in many cases too long; therefore, the tester couldn't understand whether the software was working or not. It was suggested to implement in the application a tool showing the progress of a particular query;
- The need for more and more complex pre-defined queries was identified by the tester. Stefano Cappé reassured the participants that existing queries may be improved and new queries may be created by EFSA on request;
- Additional training on the DWH was requested.

3.2. Discussion summarising advantages, issues and suggestions

A general discussion followed the 'tour de table', where advantages and issues found during the pilot and suggestions for improvement were further expanded and debated. The plenary session summarised the main points of the discussion under three chapters: advantages experienced in the pilot, issues to be addressed and suggestions for further improvement.

¹ 'Circle of trust' pilot initiative for chemical occurrence data sharing - proposed rules for the pilot-accessible at <http://www.efsa.europa.eu/sites/default/files/assets/CircleOfTrust.pdf>.

² European Food Safety Authority, 2015. The EFSA Data Warehouse access rules. EFSA supporting publication 2015:EN-768. 18 pp. - accessible at <http://www.efsa.europa.eu/it/supporting/pub/768e>

3.2.1. **Advantages experienced by the participants to the pilot**

- The CoT pilot study allows access to many data and the possibility of comparison with other countries on levels and trends was considered very useful; a dialogue between countries on these subjects might further improve the understanding of the observed levels thus driving a better management of the risk;
- Laboratories can gather information on limit of quantification (LOQ) and limit of detection (LOD), and analytical methods used in other Member State laboratories to improve their current practice;
- Through the CoT the members may access data on concentration data for chemical contaminants for areas (e.g. food groups, analytes) not included in their national datasets. These data can “fill” the gaps in missing data needed to be used for example in modelling exposure and risk assessment; With the DWH tools it is possible to easily obtain statistics on own data;
- For defining the national monitoring plan, it is possible to get useful insights from monitoring programmes in other countries; for example, substances with high occurrence levels in some countries may be considered in the monitoring plans of other Member States;
- In general, as highlighted in the previous bullets, the CoT may promote better co-operation between countries both in risk management and laboratory practices by promoting direct dialogue.

3.2.2. **Issues:**

- Slow reaction of DWH was observed: in particular, waiting time after launching queries may be too long;
- Staff not directly trained by EFSA may encounter difficulties while trying to navigate the DWH.
- The DWH doesn't show clearly the progress of the report creation activity.
- The tool needs to be used also under urgent circumstances (like incident management); in this case improved ease of use and speed of reaction are of utmost importance.

3.2.3. **Suggestions for improvement:**

- A pre-recorded tutorial for untrained users should be prepared as for end users not receiving interactive training by EFSA;
- A FAQ (Frequently Asked Questions) document on the use of the DWH should be prepared. Development of the FAQ in collaboration with the users would improve its usefulness;
- Enhanced two-way communication between EFSA and the members of the CoT in identifying the type of additional queries needed was proposed. As a first step, an active involvement of the CoT participants in the improvement process was envisaged.

Three members of the CoT offered to act as contact points for collection of suggestions on improvements of the CoT and more generally of the DWH each taking care of one among three groups of stakeholders: analytical laboratories, exposure assessors and risk managers.

1. **Analytical laboratories:** Eileen O'Dea (Ireland) will be the contact for collecting suggestions on better use of the DWH and data sharing for the advantage of analytical activity. A first suggestion was already made at the meeting: to make available a report on analytical sensitivity by matrix (food group) and by analytical method;
2. **Dietary exposure assessors:** Eleni Kakouri (Cyprus) will be the contact for collecting suggestions on better use of the DWH and data sharing for the advantage of exposure assessment;
3. **Risk managers:** Marion Bordier (France) will be the contact for collecting suggestions on better use of the DWH and data sharing for the advantage of risk management.

It was agreed that the suggestions for additional queries will be collected by the contact points and feedback will be provided to EFSA by the end of January 2016.

3.3. Discussion about the extension of the CoT pilot project

The possibility of extending the timeframe of the CoT was discussed.

According to Austria the pilot project was successful and the DWH is very useful for the CoT participants and extension to all MSs would be useful. Austria also highlighted that the group of queries and level of access of the CoT has to be regarded as an expert system for data sharing between MSs, but should not be made available for the public accessing the DWH.

Mary Gilson clarified that there are two projects: the CoT pilot project and the DWH project which are running parallel. In the DWH the data will be available at aggregated level to external stakeholders. Country-specific individual data (raw data) will be accessible for data owners and providers. In the frame of the CoT pilot project the participants of the CoT have access to each other's data at individual level according to the rules agreed at the first CoT pilot study³⁴.

The Netherlands suggested reviewing the criteria for restriction of the shared information and exclude some more fields.

Ireland explained that since due to some technical issues the functionalities of the DWH could not be tested thoroughly prior to the meeting, it is early to draw conclusions on the CoT, therefore the exercise should be extended. Eileen O'Dea also suggested implementing a logging system, to keep track of the use of the DWH.

According to France, the CoT pilot project allowed members to validate rules for data sharing and to understand better the functionality of the DWH, therefore the feedback is so far positive.

As a general comment, the DWH should be more stable and user-friendly in order to use it more extensively.

France asked whether it would be possible to distinguish the different data provider laboratories/organisations inside a country, if the data were transmitted at country level by one centralised data provider. Enikő Varga suggested reporting the name of the original data provider in the field of "Local organisation (O.1.)" or alternatively in "Laboratory (L.1.)". This field can then be easily used as a filter in the DWH.

³ 'Circle of trust' pilot initiative for chemical occurrence data sharing - proposed rules for the pilot-accessible at <http://www.efsa.europa.eu/sites/default/files/assets/CircleOfTrust.pdf>.

⁴ Update on the Circle of Trust available in the minutes of the 9th meeting of the Scientific Network on Chemical Occurrence data, accessible at <http://www.efsa.europa.eu/sites/default/files/event/150310-m.pdf>

Mary Gilsean proposed to establish a case study or project with members of the CoT whereby a PhD student in a Member State – e.g. from or linked with a national competent authority – , could analyse cross country data for specific contaminants within the CoT and write up a scientific paper. Members were asked to come up with ideas for a possible research project/(s).

3.4. Conclusions and proposals for next meetings

The final outcome of the round table discussion about the extension of the CoT pilot project was:

- There was an agreement between Members to propose extension for the CoT pilot study by end of 2017 in order to investigate better the opportunities and advantages given by the DWH;
- There is a need to reach a more 'mature' tool before extending the initiative beyond the current membership of the CoT.
- A revision and eventual fine-tuning of the conditions for data sharing was envisaged and it was agreed that additional comments on specific points to revise should be sent to EFSA by end of February 2016.

Date for next meeting

The Chair proposed to have the next meeting of the CoT project during the week of the Network in autumn 2016 (week of the 10th October 2016). The exact date will be communicated soon.

4. Closure of the meeting

The meeting was closed at about 18:00, as foreseen in the agenda.

5. Table with actions

WHO	WHAT	BY
All / Contact points defined in 3.2.3	To collect suggestions for additional queries and provide feedback to EFSA.	end of January 2016
All participants	To come up with ideas for a possible research project/(s) to establish a case study or project with members of the CoT whereby a PhD student in a Member State – e.g. from or linked with a national competent authority – , could analyse cross country data for specific contaminants within the CoT and write up a scientific paper.	next CoT meeting
All participants	To send to EFSA comments on specific points for fine-tuning of the conditions for data sharing.	end of February 2016

Document history

Document reference	Version 11
Prepared by: Francesco Vernazza, Enikő Varga	Name
Reviewed by	Name
Last date modified: 18.01.2016	Date: 14.12.2015

Scientific Network on Chemical Occurrence data Minutes of the 9th meeting

Held on 10-11/03/2015, Parma
Meeting room: Umberto I (Palazzo Ducale)
Time: 9:00-first day – 13:00 last day
(Agreed on 30 April 2015)

Participants

■ Network Representatives of Member States (including EFTA Countries):

Country	Name
Austria	Elke RAUSCHER-GABERNIG
Belgium	Kathy BRISON
Bulgaria	Snezhana TODOROVA
Cyprus	Eleni IOANNOU KAKOURI
Croatia	Sandra BASIC
Czech Republic	Irena REHURKOVA
Denmark	Jens Hinge ANDERSEN
Estonia	Kadi PADUR
Finland	Johanna SUOMI
France	Jean-Cédric RENINGER
Germany	Michael JUD
Greece	Leonidas PALILIS
Hungary	Laszlo MESZAROS
Ireland	Eileen O'DEA
Italy	Augusto PASTORELLI Michele DE MARTINO
Latvia	Dzintars ZACS
Lithuania	Agnietė GRUŠAUSKIENĖ
Luxembourg	Elisa BARILOZZI
Malta	Ingrid BUSUTTIL
Netherlands	Jacqueline CASTENMILLER
Poland	Andrzej STARSKI
Portugal	Luisa OLIVEIRA
Slovakia	Angela SVETLIKOVA
Slovenia	Marko LUCI Metka PRVINSEK
Spain	Victoria MARCOS
Sweden	Petra FOHGELBERG
United Kingdom	Sara HARDY
Norway	Per BRATTERUD

■ Hearing Experts

N/A

■ **European Commission:**

Thomas Wenzl (European Commission Joint Research Center – Institute for Reference Materials and Measurements (JRC-IRMM))

■ **EFSA:**

DATA Unit: Francesco VERNAZZA (Chair), Mary GILSENAN (HoU)*, Annette Cecilia FORSS, Stefano CAPPE*, Alessandro CARLETTI*, Petra GERGELOVA*, José Angel GOMEZ RUIZ*, Mario Monguidi*, Chiara GUESCINI, Doreen Dolores RUSSELL, Enikő VARGA*, Citlali PINTADO (LRA Unit) *

(*presented only partly in the meeting)

1. Welcome and apologies for absence

The Chair welcomed the participants.

Apologies from Romania were received.

2. Adoption of agenda

The agenda was adopted without changes.

The administrative aspects of the meeting were presented and discussed (Chiara Guescini).

3. Topics for discussion

3.1. Circle of trust – update

Francesco Vernazza gave an update about the status of the 'Circle of Trust'. Norway asked who can be the participants of the pilot. Francesco Vernazza explained that potential participants are the main data provider to EFSA, in most cases the representative in the Scientific Network on Chemical Occurrence Data and/or other governmental institution nominated by the Advisory Forum national member(s). However for the purpose of the pilot, not only the organisation will be defined, but also the contact point inside the organisation. The suggested preferred contact point was the Chemical Occurrence Network member. Germany asked about the general access right to the Data Warehouse (DWH). Francesco Vernazza replied that the document on the access rules has been recently published and is available on EFSA's website¹. Norway asked whether their contractor from other institutions can be granted access to the DWH. France requested access also for ministries which are the owner of the zoonoses and pesticides data collections.

Ireland highlighted that the pilot is a learning phase of a process and will run only until December 2015; therefore, it is too early to make changes before the end of the pilot study. Mary Gilsean agreed that the changes should be implemented in January 2016 after the pilot study.

Croatia asked whether it is allowed to search the DWH for analytical methods used in different countries in Europe for a certain substance and present this analysis at national level. In general, the participants did not foresee any issues with Croatia's request. France expressed their preference to involve more governmental institutions even in the pilot. The United Kingdom also underlined that they can agree with limited permissions only in the pilot but then involvement of other departments would be necessary.

¹ <http://www.efsa.europa.eu/en/supporting/doc/768e.pdf>.

Finally, it was decided to amend the rules for the pilot with a note to better explain the concept of 'data provider': 'data provider' means both the national organisation in charge of transmitting the chemical occurrence data to EFSA and the national organisations providing the data to be transmitted to EFSA. Consequently, the national organisations complying with this definition will be granted access to the Circle of Trust pilot study.

3.2. Summary and discussion of data collection 2014

Alessandro Carletti gave an overview of the 2014 data collection and summarised the strengths and weaknesses of the collected data. In the presentation, it was highlighted that in 2014 the majority of the transmissions (66%) were received by EFSA by the deadline of 1st of October. Mary Gilsean asked about the reasons for the delay in data transmission which resulted in five months of unplanned work at EFSA. During the discussion, apart from the lack of resources, which is a general issue in many countries, it was explained that the data from the laboratories are often received very late. The deadlines of data transmissions for the laboratories are established at national level, independently from EFSA's deadline of 1st of October. In some cases the data are owned by different governmental organisations, collected in different formats, which also hinders the timely delivery of the data. Portugal noted that this year some business rules have been changed, causing unforeseen difficulties and pointed out that all changes, which might affect the data transmission should be communicated well in advance. Ireland noted the importance of engaging with national laboratories to show how the data that they are generating are being used at European level. Currently, national laboratories do not see how their data are contributing to European risk assessments. This would help to encourage timely data transmission from national laboratories. EFSA promised to support Member States to address both issues.

Portugal highlighted an issue in reporting marine biotoxins: marine biotoxins are strictly monitored by the countries producing and selling molluscs and similar products, and a product never goes to the market if the level of marine biotoxin is exceeding the maximum limit. Francesco Vernazza explained that EFSA is aware of this issue and proposed to keep these targeted data at national level, and that EFSA might collect targeted data to perform risk assessment when needed. Random monitoring data should be collected regularly. Ireland was in favour of submitting all data collected on marine biotoxins.

Portugal asked EFSA's help to encourage industry to submit data to the national authority, preferably in Standard Sample Description (SSD) format. Mary Gilsean answered that the Stakeholder Platform discussion group, managed by the DATA unit, might be a good possibility to open discussion with them; she explained also that from this year on EFSA will prepare yearly a technical report on chemical contaminants data collection so that member States can see an overview of the contaminant data submitted annually to EFSA's database.

3.3. Update on specific requirements and discussion

Enikő Varga presented an update of the specific requirements defined for chemical contaminants data submission and underlined the importance of its annual update in order to reflect the evolution of relevant legislation and in response to recommendations relating to data in EFSA's scientific opinions. The latest version of the specific requirements document², which is available on EFSA's homepage, was published on 20th May 2014 and it will be updated by end of May 2015.

² <http://www.efsa.europa.eu/en/supporting/pub/604e.htm>.

Ireland remarked that it would be more useful update the specific requirements document before the end of the year preceding each reporting year giving more time to the countries to implement the changes. Enikő Varga confirmed that enough time will be given to the countries to implement the updated specific requirements document, and in the update of the document the deadlines for implementation will be also clearly indicated. It was confirmed that the current rules in the specific requirements document are valid for SSD1 data reporting. The specific requirements for SSD2 will be one of the outputs of the on-going SSD2 pilot project. Francesco Vernazza confirmed that the Acrylamide codes can be added as a facet in the FoodEx2 code. Ireland requested statistics from EFSA on the proportion of Irish data which are not deemed to be at a sufficient level of detail (i.e. with respect to FoodEx), so that this can be addressed with national data providers.

The participants were asked whether their organisation is responsible also for monitoring food additives: Network members from all countries except the United Kingdom, Malta, Luxembourg, Lithuania, Latvia, France and Finland confirmed that their organisation is also responsible for collecting data on food additive occurrence. France noted that it is envisaged that ANSES will start collecting data on food additive occurrence soon.

3.4. Needs for data in 2015 and overview of use in 2014

Enikő Varga gave an overview about the opinions adopted in 2014 using data submitted by Member States and those scheduled for 2015; planned ad-hoc calls for data were also presented. In 2015 EFSA will launch a call for data on (1) Erucic Acid (deadline 1st of August 2015), (2) Moniliformin and (3) Diacetoxyscirpenol (deadline 1st of October 2015). A call for data on Marine Biotoxins (Pectenotoxin and Okadaic acid) is also foreseen, but the exact date has not yet been confirmed. EFSA also plans to publish a call on food additives in summer 2015.

3.5. Update on the catalogue management system

Mario Monguidi gave a presentation on the new EFSA catalogue management system. One major catalogue release per year is envisaged. Portugal asked when the business rules will be available. Mario Monguidi answered that the business rules are already available on EFSA's website as an attachment³ to the 'Guidance of Data Exchange version2'⁴, but that their implementation in the Data Collection Framework (DCF) is foreseen only in June 2015. The new workflow will be initially used for the SSD2 pilot study.

Denmark asked about downloading the catalogues from the DCF. Mario Monguidi ensured the participants that from June 2015 the data providers will be able to download the entire set of catalogues related to each data collection.

3.6. Procurement projects supporting the harmonisation initiatives – 2015

Alessandro Carletti informed about a planned new call for tender to support Member States to implement SSD2 in their national systems; the progress of the procurement project linked to the first call for tender awarded in May 2014 was outlined together with an overview of the countries participating. Norway expressed an interest in the SSD2 implementation. Spain asked about the inclusion of Veterinary Drug Residues (VDR) in the new SSD2 call. Alessandro Carletti explained that the working group on VDR has

³ <http://www.efsa.europa.eu/en/efsajournal/pub/3945.htm> (XML.zip)

⁴ <http://www.efsa.europa.eu/en/efsajournal/doc/3945.pdf>

finalised the VDR data model based on SSD2 and that it is envisaged to include also VDR in the forthcoming SSD2 call.

EFSA promised that information will be presented about the VDR sample based data collection project during the next Network meeting. It was also highlighted that in a few years only sample based VDR data reporting will be accepted. Portugal asked if those countries, which are already participating in an SSD2 pilot can apply also for the next call, but only to the VDR domain. Alessandro Carletti indicated that this option is envisaged in the tender specifications.

In relation to the VDR data domain the members of the Network were asked to clarify which organisations of the Network also collect data on veterinary drug residues. In Austria, Croatia, Cyprus, Denmark, Finland, France, Germany, Hungary, Ireland, Lithuania, Netherlands, Norway, Portugal, Slovakia, Slovenia, Spain (responsibility shared with agricultural department) and Sweden the same organisation is responsible for collecting occurrence data on contaminants and veterinary drug residues.

3.7. DMS sharing of data – short training and FAQ

The Chair asked if any expert experienced any problem in accessing and using the DMS. No problem was reported. It was also asked if the foreseen short training and questions session on the use of the DMS was needed or desired by any Network member and nobody requested it. Therefore, it was agreed to skip the training and FAQ session on the DMS use.

3.8. Data Warehouse demo: hands-on clinic

Stefano Cappè gave a live demonstration of the Data warehouse (DWH) in the context of the 'Circle of Trust' pilot study. Data quality in the DWH was discussed and the main issues around sample discrepancies were presented. Ireland outlined that the noticed discrepancies in laboratory accreditation may not be real discrepancies, since accreditation status can be changed in time. Denmark added that the accreditation rules are different for different data collections, e.g. pesticides data collection has special rules for accreditation (with legal references). Spain noted that a laboratory can be accredited for one substance but not another. Stefano Cappè promised to find solution for that issue. Ireland cautioned the need to maintain traceability of the submitted data and highlighted the need to receive country reports on the data as soon as possible so that any issues can be addressed in the same year as the data were collected.

Germany was interested in when the DWH will be available for use outside the 'Circle of Trust' pilot study. Stefano Cappè explained that the DWH will be open from July 2015 on the zoonoses and the pesticides data domain; stakeholders will have access in accordance with the published rules⁵.

Austria presented some difficulties they experienced using the DWH. EFSA promised to address the listed issues.

3.9. Use of data in 2014: ethyl carbamate

Francesco Vernazza gave an overview of an EFSA technical report on the occurrence of ethyl carbamate in food published in 2014⁶. He provided an overview of the data from reporting countries and levels of ethyl carbamate in food groups, focusing on the four

⁵ See footnote 1 on page 2

⁶ <http://www.efsa.europa.eu/en/supporting/pub/578e.htm>

main food categories. The challenges with the data description in particular with respect to the food classification were also presented.

3.10. Training – on-site support – Guest scientist schema: planning of 2015 – Seconded National Experts

The Chair outlined the training sessions on FoodEx2 (Spain, Ireland, Hungary), SSD and data transmission (Croatia) that have been provided to some Member States in 2014 and which can be provided to others. The participants were reminded and encouraged to send a request to EFSA, if there is a training need. France expressed an interest for having training on FoodEx2.

Network members were also reminded about additional channels for exchange and co-operation that are in place as well as deadlines for expressions of interest, in particular the Guest Scientist Scheme⁷, the Seconded National Experts⁸ and National Experts in Professional Training⁹. Members were also alerted to the call for trainees in 2015 on EFSA's website¹⁰.

3.11. 2015 data collection - deadlines / future of data collection and discussion

Enikő Varga provided a short presentation on the feedback given by EFSA to the data providers on data transmission and the difficulties encountered by the data collection helpdesk in providing the feedback due to the changes in the document sharing platform of EFSA. A proposal for a new procedure was presented to members of the Network as follows: EFSA will send only the Word file and summary statistics rather than the entire cleaned dataset. The Excel file will be still created automatically, but it will be sent only if specifically requested by the data provider. The participants agreed with the proposal, and highlighted the importance of receiving the feedback document. It was also agreed that the cleaning reports should be sent by EFSA to data providers within two weeks after the cleaning procedure and that the data providers will also have two weeks for approval; in the absence of feedback EFSA will consider the cleaning report as agreed.

During the discussion, there was a question on the standardisation of the measurement Unit to microgram/kilogram; Ireland requested clarification on the conversion in the case of marine biotoxins like the Saxitoxins (STX) group of toxins that is normally reported as STX equivalents. EFSA noted that STXs are reported as micrograms STX equivalents/kg a unit substantially corresponding to micrograms/kg but referred to a specific molecule of the group. EFSA will consider whether any additional action is needed in terms of data conversion.

3.12. New developed methods for 2-, 3MCPDs and glycidol esters

Thomas Wenzl gave a presentation on the recently developed modified analytical methods for 2-, 3MCPDs and glycidyl esters and the test survey¹¹ that will be used in the ongoing risk assessment on these substances by the Panel on Contaminants in the Food Chain (CONTAM Panel)¹². The work was commissioned by EFSA as a Service Level Agreement (SLA/EFSA-JRC/DCM/2013/01). The importance of the work done by the JRC

⁷ <http://www.efsa.europa.eu/en/supporting/pub/567e.htm>

⁸ <http://www.efsa.europa.eu/en/jobs/callforsecondednationalexerts.htm>

⁹ <http://www.efsa.europa.eu/en/jobs/callfornationalexertsinprofessionaltraining.htm>

¹⁰ <http://www.efsa.europa.eu/en/jobs/traineeship.htm>

¹¹ <http://www.efsa.europa.eu/en/supporting/pub/779e.htm>

¹² <http://registerofquestions.efsa.europa.eu/roqFrontend/questionsListLoader?mandate=M-2014-0209>

for the future monitoring in the Member States laboratories of these process contaminants was highlighted.

3.13. Transmission of data to World Health Organisation - additives and discussion

Enikő Varga explained how the process¹³ of the transmission of data to the World Health Organisation WHO has been updated in 2014. In particular, it was explained to the Network Members that now raw data are transmitted with the country name (instead of a generic EU origin) and without confidentiality flag, as requested by WHO. The main differences between the EFSA DWH access rules¹⁴ and those proposed by WHO¹⁵ were also presented. Network Members were asked about their opinions on raw data transmission from EFSA to WHO and also about data transmission of data such as food additives, which are not covered by the agreement in 2010 of the former Standing Committee on the Food chain and Animal Health (SCFAH)¹⁶ now called Standing Committee on Plants, Animals, Food and Feed (PAFF Committee) concerning use, disclosure and re-use of contaminant data sent to EFSA.

Network participants expressed different opinions on whether to transmit all raw data or only those used in EFSA Opinions or reports. Nevertheless, there was agreement on the following points: (1) in order to avoid double reporting of data from EFSA and from Member States, EFSA will inform the Network before transmitting any data to WHO (2) before submitting raw data which are not contaminants (e.g. food additive occurrence data) EFSA will first ask permission from the Network members.

3.14. Guidance on data exchange

Eileen O'Dea presented the 'Guidance on data exchange version2' (GDE2)¹⁷ and how it will improve data exchange between data providers and EFSA. The general recommendations and conclusions of the GDE2 for data transmission were explained. Eileen O'Dea explained that the guidance contains the frame and structure of the data exchange, and the general business rules. Specific business rules for each data domain should be defined. For the zoonoses data collection, specific business rules relating to 2014 data collection have been recently published together with the data transmission guidance¹⁸.

3.15. A Further step of collecting occurrence and consumption data within EFSA: The use of Improrisk Model for exposure /risk assessment of lead in Cyprus and other contaminants.

Cyprus gave a presentation on user-friendly tool (Improrisk Model) developed for exposure assessment in Cyprus using lead as an example. The model is deterministic but a probabilistic dietary exposure model is also envisaged. The tool's potential usefulness and application in other Member States was discussed.

¹³ <http://www.efsa.europa.eu/en/supporting/doc/557e.pdf>

¹⁴ <http://www.efsa.europa.eu/en/supporting/doc/768e.pdf>

¹⁵ <https://dms.efsa.europa.eu/otcs/llisapi.dll/open/13966984>

¹⁶ <https://dms.efsa.europa.eu/otcs/llisapi.dll/open/13966595>

¹⁷ see note 4 on page 4

¹⁸ <http://www.efsa.europa.eu/en/supporting/pub/772e.htm>

3.16. Use of data in 2014: Beauvericin and enniatins

Petra Gergelova gave a presentation on the CONTAM Panel opinion on the risks to human health related to the presence of beauvericin and enniatins in food and feed that was published in 2014, using occurrence data submitted to EFSA. It was explained that the overall lack/limitation of the data (in particular toxicity data) was an obstacle to perform risk assessment in the opinion¹⁹.

3.17. Use of data in 2014: Arsenic

José Angel Gomez Ruiz gave an overview of a scientific report on dietary exposure to inorganic arsenic in the European population²⁰ demonstrating the use of occurrence data submitted by Member States in EFSA outputs. The conclusions of the exposure assessment were presented to the Network together with the work conducted by EFSA to analyse the data and the challenges encountered with the data.

3.18. Public access to EFSA documents

Citlali Pintado from the EFSA's Legal and Regulatory Affairs Unit (LRA) gave a presentation on the public access to EFSA documents, in particular the mechanism under Regulation (EC) No 1049/2001²¹ (hereinafter the 'PAD Regulation') which applies to Union institutions, bodies and agencies, such as EFSA. She explained that every document that EFSA is preparing can be subject to a public access to documents request and that data in a database can be considered a document. It was explained that the PAD Regulation is currently under review and that the landscape in this regard is evolving; thus, EFSA is currently dealing with access to documents requests on a case-by-case basis taking into account the exceptions of the PAD Regulation as interpreted by Union Courts. When access to data, which are not already in the public domain is requested, EFSA always consults the data providers, in accordance with the provisions of the PAD Regulation.

3.19. EXPO 2015

Doreen Dolores Russell presented an overview of the three-day EFSA Scientific Conference scheduled to take place in October 2015 in Milan connecting to the main theme "Feeding the Planet, Energy for Life" of the 2015 World EXPO. The broad interest to this event and the limitation in available places were underlined as well as financial support initiatives for young scientists.

3.20. Feedback on FoodEx2 re-coding projects

Francesco Vernazza gave an overview about the experiences on FoodEx2 re-coding within the framework of an on-going procurement project involving 19 participating EU countries. The good work being done by different Member States was presented. It was explained that some data providers did not apply for the recoding of the datasets from their country; therefore, for these datasets it is still necessary to find an experienced organisation available to perform the re-coding work. The Network members were asked to express an eventual interest in the re-coding work not yet allocated to a contractor. The Netherlands expressed an interest in re-coding the Dutch dataset. Other countries

¹⁹ <http://www.efsa.europa.eu/en/efsajournal/doc/3802.pdf>

²⁰ <http://www.efsa.europa.eu/en/efsajournal/doc/3597.pdf>

²¹ Regulation (EC) No 1049/2001 of the European Parliament and of the Council of 30 May 2001 regarding public access to European Parliament, Council and Commission documents, OJ L 145, 31.5.2001, p. 43–48.

will consider the opportunity and will communicate later to EFSA if they are available to participate to an eventual negotiated procedure.

A question was debated in relation to the FoodEx2: Ireland expressed the wish to continue using FoodEx2 also for the normal annual data reporting starting from 2015 because it is a more complete and overall better classification. Spain also agreed on this possibility. The request was how to proceed. EFSA acknowledged the legitimate wish to move to the newest standards and promised to consider the possible technical solutions for using FoodEx2 in the transition phase between SSD1 and SSD2.

Some brainstorming was done on possible solutions using a simplified format or putting the FoodEx2 code in a text field. A final answer will be provided by EFSA based on the technical evaluation of the problem.

4. AoB

4.1. Veterinary Drug Residues inquiry

The question of which Network members are also involved in the Veterinary drug residues data collection was already addressed in point 3.6 therefore, it was not raised under this agenda item as planned.

No other point was raised under AOB.

Date for next meeting

The Chair proposed to have a 2.5 days meeting on 11-13 November 2015 including a half day discussion on the Circle of Trust pilot project. No issue concerning these dates was raised.

5. Closure of the meeting

The meeting was closed shortly after 13:00.

List of Actions

Agenda item	Action/decision
3.1. Circle of trust – update	EFSA to add a note in the Rules for the Circle of Trust pilot to better explain the concept of 'data provider': " 'data provider' means both the national organisation in charge of transmitting the chemical occurrence data to EFSA and the national organisations providing the data to be transmitted to EFSA". Additionally, to grant access to the Circle of Trust pilot study to the national organisations complying with this definition having requested to participate to the pilot study.
	EFSA to communicate well in advance to the data providers the changes in the business rules impacting on the data transmission.
3.2. Summary and discussion of data collection 2014	Data providers to engage with national laboratories to show how the data that they are generating are being used at European level. EFSA to support Member States in this process.
	EFSA to prepare yearly a technical report on chemical contaminants data collection so that member States can see an overview of the contaminant data submitted annually to EFSA's database.

Agenda item	Action/decision
	EFSA to update the specific requirements by end of May 2015.
3.3. Update on specific requirements and discussion	Acrylamide codes to be added by EFSA to FoodEx2 as a facet. EFSA to prepare for Ireland statistics on the proportion of Irish data which are not deemed to be at a sufficient level of detail (i.e. with respect to FoodEx), so that this can be addressed with national data providers.
3.6. Procurement projects supporting the harmonisation initiatives – 2015	EFSA to prepare information about the VDR sample based data collection project to be presented at the next Network meeting. EFSA to find a solution for managing the differences in the laboratory accreditation for the same sample respect to different substances.
3.8. Data Warehouse demo: hands-on clinic	Austria to send a list of the problems found in using the Data warehouse and EFSA to address the problems. EFSA to maintain traceability of the submitted data and providing country reports on the data as soon as possible so that any issues can be addressed in the same year as the data were collected.
2015 data collection - deadlines / future of data collection and discussion	EFSA to implement the new procedure to provide as feedback only a word file with summary statistics while providing the excel file only on specific request. EFSA to provide the cleaning report within two weeks from the cleaning and data providers to approve within two weeks. Approval assumed as default in absence of comment by the data provider. EFSA to consider whether any additional action is needed in terms of data conversion in case of substances reported as microgram equivalents of a reference substance per kg.
3.13. Transmission of data to World Health Organisation - additives and discussion	EFSA to inform the Network before transmitting any data to WHO in order to avoid double reporting of data from EFSA and from Member States. EFSA to ask permission from the Network members before submitting raw data which are not contaminants (e.g. food additive occurrence data).
3.20. Feedback on FoodEx2 re-coding projects	Network members to express interest in participating to negotiated procedures for projects for re-coding the datasets not allocated to a contractor during 2014. EFSA to consider the possible technical solutions for using FoodEx2 in the transition phase between SSD1 and SSD2 and communicate them to the Network.

Document history

Document reference	Version 1
Prepared by	Enikő VARGA, Doreen Dolores RUSSELL
Reviewed by	Mary GILSENAN, Francesco VERNAZZA, Chiara GUESCINI
Last date modified	15/04/2015

Evidence Management Unit (DATA UNIT)

Scientific Network on Chemical Occurrence data

Minutes of the meeting on FoodEx2

Held on 19-20/11/2014, Parma

Meeting room: MTG 00 08/09

(Agreed on 08/01/2015)¹

Participants

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

Country	Name²
Austria	Elke RAUSCHER-GABERNIG (web conference)
Belgium	Kathy BRISON
Bulgaria	Snezhana TODOROVA
Cyprus	Eleni IOANNOU KAKOURI (web conference)
Croatia	Sandra BASIC
Czech Republic	Irena REHURKOVA
Denmark	Jens Hinge ANDERSEN
Estonia	Kadi PADUR
Finland	Marika JESTOI
France	Jean-Cédric RENINGER
Germany	Günter SOMMERFELD
Greece	Leonidas PALILIS
Hungary	László MÉSZAROS
Ireland	Eileen O'DEA
Italy	Michele DE MARTINO
Latvia	Dzintars ZACS
Lithuania	Agnetė GRUŠAUSKIENĖ
Luxembourg	Elisa BARILOZZI
Malta	Ingrid BUSUTTIL
Netherlands	-
Poland	Andrzej STARSKI
Portugal	Luisa OLIVEIRA
Romania	-
Slovakia	Angela SVETLIKOVA
Slovenia	Marko LUCI
Spain	Victoria MARCOS SUAREZ
Sweden	David FOSTER
United Kingdom	Christina BASKARAN

¹ The publication of the minutes shall be made without delay in compliance with the Founding Regulation and no later than 15 working days following the day of their agreement.

² Indicate first full name and them surname (John Smith) all throughout the document

Iceland	-
Liechtenstein	-
Norway	Per BRATTERUD
Switzerland	-

- **Hearing Experts**

Daniela MIHATS (web conference), Jiri VYSLOUZIL, Krisztian VARGA (web conference), Laura POTOCHNIK, Metka PRVINSEK, Petra FOHGELBERG, Sara HARDY.

- **European Commission:**

No attendee

- **EFSA:**

DATA Unit: Francesco VERNAZZA (Chair), Annette Cecilia FORSS (Trainee).

1. Welcome and apologies for absence

The Chair welcomed the participants.

Apologies were received from Rob THEELEN (Netherlands), Nicoleta MILITA (Romania).

2. Adoption of agenda

The agenda was adopted without changes.

3. Topics for discussion

3.1. Basic principles of FoodEx2 revision

The basic principles of the revision 2 of FoodEx2 were presented; they included three innovative concepts:

1. While reporting data, at least targeting the detail level including the implicit facets 'nature' and 'source';
2. Grouping the detailed elements in diverse schemas of broader categories depending on the needs of the different domains;
3. Dedicating a hierarchy to the reporting of data; this hierarchy should facilitate the choice of the right codes at the right level of detail.

3.2. The reporting hierarchy

The reporting hierarchy was presented and the logic of application of the crucial implicit facets (nature, source/source commodities/ingredient and process) was clarified.

3.3. Principles for coding, use of the browser, coding examples

Based on the building logic of FoodEx2, the major steps to follow while coding were presented. These included the identification of the proper base term and the use of the most important facets. In particular, a standardised approach was presented for vegetable and animal products with multiple treatments, for mixed commodities / ingredients and in case of presence of 'minor' ingredients added to raw commodities and derivatives thereof.

Finally, two Excel-based support tools for the coding were presented: the first one allowing the translation into words of foodex2 codes and the second one performing a code checking based on basic business rules.

3.4. Discussion

The discussion following the presentation of the system put a particular highlight on the need of tools to implement it as early as possible in the sampling and data generation chain. Possible options were identified, needing further evaluation:

- Coding tools, like the FoodEx2 browser, developed by the users' community;
- Electronic tools (like hand-held devices) to support coding in the field; these tools would cover the entire Standard Sample Description.,

The co-operation of as many as possible of the Member States' organisations active in this field was identified as a fundamental aspect for success.

4. Any Other Business

Technical meetings vs summary and strategic meetings

The need for some network meetings on technical subjects and some other more on strategic issues was shortly discussed. The network agreed on the opportunity of 2 meetings per year, the one dealing with strategic issues related to data collection and the other focused on specific technical subjects. The members of the two groups may be different. For the technical meeting, the Network suggests to investigate the possibility when the subject is common to have joint meetings with similar Network groups from other domains.

Acknowledgement in EFSA scientific outputs

The network proposed to acknowledge in any scientific output of EFSA the contribution of chemical occurrence data providers in the following form:

In the acknowledgement section in the first page: *The XX Panel (EFSA) acknowledges all European competent institutions that provided occurrence data on YYY in food, and supported the data collection for the Comprehensive European Food Consumption Database. The Panel also acknowledges all other organisations that provided additional occurrence data on YYY in food.*

In the body text at the beginning of the occurrence data section:

The data for the present assessment were provided in the framework of the annual data collection by the national authorities of yxzt..... Additional data were provided by (list of academic institutions, food business organisations and national providers of specific studies...)

(In the references section, for the additional data: *Acronym (Name of data provider), 2010. Data collected from national laboratories and provided to EFSA by yyy, State, Institution, Place, Country, 2010.*)

This proposal will be discussed with the relevant units in EFSA and possibly introduced in the standard templates for Scientific outputs.

4.1. Date for next meeting

The dates for the meetings in 2015 were discussed, based on the proposal of 2 meetings per year.

Three time slots were identified and the final choice will be based on the availability of meeting rooms in EFSA. The possible time slots for the meetings next year are: 9-12 March 2015, 11-13 May 2015 and 12-13 November 2015.

5. Closure of the meeting

The meeting was closed at about 15:00, as foreseen in the agenda.

Evidence Management Unit (DATA UNIT)

Scientific Network on Chemical Occurrence Data

Minutes of the meeting on the 'Circle of Trust'

Held on 18/11/2014, Parma

Meeting room: MTG 08/09

(Agreed on 08/01/2015)

Participants

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

Country	Name
Austria	-
Belgium	Kathy BRISON
Bulgaria	Snezhana TODOROVA
Cyprus	Eleni IOANNOU KAKOURI (web conference)
Croatia	Sandra BASIC
Czech Republic	Irena REHURKOVA
Denmark	Jens Hinge ANDERSEN
Estonia	-
Finland	Marika JESTOI
France	Jean-Cédric RENINGER
Germany	-
Greece	Leonidas PALILIS
Hungary	László MÉSZAROS
Ireland	Eileen O'DEA
Italy	Michele DE MARTINO
Latvia	Dzintars ZACS
Lithuania	Agnietė GRUŠAUSKIENĖ
Luxembourg	Elisa BARILOZZI
Malta	Ingrid BUSUTTIL
Netherlands	-
Poland	Andrzej STARSKI
Portugal	Luisa OLIVEIRA
Romania	-
Slovakia	-
Slovenia	Marko LUCI
Spain	-
Sweden	David FOSTER
United Kingdom	Christina BASKARAN
Iceland	-
Liechtenstein	-
Norway	Per BRATTERUD
Switzerland	-

- **Hearing Experts**

Laura POTOČNIK (Slovenia), Metka PRVINSEK (Slovenia), Petra FOHGELBERG (Sweden), Sara HARDY (UK)

- **European Commission:**

N/A

- **EFSA:**

DATA Unit: Francesco VERNAZZA (Chair), Mary GILSENAN (Head of Unit), Enikő VARGA (Scientific Officer)

1. Welcome and apologies for absence

The Chair welcomed the participants.

Apologies were received from Elke RAUSCHER-GABERNIG (Austria), Kadi PADUR (Estonia), Günter SOMMERFELD (Germany), Rob THEELEN (Netherlands), Nicoleta MILITA (Romania), Angela SVETLIKOVÁ (Slovakia), Victoria MARCOS SUÁREZ (Spain).

During the introduction to the meeting, the participants were informed of the Decision of the Executive Director on Declarations of Interests (applicable as of 30 September 2014), in particular on Article 10 thereof.¹

2. Adoption of agenda

The agenda was adopted without changes.

3. Topics for discussion

Mary Gilsenan gave an introduction presentation to the meeting alluding to EFSA's draft Data Roadmap, the EFSA Scientific Data Warehouse (DWH), the Open EFSA Initiative² and outlining EFSA's ambitions towards more openness and transparency of European risk assessments. Thanks to collaboration with Member State data providers the European Food Safety Authority (EFSA) has accumulated a large hub of European data for use in EFSA risk assessments. However, beyond EFSA's use of these data, which have a lot of potential added value for European research and innovation, they remain largely unexploited.

Within this context, the Circle of Trust initiative was initiated at the 8th Network Meeting on Chemical Occurrence Data in April 2014 as a **voluntary pilot study** to foster sharing of contaminant occurrence data with interested Member States as per the April meeting's minutes. The launch of this initiative is timely as it coincides with the launch of the EFSA Scientific Data Warehouse which will provide an interface to the data. By participating in this initiative, members of the group can also have access to the DWH and provide feedback on its functionality. The purpose of this meeting was to discuss how this initiative could be organised in practice and to agree a list of conditions for sharing.

Mary's presentation was followed by an open discussion which addressed different aspects of the Circle of Trust initiative. In particular, the definition of the organisations and the actual persons inside the organisations to involve in the initiative, the definition of the information to

¹ Implementing rules on declarations of interest adopted in 2012 were updated following a technical review in July 2014 and become applicable as of 30 September 2014 – The updated document is available online at <http://www.efsa.europa.eu/en/keydocs/docs/independencerules2014.pdf>

² Available online: <http://www.efsa.europa.eu/en/corporate/pub/openefsadiscussionpaper14.htm>

be shared and the proposed conditions for sharing were discussed. The participants expressed their opinions and debated the different aspects.

A set of agreed 'rules' for the Circle of Trust pilot was identified. EFSA committed to provide a document for the Member States presenting the agreed rules (see Annex). After this, the Member States will be asked to confirm participation under the agreed conditions. The participation is on voluntary basis, but Member States that do not wish to participate at the outset, are invited to do so at a later stage. The Circle of Trust pilot initiative is planned to be launched at the beginning of 2015.

The draft document with the rules proposed by the participants of the Network meeting for the Circle of Trust pilot is annexed to these minutes.

The layout of the standard templates for tables and graphs available in Microstrategy for the pilot was discussed. EFSA will develop standard templates and countries with relevant experience may put forward additional proposals.

Action: EFSA and countries having or in the process of building a data warehouse committed to make proposals for the reports (standard output models) to be available in Microstrategy. Deadline for the proposals: before the Christmas break 2014.

4. Any Other Business

N/A

5. Closure of the meeting

The meeting was closed at 18:00, as foreseen in the agenda.

Evidence Management Unit (DATA UNIT)

ANNEX

‘CIRCLE OF TRUST’ PILOT INITIATIVE FOR CHEMICAL OCCURRENCE DATA SHARING

PROPOSED RULES FOR THE PILOT³

Background

As a European organisation at the service of the European Member States and citizens, EFSA has a vision. Looking ahead at the coming challenges, this vision encompasses the priorities of cooperation, innovation and openness, with the aim of creating a more open EFSA, an open science organisation. In recent years, EFSA has evolved into an information rich public administration with data as a key asset. In collaboration with Member States, the authority has successfully accumulated a wealth of risk assessment data from Member State data providers in particular and currently has unique access to these data for use in risk assessments. The role of data is central and EFSA has developed a data roadmap draft outlining EFSA’s ambitions for a more innovative approach to data collection, access and analysis.

Within the framework of the EFSA draft data roadmap and EFSA’s vision for a more ‘Open EFSA’, EFSA would like to provide more accessibility to risk assessment data to allow better re-use of the hub of European risk assessment data that only EFSA currently has direct access to. In line with the general ‘Open Data’ movement, and is envisaged that better access to data would foster more research and innovation for the ultimate benefit of consumers.

In particular, the draft roadmap takes stock of EFSA’s and Member States’ achievements in the area of data collection and management to date and defines EFSA’s ambitions for a more innovative approach related to data collection, access and analysis. It sets the scene for more openness and transparency, following in the footsteps of other EU agencies.

The goal is to improve internal operational efficiency, increase transparency and to strengthen EFSA’s position as an information hub enabling innovative exploitation of data, and as well as transformation to an ‘Open EFSA’.

To support this process, EFSA is developing a Scientific Data Warehouse (DWH) that will allow the publication, analysis and distribution, in different formats and at different level of granularity, of data collected by EFSA. These data include among others information on zoonoses, antimicrobial resistance, foodborne outbreaks, pesticide residues, chemical contaminants, food consumption and chemical hazards. Data will be accessible through specific web reporting tools by means of tables, reports, graphs, maps and dashboards. A set of proposed conservative DHW access rules has been developed covering the different possible stakeholders. The proposed rules reflect the existing situation regarding data accessibility for different stakeholders, with the additional benefit of providing data providers access to their data. The rules have been previously shared with

³ As proposed by the participants of the meeting of the Scientific Network on Chemical Occurrence Data (specific meeting on for the Circle of Trust initiative) held in Parma on 18 November 2014

EFSA's data networks and have been discussed at the Standing Committee for Plants, Animals, Food and Feed (PAFF) (in the three sections on Pesticides Residues, on Biological Monitoring and Toxicological).

In particular, for the domain of chemical occurrence data the proposed access rules are listed in Table 1.

Table 1: Proposed Data Warehouse access rules for the domain of chemical occurrence data (extracted from data warehouse access rules).

	EFSA + EC ^{a)}	EFSA Panels/WGs ^{a)}	Data Providers	General Public
Chemical Contaminants data collections - Before the publication of the EFSA Output(s)	Full Access	Raw data access limited by the Panel/WG mandate	Access to own raw data	No Access
Chemical Contaminants data collections - After the publication of the EFSA Output(s)	Full Access	Not applicable(*) (*) <i>Mandate is closed and EFSA output published</i>	Access to own raw data + Access to data at the level of aggregation as defined in the published EFSA output(s)	Access to data at the level of aggregation as defined in the published EFSA output(s)

^{a)} EC = European Commission; WG = Working Group

As shown in Table 1, the data providers (usually Member States' official organisations) will have access to their data as well as access to aggregated statistics on all data used in EFSA output(s) at the same level of aggregation available in the EFSA output, after its publication. However, this is only a starting point.

The subject of open data was discussed at the 8th meeting of the Scientific Network on Chemical Occurrence in April 2014⁴. A common point resulting from the discussion was to adopt a tiered approach. EFSA proposed therefore a pilot 'user community', possibly within the framework of the DWH, whereby a limited number of Member States could have access to each other's raw data under defined conditions within a 'Circle of Trust' pilot. In the 'Circle of Trust' access would be significantly extended with respect to the default proposed access rules of the DWH.

The specific rules for the 'Circle of Trust' pilot were discussed in a specific meeting of the Scientific Network on Chemical Occurrence Data, held on 18 November 2014⁵. The present proposal is based on the rules defined in that meeting.

Rules

Participants of the pilot

For each country participating in the pilot, the initial participant in the 'Circle of Trust' will be the institution involved as the main data provider to EFSA, in most cases the representative in the Scientific Network on Chemical Occurrence. For the purpose of the pilot, not only the organisation will be defined, but also the

⁴ Available online: <http://www.efsa.europa.eu/en/datexegs/documents/141104-m.pdf>

⁵ Available online: <http://www.efsa.europa.eu/en/datexegs/documents/141104-m.pdf>

contact point inside the organisation. The suggested preferred contact point was the chemical occurrence network member.

Definition of the data to be shared

The elements (fields) of the Standard Sample Description revision 1 (SSD1), the EFSA standard for receipt of occurrence data, to be shared were discussed. It was proposed to include all fields of the SSD1 except the text fields that might identify a producer (i.e. *Product full text description*, *Brand name*, *Manufacturer*, *Product comment*) and the fields based on the Nomenclature of Territorial Units for Statistics (NUTS) catalogue (*Area of sampling*, *Area of origin of the product*, *Area of processing*). The reason for excluding the fields based on the NUTS catalogue is the narrow geographical areas defined in the NUTS catalogue.

It was also agreed to exclude samples from 'suspect sampling'. Data provided from the industry will also be excluded and a possible agreement with the industry data provider for sharing their data will be explored in the future. All the data provided by the competent Authorities of the countries will be included in the pilot.

Aggregated statistics will be available for three numerical fields of the SSD1: *Result LOD*, *Result LOQ* and *Result value*.

It was proposed to allow grouping and filtering the data analyses on the SSD1 fields *Country of sampling*, *Country of origin of the product*, *EFSA Product Code*, *Product code*, *Method of production*, *Year of sampling*, *Sampling strategy*, *Sampling point*, *Laboratory accreditation*, *Parameter code*, *Type of parameter*, *Analytical method code*, *Accreditation procedure for the analytical method* and *Type of result*.

An overview of the fields of the SSD1 and their status in the pilot is shown in Table 2

Table 2: Elements (fields) of the Standard Sample Description (SSD1) and their status in the pilot.

SSD1 Code	Element Name	Element Label	Catalogue	Description	Status (a)
S.01	<i>labSampCode</i>	Laboratory sample code		Alphanumeric code of the analysed sample.	I
S.02	<i>labSubSampCode</i>	Laboratory sub-sample code		Numeric sequence number reflecting a subgroup of the analysed sample. The default value is 1.	I
S.03	<i>lang</i>	Language	LANG	Language used to fill in the free text fields (ISO-639-1).	I
S.04	<i>sampCountry</i>	Country of sampling	COUNTRY	Country where the sample was collected. (ISO 3166-1-alpha-2).	F1
S.05	<i>sampArea</i>	Area of sampling	NUTS	Area where the sample was collected (Nomenclature of territorial units for statistics – NUTS – coding system valid only for EEA and Switzerland).	E
S.06	<i>origCountry</i>	Country of origin of the product	COUNTRY	Country of origin of the product (ISO 3166-1-alpha-2 country code).	F1
S.07	<i>origArea</i>	Area of origin of the product	NUTS	Area of origin of the product (Nomenclature of territorial units for statistics – NUTS – coding system valid only for EEA and Switzerland).	E
S.08	<i>origFishAreaCode</i>	Area of origin for fisheries or aquaculture activities code	FAREA	Fisheries or aquaculture area specifying the origin of the sample (FAO Fisheries areas).	I
S.09	<i>origFishAreaText</i>	Area of origin for fisheries or aquaculture activities text		Fisheries or aquaculture area specified in free text.	I
S.10	<i>procCountry</i>	Country of processing	COUNTRY	Country where the food was process (ISO 3166-1-alpha-2).	I
S.11	<i>procArea</i>	Area of processing	NUTS	Area of product processing (Nomenclature of territorial units for statistics – NUTS – coding system valid only for EEA and Switzerland).	E

S.12	<i>EFSAProdCode</i>	EFSA Product Code	FOODEX	Product under analysis described according to the EFSA Food Classification and Description System, currently under development.	F1
S.13	<i>prodCode</i>	Product code	MATRIX	Product under analysis described according to the MATRIX catalogue, currently available.	F2
S.14	<i>prodText</i>	Product full text description		Free text to describe in detail the product sampled. The text should provide additional information in respect to S.13. This element becomes mandatory if “product code” is ‘XXXXXXA’ (Not in list).	E
S.15	<i>prodProdMeth</i>	Method of production	PRODMD	Code providing additional information on the type of production for the food under analysis.	F1
S.16	<i>prodPack</i>	Packaging	PRODPAC	Describe container or wrapper that holds the product. Common type of packaging: paper or plastic bags, boxes, tinplate or aluminium cans, plastic trays, plastic bottles, glass bottles or jars.	I
S.17	<i>prodTreat</i>	Product treatment	PRODTR	Used to characterise a food product based on the treatment or processes applied to the product or any indexed ingredient.	I
S.18	<i>prodBrandName</i>	Brand name		Brand name of the product under analysis.	E
S.19	<i>prodManuf</i>	Manufacturer		Company manufacturer of the product.	E
S.20	<i>prodInged</i>	Ingredients		List of ingredients, separated by “\$”, for the product under analysis. Use to provide further information on composite product.	I
S.21	<i>prodCom</i>	Product comment		Additional information on the product, particularly home preparation details if available.	E
S.22	<i>prodY</i>	Year of production		Year of production.	I
S.23	<i>prodM</i>	Month of production		Month of production.	I
S.24	<i>prodD</i>	Day of production		Day of production.	I
S.25	<i>expiryY</i>	Year of expiry		Best before year or use by year or other indication of the expiry year.	I
S.26	<i>expiryM</i>	Month of expiry		Best before month or use by month or other indication of expiry month.	I
S.27	<i>expiryD</i>	Day of expiry		Best before day or use by day or other indication of the expiry day.	I
S.28	<i>sampY</i>	Year of sampling		Year of sampling. If the measure is the result of a sampling over a period of time, this field should contain the year when the first sample was collected.	F1
S.29	<i>sampM</i>	Month of sampling		Month of sampling. If the measure is the result of a sampling over a period of time, this field should contain the month when the first sample was collected.	I
S.30	<i>sampD</i>	Day of sampling		Day of sampling. If the measure is the result of a sampling over a period of time, this field should contain the day when the first sample was collected.	I
S.31	<i>progCode</i>	Sampling programme code		Sender’s unique identification code of the programme or project for which the sample analysed was taken.	I
S.32	<i>progLegalRef</i>	Programme legal reference		Reference to the legislation for the programme defined by programme number.	I
S.33	<i>progSampStrategy</i>	Sampling strategy	SAMPSTR	Sampling strategy (ref. EUROSTAT - Typology of sampling strategy, version of July 2009) performed in the programme or project identified by programme code.	F1
S.34	<i>progType</i>	Type of sampling program	SRCTYP	Indicate the type programme for which the samples have been collected.	I
S.35	<i>sampMethod</i>	Sampling method	SAMPMD	Code describing the sampling method.	I
S.36	<i>sampleNum</i>	Number of samples		Number of food samples analysed, only if composite samples were used.	I
S.37	<i>lotSize</i>	Lot size		Size of the lot the sample belong to.	I
S.38	<i>lotSizeUnit</i>	Lot size unit	UNIT	Unit in which the lot size is expressed.	I
S.39	<i>sampPoint</i>	Sampling point	SMPNT	Point in the food chain where the sample was taken. (Doc. ESTAT/F5/ES/155 “Data dictionary of activities of the establishments”).	F2
L.1	<i>labCode</i>	Laboratory		Laboratory code (National laboratory code if available). This code should be unique and consistent through the transmissions.	I

L.2	<i>labAccred</i>	Laboratory accreditation	LABACC	The laboratory accreditation to ISO/IEC 17025.	F2
L.3	<i>labCountry</i>	Laboratory country	COUNTRY	Country where the laboratory is placed. (ISO 3166-1-alpha-2).	I
O.1	<i>localOrg</i>	Local organisation		Local or regional organisation (Competent authority or company affiliate) who requested initially the analysis.	I
O.2	<i>localOrgCountry</i>	Local organisation country	COUNTRY	Country where the local organisation is placed. (ISO 3166-1-alpha-2).	I
R.01	<i>resultCode</i>	Result code		Unique identification number of an analytical result (a row of the data table) in the transmitted file. The result code must be maintained at organisation level and it will be used in further updated/deletion operation from the senders.	I
R.02	<i>analysisY</i>	Year of analysis		Year when the analysis was completed.	I
R.03	<i>analysisM</i>	Month of analysis		Month when the analysis was completed.	I
R.04	<i>analysisD</i>	Day of analysis		Day when the analysis was completed.	I
R.05	<i>EFSAParamCode</i>	EFSA Parameter Code	To be defined	Parameter/analyte of the analysis described according to the EFSA Parameters System, currently under development.	I
R.06	<i>paramCode</i>	Parameter code	PARAM	Parameter/analyte of the analysis described according to the Substance Code of the PARAM catalogue.	F1
R.07	<i>paramText</i>	Parameter text		Parameter subject of the analysis described according to the PARAM catalogue.	I
R.08	<i>paramType</i>	Type of parameter	PARTYP	Define if the parameter reported is an individual residue/analyte, a summed residue definition or part of a sum a summed residue definition.	F2
R.09	<i>anMethRefCode</i>	Analytical method reference code		Identifier for the method used. When validated methods are used, the official reference code should be provided.	I
R.10	<i>anMethCode</i>	Analytical method code	ANLYMD	Code describing the instrument used in the method.	F1
R.11	<i>anMethText</i>	Analytical method text		Free text describing the analytical instrument used, particularly if “other” was reported for “Analytical method code”.	I
R.12	<i>accredProc</i>	Accreditation procedure for the analytical method	MDSTAT	Accreditation procedure for the analytical method used.	F2
R.13	<i>resUnit</i>	Result unit	UNIT	Unit of measurement for the values reported in “Result LOD”, “result LOQ”, “CC Alpha”, “CC Beta”, “Result value”, “Result value uncertainty standard deviation”, “Result value uncertainty” and “Result legal limit”.	I
R.14	<i>resLOD</i>	Result LOD		Limit of detection reported in the unit specified by the variable “Result unit”.	A
R.15	<i>resLOQ</i>	Result LOQ		Limit of quantification reported in the unit specified by the variable “Result unit”.	A
R.16	<i>CCalpha</i>	CC alpha		CC alpha value (decision limit) reported in the unit specified by the variable “Result unit”.	I
R.17	<i>CCbeta</i>	CC beta		CC beta value (detection capability) reported in the unit specified by the variable “Result unit”.	I
R.18	<i>resVal</i>	Result value		The result of the analytical measure reported in the unit specified by the variable “Result unit”.	A
R.19	<i>resValRec</i>	Result value recovery		Recovery value associated with the concentration measurement expressed as a percentage (%). i.e. report 100 for 100%.	I
R.20	<i>resValRecCorr</i>	Result value corrected for recovery	YESNO	Define if the result value has been corrected by calculation for recovery.	I
R.21	<i>resValUncertSD</i>	Result value uncertainty Standard deviation		Standard deviation for the uncertainty measure.	I
R.22	<i>resValUncert</i>	Result value uncertainty		Indicate the expanded uncertainty (usually 95% confidence interval) value associated with the measurement expressed in the unit reported in the field “Result unit”.	I
R.23	<i>moistPerc</i>	Percentage of moisture in the original sample		Percentage of moisture in the original sample.	I
R.24	<i>fatPerc</i>	Percentage of fat in		Percentage of fat in the original sample.	I

		the original sample			
R.25	<i>exprRes</i>	Expression of result	EXRES	Code to describe the how the result has been expressed: Whole weight, fat weight, dry weight, etc...	I
R.26	<i>resQualValue</i>	Result qualitative value	POSNEG	This field should be completed only if the result value is qualitative e.g. Positive / Negative. In this case the element "Result value" should be left blank.	I
R.27	<i>resType</i>	Type of result	VALTYP	Indicate the type of result, whether it could be quantified/determined or not.	F1
R.28	<i>resLegalLimit</i>	Legal Limit for the result		Report the legal limit for the analyte in the product sampled.	I
R.29	<i>resLegalLimitType</i>	Type of legal limit	LMTTYP	Type of legal limit applied for the evaluation of the result. ML, MRPL, MRL, action limit.	I
R.30	<i>resEvaluation</i>	Evaluation of the result	RESEVAL	Indicate if the result exceeds a legal limit.	I
R.31	<i>actTakenCode</i>	Action Taken	ACTION	Describe any follow-up actions taken as a result of the exceeding a legal limit.	I
R.32	<i>resComm</i>	Comment of the result		Additional comments for this analytical result.	I

- (a) The elements tagged with E will be excluded from the pilot; all the other elements will be included (I). Elements tagged with F1 or F2 (first or second priority) are those intended for filtering or grouping in the report tables/graphs. The elements tagged with A are those for which statistics are created.

Conditions for sharing

It is proposed that access be granted to the institutions participating in the Circle of Trust but without creating any report document circulated either internally or externally.

Use for specific purposes leading to (institutional- or third party-) reports or documents is only with prior discussion and permission from the owner of the data. This approach was viewed to favour a stronger co-operation between participating countries with the possibility of wider collaboration as an outcome of this pilot project.

In case of agreement for publication of reports based on the shared data, all data providers should be acknowledged in any such publication.

Duration of the pilot: it is proposed to start with 1 year and possibly extend the period after the 'learning phase'.

In terms of timeframe, members of the group agreed that the scope would be limited to chemical contaminant occurrence data with a sampling year from 2010 onwards.

Access will be granted through the DWH.

Evidence management Unit (DATA)

Scientific Network on Chemical Occurrence Data

Minutes of the discussion session

Held on WEB-conference, 17/06/2014 (9:00-13:00)

(Agreed on 4 July 2014)¹

Participants

• **Network Representatives of Member States:**

Country	Name ²	Country	Name
Austria	-	Italy	-
Belgium	-	Latvia (LV)	Aija Melngaile
Bulgaria (BG)	Snezhana Todorova	Lithuania	-
Cyprus (CY)	Eleni Kakouri	Luxembourg (LU)	Elisa Barillozzi
Croatia (HR)	Sandra Basic	Malta	-
Czech Republic (CZ)	Jiří Vysloužil Jana Nečesalová	Netherlands (NL)	Jacob van Klaveren
Denmark	-	Poland (PL)	Andrzej Starski
Estonia	-	Portugal	-
Finland (FI)	Anja Hallikainen Elina Hietikko	Romania	-
France (FR)	Jean-Cédric Reninger	Slovakia	-
Germany (DE)	Annett Mellenthin	Slovenia (SI)	Alexandra Jug
Greece	-	Spain (ES)	Victoria Marcos Suárez
Hungary (HU)	László Mészáros	Sweden (SE)	David Foster Petra Fohgelberg
Ireland (IE)	Donal McCoy	United Kingdom	-

• **EFSA:**

- DATA: Francesco Vernazza (CHAIR)

• **Others (if applicable such as WGs/other country representatives)**

Norway Per Bratterud

¹ The publication of the minutes shall be made without delay in compliance with the Founding Regulation and no later than 15 working days following the day of their agreement.

² Indicate first full name and then surname (John Smith) all throughout the document

1. Welcome and apologies for absence

The Chair welcomed the participants and thanked France for proposing this additional session to discuss the point on Support and training that could not be addressed during the Network meeting on 8-9 April 2014.

Apologies were received from Austria, Belgium, Denmark, Estonia, Greece, Italy, Lithuania, Malta, Portugal, Slovenia and United Kingdom

2. Adoption of agenda

The agenda included two points:

1. Plenary discussion following the feedback from the break-out groups on support and training for FoodEx2 and SSD2, referring to the minutes of the meeting of 8-9 April;
2. Discussion of some proposals on FoodEx2 update based on suggestions received by the users.

It was adopted without changes.

5. Topics for discussion

5.1 Support and training

After a plenary reading of the Annex I of the minutes of the meeting of 8-9 April 2014 (feedback from the break-out groups on Support and training), the participants discussed the ideas and proposals contained in the document. Some major subjects were debated:

1. Promotion of the data collection process at all levels, in particular at level of decision makers;
2. Resourcing the harmonisation and data collection process;
3. Integration of the new standards into the existing systems and the need to establish a technical forum for these questions;
4. Training initiatives.

Promotion of the data collection process at all levels, in particular at level of decision makers

The importance of advertising at operational and managerial levels in the Member States (MS) the advantages of the harmonised data collection at European level was stressed by all participants. In particular SE, CY, FR and NL said that a collection of 'success stories' made possible by the use of the new standards would be a useful tool. EFSA agreed on the principle and highlighted the fact that the progressive implementation of the new standards will allow more refined data analysis, resulting in very good success stories; a possible initiative would be to collect a list of report, opinions and Commission requests where the level of details and the facets available in the new standards were needed. FR highlighted the importance of concrete examples of the use done of the data. EFSA should every year communicate with a 'leaflet' the use of data in reports, opinions, advice to the European Commission (EC). It should also be explained how data are used and a more extensive explanation should be provided for the need for mandatory fields, since the concept of '*mandatory*' needs to be justified at all levels. NL proposed advertisement by explaining which facets have proved to be crucial in some specific assessments (FCMs, Some contaminants etc...). CY observed that exposure assessment is per se a good justification; having more detailed information allows making more accurate exposure assessment. ES also noted that an accurate data collection is always an advantage for assessment; an important point is that this may reduce the conservative assumptions, thus protecting the

consumers without useless limitations on the food production side. DE proposed as a good argument the fact that detail is crucial in crises management, sampling planning and similar food safety related activities.

Taking advantage of the update of the Regulation 882/2004 for official controls was also briefly mentioned, since this subject was separately debated in the network. FI asked whether EFSA could engage directly in providing a short paper highlighting what would be needed at legislation level, to provide a basis for discussion in the EC committees. EFSA said that based on the general principle of separation of risk assessment and risk management these initiatives should be managed at MS level. EFSA also observed that quite concrete points were already included in the proposal presented by IE at the Network meeting in April.

Resourcing the harmonisation and data collection process

All participants agreed on the importance of making the process of harmonisation and data collection sustainable (maintenance, updates, coding...) by ensuring proper financial support. A model of funding similar to the one adopted for the Focal Points (FP) was identified as a potentially effective option. The option should be investigated through the channel of the Advisory Forum (AF). Co-funding shared between EFSA and the EC (the principal 'clients' of the harmonised data) was also envisaged.

FI underlined the fact that, apart from the operational tasks listed above, the coordination of the data collection across different domains is also important. The inter-domain coordination might be a task for the FPs, while the operational tasks should be performed by a dedicated resource. CY informed that the discussion on additional funding of the FPs to also cover the coordination of the scientific networks is already under discussion between EFSA and the MSs. For the additional operational resource, the Network members will liaise with the respective AF members.

Integration of the new standards into the existing systems

ES observed that really many aspects are involved under this point: Training, Mapping tools, Devices in the field work. Big differences exist among countries respect to the systems on place, depending on organisation. DE informed that a discussion on the integration in the existing devices of the harmonised standards has already started at country level in Germany and it was found that most of the systems in place cannot manage the faceted approach. It would be of help communicating that at EU level the data transmission moves to faceted catalogues (Germany is also introducing the same concept at national level) and that EFSA shares this vision. DE would appreciate if EFSA might contribute to more communication at national level sharing the vision with all involved institutions.

An important aspect regarding the integration of the new standards is the management and integration of the catalogues, first of all FoodEx2. NO, SE and FR proposed that EFSA provides to the countries the code of the FoodEx2 browser as a starting point for developments of tools for data collection 'in the field'. EFSA proposed to release the code under a GNU-like open source license, with the proper disclaimer of use-at-own-risk. The advantage would be a community-based development whose results would be available to the entire community. All countries agreed in principle with this approach. HU, while welcoming the GNU-like approach as best option, warned about the need to reach a "critical mass" for this activity.

In the field of integration, SE proposed to establish a technical forum, holding meetings with focus on the problems and solutions implementing SSD2. The integration with existing systems, or legacy systems, could be discussed and the different countries could help each other. NO supported the idea from Sweden on a technical group on implementation of SSD2 regardless of domain. A group like this could function mainly by teleconferences and email. All other countries represented in the discussion agreed with the proposal.

Training initiatives

Both, training in EFSA and training in the countries were considered. ES suggested as starting point several countries attending training in EFSA, then web conferences on a regular basis.

The concept of trainings located in one country but serving a pool of neighbour countries was explored. FR proposed a training group with Switzerland, Belgium and Luxembourg for instance based on the common language. An alternative option might be with other close countries (like Spain). CY offered to host a local training with Greece taking advantage of the common language. LV proposed a regional training session for the Baltic Region and would also be available to host it.

HU proposed regional "contact" *training for trainers*. Hungary could be a good location for that involving the other central European countries like Austria, Croatia, Romania, Slovakia, Slovenia etc.

Other tools like the Guest scientist schema were also mentioned to this respect. Countries interested in it were invited to express their interest with EFSA through official channels. DE said that technical support by EFSA staff in 2015 and 2016 - 2018 for the implementation process (secondment by EFSA staff) would be very useful for them. For example, in the process of implementing FoodEx2 and SSD2, some technical support by EFSA staff in implementing EFSA's business rules in the national system would be needed (short stay, sharing of SAS code); same for XML export.

FI proposed to prepare promotional and introductory material e.g. on FoodEx2 (like a booklet, with examples) suitable for communicating and introducing the concepts at all levels. CZ stressed the potential of instructional videos as a self-administered training tool. DE also supported the idea of e-learning tools.

5.2 FoodEx2

Some proposals for the ongoing update of FoodEx2 based on the comments received and the experience gained were presented to the group.

The first proposal was to simplify the task of coding in FoodEx (reporting) by creating a reporting hierarchy built with a pre-defined priority in the implicit facets, with the aim of having a unique combination of facets for each term. At the same time, the Master hierarchy (not in use) would be removed from the browser and the possibility to filter out the unneeded lists in the different domains will be explored.

The second proposal was to introduce where possible 'source-less' or 'ingredient-less' generic groups, based only on the nature facet as starting point for the branches in the hierarchy. This would allow reporting in cases of limited information and allow to correctly building terms not present in the explicit list.

The third proposal was in the case of processed fish, seafood, meat or vegetables to pre-define the order of applicability of some crucial treatment descriptors, like canning, pickling, salting, smoking etc. This is expected to simplify the use of the classification for coding and remove ambiguity.

In line with the above mentioned proposals, the revision of the facet process and the facet nature and the restructuring of some processed products (fish and seafood) were presented.

The update of the list of commodities aligned with the EC revision of the matrix list for pesticides was also explained.

A proposal was presented for reporting commodities with minor ingredients added (like salted peanuts) and mixed products (like mixed milk samples); the proposal was based on a flexible use of the facets 'Ingredients' and 'Source commodities'.

Other actions aimed at simplifying the use of FoodEx were listed. They include improvement of the scope notes, the creation of a flat list of pre-defined codes coming from the practical use (to be used as lookup aid during coding), the improved list of aliases, the possible use of filters to exclude terms at level of detail not needed (like in the case of cheeses). A number of improvements to the browser suggested by the users were proposed.

In particular, the improvement of the browser was proposed as a possible community action based on the GNU-like open source licence concept introduced during the discussion of point 5.1.

The comments received for these proposals were positive. Many participants underlined that clarity and simplification in the use of FoodEx2 is of paramount importance.

6. Next meeting(s)

The meeting was concluded at 13:00. No further meeting dates were discussed in this session.

Evidence Management (DATA) UNIT

Expert Group (Network) on Chemical Occurrence

Minutes of the 8th meeting

Held on 8-9 04 2014, Parma

(Agreed on 16 May 2014)¹

Participants

- **Network Representatives of Member States and Norway:**

Country	Name	Country	Name
Austria	Elke RAUSCHER-GABERNIG	Ireland	Eileen O'DEA
Belgium	Vera CANTAERT	Latvia	Dzintars ZACS
Bulgaria	Snezhana TODOROVA	Lithuania	Agnetė GRUŠAUSKIENĖ
Croatia	Sandra BAŠIĆ	Netherlands	Jacob VAN KLAVEREN
Cyprus	Eleni IOANNOU-KAKOURI	Norway	Per BRATTERUD
Czech Republic	Irena REHURKOVA	Poland	Andrzej STARSKI
Denmark	Jens Hinge ANDERSEN	Portugal	Luisa OLIVEIRA
Estonia	Rina RAND	Slovakia	Angela SVETLIKOVA
Finland	Anja HALLIKAINEN	Slovenia	Marko LUCI Aleksandra JUG
France	Jean-Cédric RENINGER	Spain	Victoria MARCOS SUÁREZ
Germany	Annett MELLENTHIN	Sweden	David FOSTER Petra FOHGELBERG
Greece	Leonidas PALILIS	United Kingdom	Kevin HARGIN
Hungary	László MÉSZÁROS		

- **Hearing Experts:**
 - Karine VIN - ANSES
- **European Commission and/or Member States representatives:**

¹ The publication of the minutes shall be made without delay in compliance with the Founding Regulation and no later than 15 working days following the day of their agreement.

- Thomas WENZL - Joint Research Centre (JRC)

- **EFSA:**

- DATA Unit: Francesco VERNAZZA (Chair), Mary GILSENAN, Francesco POMILIO, Doreen Dolores RUSSELL, Chiara GUESCINI*, Stefano CAPPÉ*, Enikő VARGA*, Alessandro CARLETTI*, Fanny HÉRAUD*, Liisa VALSTA*.
- EXO: Roy KIRBY*
- * Attendance at specific points on the agenda.

- **Others (pre-accession countries):**

- Zdenka ZORICIC - Montenegro
- Lidija DAMEVSKA - FYROM
- Dragana JOVIC - Serbia
- Serap HANCI - Turkey

1. Welcome and apologies for absence

The Chair welcomed the participants to the meeting.

Apologies were received from Iceland, Italy, Luxembourg, Malta and Romania.

The main objectives of the meeting were outlined by the Chair and the administrative issues associated with the representatives' attendance at the meeting explained to the meeting's participants.

2. Adoption of agenda

The agenda was adopted without changes.

3. Declarations of interest

In accordance with EFSA's Policy on Independence and Scientific Decision-Making Processes regarding Declarations of Interests (Dols)² and the Decision of the Executive Director implementing this Policy³, members of networks, peer review meetings, networking meetings and their alternates shall be invited to complete and submit an Annual Declaration of interest (ADoI).

EFSA screened the ADoI and the filled in by the experts invited for the present meeting. No conflicts of interests related to the issues discussed in this meeting have been identified during the screening process or at the Oral Declaration of Interest (ODOI) at the beginning of this meeting.

The Chair thanked the representatives that have submitted their ADoIs.

² <http://www.efsa.europa.eu/en/keydocs/docs/independencepolicy.pdf>

³ <http://www.efsa.europa.eu/en/keydocs/docs/independencerules.pdf>

4. Agreement of the minutes of the 7th meeting of the Expert Group (Network) on Chemical Occurrence held on 14-15 05 2013, Parma

The minutes were agreed by written procedure on 07 June 2013 and published on the EFSA website on 18 June 2013.

5. Topics for discussion

5.1 New name, structure and organisation of the Department and the Unit

Mary Gilsenan, head of the DATA Unit, presented the remit of the Risk Assessment and Scientific Assistance (RASA) Directorate (now called Department) and summarised the purpose of the restructuring: to gain efficiency by introducing a project management approach and strengthened collaboration between the reorganised units. The tasks and the structure of the four new RASA units were outlined. Data collection is organised in the DATA unit in order to centralise and streamline data collection, to increase efficiency through the adoption of new work approaches and to pool existing knowledge and resources.

5.2 Presentation of SSD2 (Standard Sample Description Version2)

Stefano Cappè gave an overview of the Standard Sample Description, version 2 (SSD2) data model explaining why an updated version is needed and giving the timeframe for the introduction of the revised system. To increase the flexibility of the SSD2 system an update is required to incorporate the reporting of microbiological contaminants, anti-microbial isolates, food additives and zoonotic agents and SSD2 is also required to fully support the EFSA food classification system (FoodEx2). The progress on the development of SSD2 was provided together with the milestones of the project.

Finland requested further details on molecular typing and on the timeframe for introduction of the collection of veterinary drug residues data. EFSA replied that it has recently received a mandate to collect sample based veterinary residue data for the first time and that a pilot data collection is envisaged in 2015. The Netherlands asked if it is possible to be given an overview of the advantages of SSD2 to help convince data providers in Member States of the advantages of adopting SSD2 and to link to mandates from the Commission. Cyprus asked about the start date of the SSD2 pilot and web based catalogues. Stefano Cappè indicated that the time depends upon completion of the evaluation process but it could be indicatively mid June 2014. Croatia asked if a new developed system should be done using SSD2. Stefano Cappè said that the development should be done in agreement with the deliverables of the grants/procurements but in case they wish to be aligned with the most updated version, they should be able to export also SSD1 files from their IT system. The mapping between SSD2 and SSD1 is quite straight forward as indicated in the guidance. Norway asked about the use of semantic web technology to access catalogues. EFSA explained XML format is currently specified for catalogues but the Guidance on Data Exchange anticipates their availability in RDF format. EFSA indicated that the RDF format will be implemented in the EFSA system after the XML functionality will be operative. Portugal requested if samples from food-borne outbreaks could be signalled and reported in SSD2. Stefano Cappè said this part was not under the scope of the mandate for SSD2. However, in the framework of the activities for the implementation of molecular typing data collection, food borne outbreaks data are being considered for future inclusion in SSD2.

5.3 Support for SSD2

Alessandro Carletti described the support available for SSD2. EFSA has launched a call for the testing and assessment of SSD2 and suitability for reporting data. A call has been launched, the evaluation process is in progress and the kick off meeting is envisaged in May/June 2014. He outlined the tasks and deliverables required of the contractors.

Norway asked EFSA if there would be a new version of FoodEx2, EFSA advised that revisions to improve the tool are in progress and a new release is planned: this would be elaborated upon in the following presentation. Spain's question concerned future changes to SSD2 given that the new version contains more domains than SSD1. EFSA replied that major structural changes are not expected; any changes will likely be supported in the structure of SSD2 through the use of compound fields. Nonetheless some extensions of the catalogues can be expected. Norway asked if a procedure for proposing new items is anticipated. EFSA replied that there should be a release each year and that there will be an opportunity for the Network to provide feedback.

5.4 Tour de table on SSD2, its support and the implementation planning

Discussion on this aspect was conducted in groups (together with the support for FoodEx2 implementation) and the comments and feedback of the interested Member States are summarised in Annex 1.

5.5 FoodEx2 update and questions

Francesco Vernazza informed the meeting about the ongoing revisions to the FoodEx2 system. For the benefit of newer representatives he provided a detailed explanation on how FoodEx2 is structured and its use. Revisions to FoodEx2 will include the introduction of generic terms; an update to the core list, revising the list of commodities based on the new pesticide legislation and -based on comments received- a revision of certain facets. In the long term the aim is to simplify the choice of the correct term and to enable the introduction of national foods. The timetable envisaged for the revisions was also presented.

Finland provided a comment on food classification citing the detailed example used by FV of packaged eggs. EFSA replied that FoodEx is designed for different uses so the different levels of classification are provided. However, in each domain a proper level of detail may be used. Ireland's contribution concerned practical implementation and use of the tool at national level, while acknowledging the tool's comprehensiveness. Ireland noted that it is difficult to convince sampling officers at national level to move from existing national food classification to FoodEx2. Spain agreed with Ireland and suggested that EFSA could improve communication with countries on the use of the system and collect feedback. Norway advised that an advantage for samplers would be to have FoodEx2 in different languages. Norway requested an example of practical implementation of FoodEx2 in English (e.g. web based/hand held model) and suggested that translation into national languages could be done at national level. The Netherlands added that it would be advantageous to have examples of how it is used in risk assessment and suggested an app for FoodEx2. Ireland concurred with Norway and the Netherlands and added that since domain specificity was introduced in FoodEx2, the domain-specific applicability of facets and facet descriptors should clearly be defined to assist sampling officers. EFSA noted that

a short list of mandatory facet descriptors will be included in a forthcoming guidance document within the framework of the EU Menu project⁴ managed by the DATA unit. Cyprus informed the meeting that it was difficult to convince sampling officers of the need for FoodEx2 in Cyprus. Nevertheless Cyprus noted that explaining to the sampling officers and to the laboratory staff that the coding of its national databases for chemical occurrence and food consumption data using FoodEx2 enables improved exposure assessment is a worth and valid justification to support its adoption.

5.6 Support of FoodEx2: Projects and training

EFSA presented to the network some training and support options to facilitate and support the implementation of FoodEx2. Feedback was sought from the meeting participants to help choosing the best options and better adapt training to Member States' needs. Some already planned training opportunities and procurement projects on FoodEx2 coding were proposed.

Norway requested a document elaborating on these proposals to share with their colleagues. EFSA explained that the presentation is designed to elicit further discussions among the meeting participants.

5.7 Guest Scientist presentation

Not done as separate presentation due to time constraints. The Guest Scientist option was included in the previous presentation together with other support options. It was clarified that the deadline for receipt of expressions of interest from Member States to participate in a 2014 pilot Guest Scientist initiative closed on 31 March 2014. The Network was invited to consider this initiative for 2015, in case it is continued after the pilot phase.

5.8 Discussion and possible agreement on a training calendar for this and next year

Network members discussed this agenda item in break-out groups (together with the support for SSD2 implementation) and the comments and feedback of the interested Member States are summarised in Annex 1. These points were not discussed in a plenary session due to the lack of time.

5.9 Update on the TDS-Exposure research programme

Karine Vin (ANSES) provided an update on the project on TDS (Total Diet Studies) Exposure. She outlined the principles of TDS, its strengths and weaknesses, the objectives of the project, institutions and national food authorities involved in the project, and project organisation (organised in work packages). The expected outcomes of the project were also presented. Dissemination is enabled via training and website www.tds-exposure.eu.

EFSA asked about the timeline of the project and when the data would be available; furthermore EFSA requested clarifications on ownership issues and use of FoodEx2 coding for the pilot study data. The speaker indicated that the data will be available at the end of

⁴ Project which provides financial support and guidance to Member States towards harmonisation of food consumption data at European level.

January 2016 and will be coded according to FoodEx2. EFSA also expressed its interest in the data and proposed a follow up discussion on this.

5.10 Presentation of the new DMS for sharing

Roy Kirby presented the needs for and description of the new EFSA DMS (Document Management System). A detailed timetable for the virtual training, foreseen from September to November, will be shared with the meeting participants in July. The training will be offered in form of webinar by the software provider.

Cyprus, Ireland, Germany and Finland asked for further details concerning the training, number of participants per institution and when Sciencenet will be no longer available for sharing of documents. It was clarified that the date for switching Sciencenet off is not yet defined, but a prompt adoption of the new system was encouraged.

5.11 New Specific Requirements

Enikő Varga provided an update on specific requirements and outlined the mandatory requirements for all contaminant data collections. She also presented mandatory requirements relating to specific data collections. An updated version of the current Specific Requirements document will be published by the end of April 2014.

Enikő informed participants of a change in the status from recommended to mandatory of two data elements in SSD: (1) the analytical method, and (2) product full text description. France noted that modifications to the SSD need to be communicated at least two years in advance in order to have effect as, firstly, sampling in Member States is typically done a year in advance of data transmission to EFSA and, secondly, the sampling strategy is defined in the year before the sampling. EFSA advised that this does not present any problems because data providers can select 'Classification not possible' in the field of analytical method for this year's data collection. For the laboratory sampling code France also requested an increase from 20 to 30 characters as the current character constraint is insufficient for France's use. Finland sought clarification on the Baltic fish mandate expected to be received by EFSA this year.

5.12 Discussion on how to update 'accepted' data during the data analysis process: proposals and agreement on standard procedures

Enikő Varga informed the meeting participants of the point at which feedback on data is provided to Member States following transmission to EFSA. She advised that the main feedback to the data providers relates to data quality issues linked to intended use of the data in scientific opinions. The most frequent feedback requests regard the plausibility of results, clarifications concerning the analytical methods and requests concerning the Limit of Detection/Limit of Quantification (LOD/LOQ). She underlined the importance of the quick replacement of the corrected data during the preparatory work of a scientific opinion or report. However, since the replacement is time consuming and requires great effort from the data providers, EFSA proposed that it can be done by EFSA after a certain waiting period (e.g.: 1 month). The participants agreed with this proposal.

5.13 Data Warehouse (DWH): update and focus on access policy

Stefano Cappè gave a presentation on the scope of the EFSA Data Warehouse including timelines, proposed access rules and the expected use. He explained that a data warehouse is essentially a database for reporting and analysis and that it is possible to extract reports and information from it.

With regard to access Ireland asked if the DWH would be accessible to all data providers in each Member State: this was confirmed. Finland highlighted specific examples of problems with data access currently and if it would be possible to access the datasets of other Member States. Stefano Cappè pointed out that in the DWH access policy document, data providers are allowed to access lowest level granularity information only for their own data. Germany commented that data providers should have access to aggregated data, on other countries. In addition Germany said it would like to have access to country level data from all the data providers from Germany, a proposition supported by a number of participants. Stefano Cappè said that this is in principle possible. EFSA explained that it cannot grant access to data in the Data Warehouse until the draft data access rules are agreed by Member States within the framework of the relevant sections of the Standing Committee on the Food Chain and Animal Health (SCFCAH). In the future, data access rules may be amended to broaden them.

EFSA informed the meeting participants that it will include not only the data used in EFSA opinions but also the data that has not been used; data used in EFSA opinions will be flagged.

The Netherlands asked how data quality will be handled in the Data Warehouse. EFSA explained that (flagged) data used in scientific opinions and/or published reports undergo an additional 'data cleaning' during data analysis (e.g. elimination of outliers if agreed by a working group) and that current practice dictates that treatment of data is documented in the interest of openness and transparency.

5.14 3-MCPD project with JRC

Thomas Wenzl (TW) from the JRC presented the background to this project in relation to the high levels found in food based on a report published by EFSA in 2013. He informed that validated analysis methods exist for measuring 2-MCPD, 3-MCPD and glycidyl esters (methods 3-in-1) in edible oils but not in other foods. He also informed the meeting of developments in this area and that a mandate for a scientific opinion on 3-MCPDs (3-monochloropropane-1,2-diol) and glycidyl esters is in preparation for EFSA which will entail a request for data from Member States in due course. He outlined the challenge of the project which concerns analysing these contaminants in foods other than edible oils. He provided a list of the foods concerned and the numbers of samples needed (minimum requirements).

Cyprus asked about validation of methods for food items other than edible oils and it was clarified that so far validated methods only exist for edible oils. TW also informed that, based on the EFSA preliminary exposure assessment included in the 3-MCPD report, the Commission is in favour of establishing a new LOQ at 100 µg/kg (calculated on fat). A different extraction process is needed for solid food but unfortunately the methodology is not yet available.

5.15 Revision of Regulation (EC) No.882/2004: highlights and discussion

Ireland provided some background to the need to give legal status to SSD to formalise how data should be transmitted to EFSA. The revisions to Regulation 882/2004 which are currently in consultation are a good opportunity to do so. There is a small window of opportunity to comment on the draft text. The speaker elaborated that there should be some synchronisation for all the domains to avoid having the legislation changed per domain.

Finland agreed that it is a good idea to have SDD in the legislation. There is a need to separate control from monitoring though Ireland noted that Irish control and monitoring data are collected in the same way.

The Netherlands, Cyprus and the UK agreed in principle that it is good idea and EFSA advised that implementing rules, which may be introduced, would be an alternative opportunity to add SSD to the legislation. The UK advised that there is a need to work on justification in this regard.

5.16 Outcome of the 2013 data collection – Strengths and weaknesses of the collected data. Use of the data from the previous collections in scientific documents during 2013

Alessandro Carletti provided an overview of the 2013 data collection with accompanying statistics to show of the type of data transmissions. He outlined the strengths and weaknesses in the data collection. Some 80 % of data transmitted were in SSD format.

Cyprus proposed improvements to the analytical method and LOQ/LOD. Ireland asked how much data is used in EFSA's scientific opinions and reports as this information would be useful to justify Member States' efforts in providing data to EFSA. Alessandro agreed to provide this information for the 2013 data collection. Ireland and Cyprus would like to see data providers' contributions acknowledged in EFSA scientific outputs in a standardised way, preferably by country name. Furthermore Cyprus mentioned that it would be very useful if an EFSA report on Contaminants could be written every year as in the case of Pesticide Residues. Alessandro also provided a list of EFSA opinions and reports that are in progress or published using contaminant data submitted by Member States, since the last network meeting.

5.17 2014 Data collection, help desk and timing (including urgent matters with no data)

Enikő Varga (EV) presented the checkpoints, where feedbacks are given to data providers following data transmission to EFSA: (1) notification about accepted data, (2) cleaning reports after the advanced cleaning, (3) summary table when targeted contaminants are selected for a scientific report or opinion; and asked the participants to propose changes. EFSA proposed, that the cleaning reports are provided approximately four times per year but considering the number of replacement files cleaned perhaps twice per year would be sufficient. Due to the heavy files, it was also proposed, that the cleaning reports should be uploaded into the Sciencenet instead of sending them as an attachment. Deadlines of the special data collections (acrylamide, additives and mycotoxins) and continuous data collection were outlined.

5.18 Comments of the MSs on last year's data collection and intentions/proposals for the coming exercise (2014)

Ireland asked for an explanation as to what exactly a cleaning report is and the purpose of sending it. EV answered, that the cleaning report contains two parts: (1) a Word document, which shows the final number of the records, will be inserted in the database, and gives information also about the possible data rejection and its reason and (2) an Excel table, which shows the transmitted dataset in the form, how it will be integrated in the database after cleaning and standardisation, Croatia requested more information about the mycotoxins data for the WHO. EV clarified that EFSA was requested by WHO to submit data on mycotoxins from 2008 onwards to them by the end of July 2014. However this is not a special call: the mycotoxin data requested belong to the 2014 continuous call, EFSA asked only for early submission in order to be able to transmit also the most recent data to WHO.

5.19 New mandate of the Network and new coordination roles

The Chair presented the changes to the terms of reference of EFSA Networks in general and how this affects the chemical occurrence network in particular. The terms of reference and outputs expected were presented as well as the commitment needed from representatives to liaise as appropriate at national level prior to and after network meetings. He also provided the comments made by the Advisory Forum on the chemical occurrence network including increased frequency of meetings due to the broadening of the types of data collected (possibly also using alternative forms, like tele-meetings and web-conferences) and comments on the heterogeneous composition of the network in terms of expertise.

Croatia informed about duplication of data collection requests made to the Advisory Forum and Focal Points, and the DATA unit and suggested to unify the requests in a single point. EFSA clarified that the data collection calls are 'officially' published in the EFSA Website. The communications in different forum are to be interpreted as support actions. The Netherlands suggested better connections between the Advisory Forum, Focal Points and the Network members to improve clarity in roles and responsibilities.

Ireland commented that too much emphasis is placed on collecting data at national level rather than on data analysis. Representatives should discuss analysis of data at national level and bring this back to the EFSA Network. Finland proposed that every country should have established data transmission systems based on harmonised methodologies and automatic validation. Finland also proposed that Member States should undertake monitoring in a more harmonised way based on recommendations from the Commission or EFSA and that data should be representative in each Member State. EFSA reminded meeting participants of the window of opportunity to provide comments on the draft text of Regulation (EC) No 882/2004, and that it would be an opportune time to make such suggestions at Member State level in this regard.

France agreed that there should be more discussion on analysis of data and would like examples of how EFSA uses the data to be presented at network meetings including an explanation of how data were treated in the analyses. France also suggested two meetings a year and to have more interaction between meetings. Norway agreed that two meetings per year would be better as the scope is opening up to a wider remit.

5.20 Data collection strategy

Mary Gilsenan presented the draft data strategy and the need for involvement of different parties in finalising the draft strategy document. She noted that EFSA has accumulated a large volume of data for use in risk assessments, but in most cases EFSA does not have ownership of these data. The three draft objectives identified are data quality, open data and data interoperability. The main drivers behind the data quality and open data strategic objectives are more openness and transparency.

5.21 Break-out groups

Following the short presentation members were invited to participate in small discussion groups to consider issues relating to data access and data quality.

5.22 Plenary discussion on draft data strategy

Reports from each break-out group were presented in a plenary session. EFSA thanked the groups and the rapporteurs for their feedback. A summary of the break-out presentations is presented in Annex 2. A common point made regarding open data is to adopt a tiered approach. EFSA proposed a pilot 'user community', possibly within the framework of the data warehouse, whereby a limited number of Member States could have access to each other's raw data under defined conditions within a 'circle of trust'. Norway, Sweden, Ireland and the UK indicated their willingness in principle to be involved in this tentative proposal for a pilot. Regarding data quality, many aspects were highlighted and a particular role of the EU Reference Laboratories and National Reference Laboratories was suggested.

5.23 Summary of the meeting's achievements and decisions

Doreen Dolores Russell summarised the main actions and decisions of the meeting.

5.24 Evaluation of the meeting and suggestions for next meeting

Participants were asked to complete a meeting evaluation sheet for EFSA.

6. Any Other Business

No further items were discussed.

7. Next meeting(s)

Proposed dates for the next physical meeting will be circulated in a doodle.

Summary of meeting's achievements and decisions

Agenda item	Action/decision
5.2 Presentation of SSD2 (Standard Sample Description Version 2)	EFSA will consider the feasibility of presenting an overview of data requests linked to the corresponding mandates at future chemical occurrence network meetings.
5.9 Update on the TDS-Exposure research program	The DATA unit confirmed that it is interested in the data generated by this project and will initiate a discussion with the core team about data availability.
5.13 Data Warehouse (DWH):update and focus on access policy	EFSA will take back to the DWH Project the fact that data providers should have access to data at single data level.
5.16 Outcome of the 2013 data collection – Strengths and weaknesses of the collected data. Use of the data from the previous collections in scientific documents during 2013	EFSA will provide to the network information on how much data is used in EFSA opinions. This information would help support the efforts at Member State level to collate and send data to EFSA.
	EFSA will consider the proposal to include in EFSA opinions an acknowledgment of the data contribution of the appropriate MS(s).
5.19 New mandate and new coordination roles + clarification questions	EFSA will investigate the ways for improved connection between the AF/Focal points and the Network - to better explain and justify the budget needed for data collection - discussions should take place at the AF/Focal points so that agreements can be reached.
	MSs and EFSA expressed the intention to cooperate to add at national level a focus on data analysis. MSs to discuss on analysis of data at national level and bring it back to the EFSA Network.
	EFSA will consider more frequent meetings, possibly with different format.
5.22 Plenary discussion on draft data strategy	EFSA will investigate the possibility of a pilot 'user community', possibly within the framework of the Data Warehouse, whereby a limited number of Member States (on voluntary base) could have access to each other's raw data under defined conditions within a 'circle of trust'.
	EFSA will investigate the possibility of involving the EU Reference Laboratories and National Reference Laboratories in activities for harmonisation of data collection and improvement of data quality.

Annex 1

Harmonisation, support and training for FoodEx2 and SSD2

The members were invited to provide comments and suggestions on support and training in general and in particular on the options presented by EFSA.

Group 1

Rapporteur: Eleni Kakouri (CY)

1. Commitment of laboratories, inspectors and managers of food authorities is important and explanation is needed about the need and why of data collection and harmonization, of coding the data etc.
2. About training, two possibilities were envisaged:
 - (i) Training in EFSA to define criteria for harmonization e.g. which facets, codes /rules to limit the different ways of understanding foodEx2 and
 - (ii) Training in MSs from EFSA; this was the best solution for the majority of the 7 MS in the group, as the benefit from this will be for more people in a MS: getting the people from all labs, inspectors, data managers, risk assessors etc. would be possible for trainings in MS.
3. There is a need for sustainability: Possible financial support from EFSA or EC to guarantee sustainability of the developed systems in MSs (maintenance, updates, coding), as it happens in the case of the Focal Points.
Possibility of a regulatory provision was suggested: e.g. in the current amendment of Regulation 882/2004 for official controls, the possible introduction of requirements about the way to transmit data according to the SSD2 format would help the implementation.

Group 2

Rapporteur: Eileen O'Dea (IE)

1. TRAINING AND TRAIN THE TRAINERS

- Overall, training is useful
- Topics: SSD1->SSD2; FoodEx1 -> FoodEx2; TDS; SSD2 (non SSD1 users).
- Training should be to specific topics, to minimise complexity.
- Help should be provided to MSs for 'selling' the systems to the users; Risk analyses where classification & specific facets are critical to improving the value of the data analysis should be presented.
- Examples should be made within each specific domain, especially for complex parameters.
- Who to Train? Reporting Officers (National); Labs; Sampling Officers; Sampling Planners.
- Who should Train? Two options: EFSA direct to each level; EFSA to National Representatives who then trains others.

2. TOOLS

- Simple Mapping tools (e.g. Excel)
 - what is available?
 - can we share existing tools even if they are not perfect?
 - SSD1->SSD2
 - FoodEx1-> FoodEx2
 - FoodEx1 -> Zoonoses
 - FoodEx1 -> Pesticides
 - National -> EFSA
 - ...
- Online Tools – eLearning for mass distribution
- Many-to-one web conference with EFSA Evidence Management
 - All domains represented for a MS
 - Status of each
 - Tools available to advance
 - Projects available to help fund
- ‘Sales’ support tools
 - Targeted at Management, Labs, Sampling Officers
 - Domain Specific
 - Concrete uses of data by EFSA/Commission

3. DATA CAPTURE (tool for data capture)

- FoodEx2 impossible without PDA
- Multinational (EFSA can take care of this?)
 - Development, Maintenance, Training, Catalogue updates
- Multilingual
 - Capability not translation
- MultiDevice – online, smartPhones, etc
- Mandatory/Recommended/Applicability
- Domain Specificity (to reduce complexity)
- Flexible output formats for system integration
- Extensibility for multiple forms
- EU Food Safety Professional with one device

4. PROJECTS

- Funding really helps!
- Re-coding - seems simple – EFSA support?
- Start with a small domain then evaluate national all-domain implications – who & what training

Group 3

Rapporteur: Anja Hallikainen (FI)

Comments were provided by different members in the group:

1. Slovenia: 2-3 days training/year, online web support needed too.
2. Norway: support in technical implementation, examples to help sample description, tools to present sample taking, specific training for sample takers.
3. Lithuania: EFSA staff could be invited to give training in our country.
4. Germany: matrix catalogue is in process in Germany, very similar like EFSA's catalogue. For training, guest scientists are an option or staff from EFSA going to the countries.
5. Finland: more training for sample takers and chemists, guest scientist with certain domain expertise to EFSA, access to EFSA's data warehouse and different projects to utilize the data.
6. Estonia would like to share the proposed ideas and experiences of the member countries.
7. Denmark: EFSA and Commission should work together to get specific requirements into legislation. Regulations help laboratories and other co-workers to use resources to the data transmission

Group 4

Rapporteur: Kevin Hargin (UK)

1. SSD2 is very complicated, thus training is necessary
2. Two kinds of training:
 - (i) Overview or Introductory (why it is necessary)
 - (ii) Advanced/practical – “how to use it”
3. Workshops should be considered, although Webinars should also be used (maybe Workshops for (ii) above and Webinars for (i)?)
4. Decision-makers need to be involved (e.g. agree the need for SSD2 at Expert Group level in Brussels)
5. Need an Impact Assessment – what are the advantages/disadvantages? What fields are mandatory and why?

6. Needs to be an electronic system – electronic data capture with a guided approach to sample recording

Annex 2

Feedback from the breakout groups' discussions on Open Data and Data Quality

Following the plenary presentation by Mary Gilsenan, the members participated in one of four breakout sessions; two of them focused on data quality and two on open data.

The groups were asked to address the following specific questions on open data and data quality, respectively.

Data Quality

1. What measures could EFSA and Member States take to improve the quality of data used in EFSA risk assessments?
2. Presently, data in the EFSA chemical occurrence database mainly includes data generated within the framework of national plans to a large extent focused on compliance with legal limits. Would members envisage a specific European sampling plan for exposure assessment to be implemented co-operatively? If so, what measures could be taken to initiate this process?

Open Data

EFSA receives an increasing number of requests from a wide range of stakeholders to access the raw data used in our scientific opinions.

1. What are the main obstacles to opening up EU risk assessment data?
2. What steps could EFSA take to open up EU risk assessment data to increase transparency in our risk assessments?

The rapporteur of each breakout group reported back to plenary on the main points discussed. The summaries of their remarks are provided below.

Group 1 - Data Quality

Facilitator: Fanny Heraud, EFSA

Rapporteur: Eleni Kakouri (CY)

Measures to improve data quality:

1. Data representativeness:
 - TDS approach;
 - Better definition on random/selective sampling
2. Analytical quality:
 - LOD/LOQ/recovery/uncertainties,
 - Report the results: provide both LOD/LOQ and better differentiate non detected/traces;
 - Define objectives of analytical performance for contaminants fit to risk assessment purposes;
 - Legislation
3. How to manage gaps/outliers/uncertainties:
 - Sampling recommendations;
 - Initiate ad hoc surveys to fill the gaps;
 - More involvement of MSs in the exposure process

- Specific network of exposure assessment methodology tool advice on specific assessment

4. Feedback to the data providers:

- Networks;
- Report back to the countries.

5. Move to risk-based approach:

- EU legislation (Regulation 882/2004 amendment):
- However flexibility is important because all risks are not present in all countries.
- Recommendations on FoodEx/chemicals of interest in regards to the risk assessment.

Group 2 - Open data

Facilitator: Stefano Cappè, EFSA

Rapporteur: Eileen O'Dea (IE)

OBSTACLES TO OPEN DATA:

MS discharging responsibility, improper use of the data, media impact, unfair competition, quality of data is limiting factor, misunderstanding of data, misinterpretation of data, who is in control of the data, who is exploiting the data, live their own life, limitation of data, original data publication (scientific prerogative).

EFSA STEPS TOWARDS OPEN DATA:

continuum of data quality, data must be of good quality (Step 1: Trust MSs, training on usage; Step 2: Extend to country level including Universities etc, Step 3: All stakeholders), what data is published, depends on users, publish data when validate, publish data quality statistics, data quality indicators (Metadata), document limitations of data as part of opinions, more work (Peer Review) and capability to react to different interpretations.

Trust and Control applies to both.

10 YEARS FROM NOW IN AN OPEN DATA ENVIRONMENT

Community of people who understand the grammar for interpreting the data and deriving information

Group 3 - Data Quality

Facilitator: Francesco Vernazza, EFSA

Rapporteur: Jens Hinge Andersen (DK)

1. Data quality (sampling)

- Data from relevant matrices i.e. that contribute to risk.
- Data should be representative within this group.
- Sufficient samples in order to secure the statistics.

2. Data quality (information)

- Plan for the data creation step:
 - Sample information.
 - Analytical methods (detection limit etc.).

3. Recommendations

- EU coordinated plan (in COM Recommendations) in addition to national risk based programmes?
- “Coordinated laboratories” in EU for special analysis?
- Dietary exposure based requirements of the analytical methods;
- EURL/NRLs involved (or better an obligation) in risk assessment needs;
- Plausibility checks: can they be implemented in IT-systems?
- Readability and content of feedback (DCF);
- Sharing of validation rules/methods between EFSA/MS (outliers, “can the data be used for risk assessment?” etc.);
- EFSA should ensure that the different specific requirements are put into legislation (and the MS should support this).

Group 4 - Open data

Facilitator: Saghir Bashir, EFSA

Rapporteur: Kevin Hargin (UK)

MAIN CHALLENGES FOR EFSA?

- Need to get agreement from all MSs –possible reluctance from some MSs;
- EFSA needs to communicate effectively, in a whole range of possible fora, why openness is necessary and what the impacts (both positive and negative) are likely to be;
- Risk of misuse of data – the user of the data should know its context, e.g. where and how the data were collected, and for what purpose;
- How to prevent double counting of the data (e.g. data submitted to EFSA and also published by the MS elsewhere).

WHAT CAN BE DONE NOW BY EFSA?

- Everybody agreed in principle with sharing data among MSs;
- All data from Opinions should be shared;
- Perhaps EFSA could consider a ‘tiered approach’, i.e. data sharing among MSs, sharing of aggregated data, a pilot of wider sharing among some MSs, etc;
- In general aggregated data sharing might be a quick step (maybe some sensitivities, but these should be the exception);
- Problem: are data cleaned enough; MSs should be enabled to have a final check – needs to be an agreed procedure.

Dietary and Chemical Monitoring (DCM) UNIT

Expert Group (Network) on Chemical Occurrence
Minutes of the 7th meeting
Held on 14-15 05 2013, Palazzo Ducale, Parma
(Agreed on 07 06 2013)

Participants

- **Network Representatives of Member States:**

Country	Name	Country	Name
Austria	Elke RAUSCHER-GABERNIG	Latvia	Dzintars ZACS
Belgium	Vera CANTAERT	Lithuania	Agnietė GRUŠAUSKIENĖ
Bulgaria	Snezhana TODOROVA	Macedonia	Lidija DAMEVSKA
Croatia	Sandra BASIC	Norway	Per BRATTERUD
Cyprus	Eleni Ioannou KAKOURI	Poland	Jacek POSTUPOLSKI
Czech Republic	Irena REHURKOVA	Portugal	Luisa OLIVEIRA
Denmark	Jens Hinge ANDERSEN	Romania	Nicoleta MILITA
Estonia	Kaja SEPPER	Serbia	Dragana JOVIC
Finland	Anja HALLIKAINEN	Spain	Victoria MARCOS
France	Jean-Cédric RENINGER	Sweden	Elsa ASTOR
Germany	Günter SOMMERFELD	The Netherlands	Jacob VAN KLAVEREN
Greece	Leonidas PALILIS	Turkey	Serap HANCI
Hungary	László MESZAROS	UK	Kevin HARGIN
Ireland	Eileen O'DEA		
Italy	Michele DE MARTINO		

- **Hearing Experts:**

Finland	Elina HIETIKKO
Sweden	Frida BROMAN

- **EFSA:**

VERNAZZA Francesco (FV)	DCM (Chair)
GILSENAN Mary (MG)	DCM
GOMEZ RUIZ Jose Angel (JGR)	DCM
GUESCINI Chiara (CG)	DCM
VARGA Eniko (EV)	DCM
CAPPE Stefano (SC)	DCM
KRIULINA Nadezhda (NK)	DCM*
GERGELOVA Petra (PG)	DCM*
CARLETTI Alessandro (AC)	DCM*
VALSTA Liisa (LV)	DCM*
TRIACCHINI Giuseppe (GT)	DCM*
POMILIO Francesco (FP)	DCM*
IOANNIDOU Sofia (SI)	DCM*
HERAUD Fanny (FH)	DCM*
DURAND Louise (LD)	DCM*
RIZZI Valentina (VR)	BIOMO*
ABBINANTE Fabrizio (FA)	RASA P&M*

* = Partial attendance at specific points of the agenda

1. Welcome and apologies for absence

The Chair welcomed the participants.

Apologies were received from Luxembourg, Malta, Montenegro, Slovakia and Slovenia.

Iceland did not nominate participants for this meeting.

2. Adoption of agenda

The agenda was adopted without changes.

3. Declarations of interest

In accordance with EFSA's Policy on Independence and Scientific Decision-Making Processes regarding Declarations of Interests (Dols)¹ and the Decision of the Executive Director implementing this Policy², members of networks, peer review meetings, networking meetings and their alternates shall be invited to complete and submit an Annual Declaration of interest (ADol).

EFSA screened the ADol filled in by the experts invited for the present meeting. No conflicts of interests related to the issues discussed in this meeting have been identified during the screening process or at the Oral Declaration of interest (ODol) at the beginning of this meeting.

The Chair thanked the representatives that have submitted an ADol.

4. Agreement of the minutes of the 6th meeting of the Expert Group on Chemical Occurrence held on 15-16th March 2012, Parma. The minutes were agreed by written procedure on 25th April 2012 and published on the EFSA website on 27th April 2012.

5. Topics for discussion

5.1 Introduction

The administrative aspects of the meeting were presented and discussed (CG).

Recent staff changes in the Dietary and Chemical Monitoring (DCM) Unit (reference Unit for this Network) were presented for information (FV).

- **Objectives of the meeting**

The general tasks of the Chemical Occurrence Network were summarised in order to inform new representatives from some Member States (MS). Additionally the main objectives of the 7th meeting were presented as follows:

1. Taking stock of the progress in the ongoing harmonisation initiatives such as the Standard Sample Description version 2 (SSD2), the new EFSA food classification and description system (FoodEx2) and the EFSA Data Warehouse (DWH) by:
 - a. Informing all partners of ongoing initiatives;
 - b. Agreeing on the principles and the planning of the initiatives;
 - c. Discussing advantages of change and reasons for resistance;
 - d. Getting suggestions from the MS perspective.
2. Defining a preliminary timetable for implementation of SSD2 / FoodEx2.
3. Agreeing on specific training / support activities and fixing a calendar for them.
4. Promoting the exchange of tools between MSs.
5. Showing the facts about the 2012 data collection, use of data collected and promoting further improvement of the whole process.
6. Planning the timing and conditions of the future data collection.
 - a. Discussing the possibility of a reduced window for data submission.
 - b. Promoting a stricter respect of timelines.

¹ <http://www.efsa.europa.eu/en/keydocs/docs/independencepolicy.pdf>

² <http://www.efsa.europa.eu/en/keydocs/docs/independencerules.pdf>

7. Encouraging as many volunteer MSs as possible to participate in implementation projects in the present and next year.
8. Identifying possible partners for outsourcing projects.
9. Continue the discussion on data sharing started in the previous years.

5.2 Data collection and use of data

AC presented the outcome of the 2012 data collection “Outcome of 2012 data collection – Strengths and weaknesses of the collected data. Use of the data from the previous collections in scientific documents during 2012”. The Netherlands pointed out that the main problem is that the data are collected for monitoring purposes and this implies that crucial information for exposure calculations is missing. The discussion also highlighted that financial and political support for data collection for exposure assessment is needed. Additionally, close communication between EFSA and MS on the information needed for exposure calculations is necessary. Clarification was given to some doubts concerning the food and feed classification shown during the presentation. Portugal asked for information for some submitted samples that did not appear in the report. As samples were submitted late in December, but the country data provider amended and re-submitted the data recently (after the closure of the 2012 data collection), the data was unintentionally considered as a part of the 2013 data collection but will be considered for reports/opinions. Ireland asked about the possibility of submitting smaller data files that would facilitate when replacing wrong data to avoid re-loading large amounts of data. AC replied that this would be possible provided that the data are sent in a short period of time.

MG presented the work plan for 2013 related to the activities of the Chemical Occurrence Network. The Finnish representative asked about the reasons why the different ongoing CONTAM Panel opinions were specifically focused on the contaminants shown on the presentation (tropane alkaloids, acrylamide, chromium and nickel, etc.). MG explained that the CONTAM Panel receives different requests from the European Commission and when an exposure assessment is required the DCM unit receives an assistance request to support the CONTAM Panel in the preparation of a Scientific Opinion. Several MSs commented that better communication of the European Commission not only with EFSA but also with them would allow a better planning for data collection. MG explained that planning is needed but in certain cases urgent and unexpected requests arrive. This can be the case when new toxicological studies on specific contaminants are reported (e.g. acrylamide) or due to requests from MSs to the Commission to carry out dietary risk assessments on contaminants that are found at high levels in certain food commodities (like in the case of chromium and nickel).

5.3 Harmonisation activities and support for data collection

- **Harmonisation**

EV gave a presentation on the procedure for validation and use of data (including feedback in order to guarantee quality of data and avoid missing submissions), and some practical examples of recent clarification requests. The question was raised whether to contact directly the laboratories for specific technical clarifications, in order to reduce the waiting time. A tour of the table followed for the MSs to express their opinions. In general, MSs showed their preference to keep only one contact point between EFSA and them when clarification on the submitted data is needed. In this way, the data providers could also update and correct their own databases with the information obtained from the laboratories while communicating it to EFSA. Some MSs reported difficulties to obtain further information

from the laboratories from which they received the data. Although the MSs recognise that communication with EFSA is adequate, the MSs would like to have information in advance on the type of data that will be needed in the near future in order to improve the data transmission to EFSA. Several countries pointed out that it would be useful to implement some business rules for certain contaminants that improve the quality of the data, which would minimise further contacts for clarification. A balance should be found between complexity of the SSD and quality of the data submitted. MS also noted that in many cases it is difficult to get more complete information on the analysed samples because the laboratories cannot accept extra workload for the clarification requests. The collaboration of EFSA providing information sessions or guidance documents to the laboratories would be very useful to inform them of the importance of reporting adequate information, thus preventing to some extent the need for clarification.

FH presented an update of the specific requirements defined for chemical contaminants data submission. Denmark commented on the difficulties to report information on fat percentage and asked about the way to report samples that have been reconstituted (e.g. baby food). Germany remarked that making the data element “Result value corrected for recovery” mandatory could be a problem as they need time to implement this term in their national database. France agreed with Germany that more time is needed to implement the new business rules. Indeed, new business rules need at least 2 years to be used for data transmission (e.g. : in 2013, new instructions are transmitted to laboratories; in 2014, these instructions will be applied by laboratories for the analysis and in 2015, data with these new business rules will be transmitted to EFSA). FV confirmed that enough time will be given to the countries to adapt to the new specific requirements. EV said that at the moment only the information on the analytical method is mandatory while for the other specific requirements there will be a transition period.

SC gave a presentation on the SSD2. Sweden commented that they did not like the continuous change of the standard, particularly the name of some data elements. They pointed out that the previous version of the standard sample description (SSD1) was adequate and that moving to SSD2 would imply further investment to adapt their national system. SC together with several of the experts that worked in the working group (WG) on SSD2 (Denmark, France, Ireland) explained that the change of the name of the data elements was needed to avoid confusion across food safety domains. New names are needed to accommodate all the domains (pesticides, chemical contaminants, biological contaminants, etc.) that the SSD2 is now covering. In addition it was explained that the SSD2 has certain flexibility (not present in SSD1) to accept future reporting requirements if needed. SSD2 also gives the possibility to report not only using XML-format but also Excel, a feature requested by many data providers. EFSA intends to provide financial support for the implementation of the SSD2 system at national level through grants..

Different MSs (Bulgaria, Cyprus, Germany, Norway, France, Greece, Hungary, Ireland, Portugal, Romania and Finland) participating in pilot projects presented their experiences. Most of the presented projects were on the implementation of FoodEx2 as part of the SSD, and some were on the implementation of SSD1 and the electronic transmission. Each MS showed the different steps followed during the project, presenting their conclusions/recommendations and the main problems they faced. The points underlined by most of the countries were:

- Translation of the catalogues to the national languages was very time consuming.
- It is difficult to translate some foods into local languages.
- The food catalogue should be amended, incorporating some missing foods.
- More facet descriptors should be added.

- Food descriptions in the scope notes should be improved, possibly with the addition of pictures.
- The FoodEx browser is very useful; therefore, its further development has been advocated by many participants, and additional capabilities have been suggested (e.g. management of spaces, case sensitivity, automatic link to search engines etc.).
- Selection of food elements or facets in different order leads to different codes in FoodEx2: a rule for ordering the information should be defined and built into the system.
- A clear and concise user manual is essential.
- Training on FoodEx2 is necessary.
- EFSA should clearly communicate what is being changed in FoodEX2 and when. EFSA should also sufficiently in advance inform the MSs if any changes in business rules are foreseen. In general, a clear and agreed terminology updating plan has been identified as a crucial component of the harmonisation process. The frequency should not exceed six months for the terminology and five years for the structural elements of the SSD.

The Cyprus representative showed the Terminology translation web tool developed in Cyprus in order to improve the quality in the process of translation aimed at creating the national versions of FoodEx2. The tool will be made available to the other members of the Network.

FV presented the current situation of the FoodEx2, the comments that have been received by the MSs, and the changes that have been already implemented in the last version. Finland remarked that perhaps it is not needed to go the maximum level of detail when collecting data, also considering the current economic situation. FV agreed with this comment.

GT gave an overview of the EFSA pesticide residues data collection.

The present status of the FoodEx browser was presented by FV. The different features offered by the tool and the tips for installing it by local users were summarised.

- **Support**

FA and SC presented an overview of the EFSA Data Warehouse (DWH), its current status and the first draft of the data access policy. Finland commented on the benefits of having all the data centralised in one place to avoid double submission. The Netherlands expressed satisfaction with the idea of the DWH from a scientific point of view. Some countries expressed concern about the possible implications of public access to occurrence data without the knowledge basis to interpret them. Possible high values might cause unjustified alarm. One MS recommended that this subject should be debated outside the remit of the Network, such as the EFSA focal points and the European Commission Standing Committee on the Food Chain and Animal Health (SCFCAH). Cyprus highlighted the need to clarify the question of ownership of the data in the draft policy. FA clarified that this aspect is already covered in a specific paragraph of the policy on which comments are welcome. Finland asked about the format on which the data will be published in the DWH. FA replied that the data will be published in aggregated form at a level decided by EFSA and the owners of the data. FA also clarified that the policy of the DWH concerns only the data stored in the DWH. In response to a question from France, FA explained that the deadline for the consultation phase of the draft DWH access policy is 21st May 2013. FA also indicated that at a later stage, it is envisaged that MSs will be asked to review specific reports created in the DWH.

EV explained how the submission of data to WHO is made, and showed the main differences between the SSD and World Health Organisation (WHO) GEMS food system. A document will be provided to all the members of the Expert Group describing the steps that

are followed to submit occurrence data from EFSA to WHO. Network experts will be invited to provide comments on the document by the end of June 2013. EFSA aims to circulate the final version of the document to the Network by the end of July 2013. SC explained that the data that will be sent to WHO pertain to those used in scientific opinions and/or scientific / technical reports. Cyprus asked to receive the draft document on the steps followed to submit data to WHO by email rather than sharing it together with the meeting documents. SC agreed to this and confirmed that the details of the consultation and the deadline for comments will be communicated in the text of the email that will be sent to Network members.

SC presented how EFSA plans to support the implementation of the new standards through training. He also gave an overview of planned support projects.

In relation to projects across domains, such as SSD2 implementation, members of the Network were asked to clarify which of the following domains are in the remit of their institutes. They responded as follows:

Pesticides: Belgium, (Bulgaria, managed in the same Food safety Authority but not directly by the Risk assessment centre), Cyprus, Denmark, Estonia, France (partially), Germany, Hungary, Ireland, The Netherlands, Norway, Spain and Sweden.

Microbiological data: Belgium, (Bulgaria, managed in the same Food safety Authority but not directly by the Risk assessment centre), Cyprus, Finland, France (partially), Greece, Ireland, Norway, Portugal, United Kingdom.

Food additives: Cyprus, Belgium, France, Germany, Greece, The Netherlands, Poland, Portugal, Romania, Spain, United Kingdom.

A tour of the table followed to discuss the intention of the different countries to participate in negotiated procedures and/or grants, and their training needs. Countries expressed their interest in training for SSD1, SSD2 and FoodEx2. Some delegates indicated that an initial face-to-face training would be very useful together with the creation of a web-forum where EFSA and the different countries could interact and find the responses to frequently asked questions (FAQs) on different issues. Ad-hoc audio-meetings, explanatory videos and e-learning would be also useful. They also asked for guidance and information material (e.g. leaflets) that could be distributed to the laboratories and data managers. Also, training for sampling officers and laboratories was proposed. Another proposal was to create a browser-like online application (or alternatively a mobile application) so that the sampling officers could enter the appropriate information at the sampling point. MSs expressed their willingness to participate in grants and/or negotiated procedures although they also showed their concern about the short timeline for the applications and the amount of work needed for the preparation. More relaxed timelines were suggested. The Danish representative stressed the need for clear guidelines and documentation from EFSA on how to use FoodEx2, especially how to create new codes, and for FoodEx2 to be stable to facilitate its implementation.

5.4 Cooperation with other Units/Panels

In the frame of the cooperation that DCM unit has with other units within EFSA, VR gave an overview of the data collection activities carried out by the BIOMO unit. Cyprus asked whether EFSA receives data directly from the MSs. VR replied that data on zoonoses and zoonotic agents to be collected according to the Directive 2003/99/EC are sent directly to EFSA. For the zoonoses with control and eradication programmes in place in the EU (e.g. bovine tuberculosis and brucellosis), data are also to be submitted to the European Commission. At the moment only 15 countries are able to use the EFSA Data Collection Framework (DCF) data transmission while the remaining countries transmit the data through a web application. The aim is that in the near future all reporting countries use the electronic

data transmission (DCF) as EFSA is not able to support two parallel reporting systems still for many years.

FV presented a procurement project on post market monitoring of regulated substances awarded to the Asociación de Investigación de la Industria Agroalimentaria (AINIA), Spain. The proposed multi-residue method was considered very promising in terms of costs and data output. Concerns were expressed about the availability on the market of the equipment needed to use the proposed method.

5.5 Forecasts for 2013 data collection and further planning

SC presented information on the 2013 data collection. Some changes for data providers due to IT constraints related to the DCF web service were presented. Guidance was given on how to replace old files. Data collection on chemical contaminants will be officially opened after 31st May 2013 with the deadline 1st October 2013. For additives included in the recent call for data, the deadline for submission of data for the first batch of additives is 31st July 2013. Further information can be found at <http://www.efsa.europa.eu/en/data/call/130327.htm>. The call for additive data includes use levels (targeting food business operators) as well as concentration data. The latter is more relevant for MS governmental data providers. In response to a question from the Finnish representative, SC and FV clarified that all food additive data regardless of when they were analysed are welcome and that their possible use will be defined by the WG in charge of preparing the different opinions.

5.6 Conclusion

The meeting was concluded in time with the agenda and no additional points were raised.

6. Next meeting

A preliminary date for the next meeting was fixed at 8-9 April 2014.

DCM UNIT

Parma, 21 March 2012

Minutes of the
6th MEETING OF THE EXPERT GROUP FOR CHEMICAL OCCURRENCE DATA
Parma, 15-16 March 2012

Participants

Expert Group Members:

Austria	RAUSCHER-GABERNIG	Elke
Belgium	CANTAERT	Vera
Bulgaria	VRABCHEVA	Tery
Croatia	BASIC	Sandra
Cyprus	IOANNOU KAKOURI	Eleni
Czech Republic	REHURKOVA	Irena
Denmark	ANDERSEN	Jens Hinge
Estonia	SEPPER	Kaja
Finland	HALLIKAINEN	Anja
France	RENINGER	Jean-Cédric
Germany	JUD	Michael
Greece	PALILIS	Leonidas
Hungary	TÚRI SZERLETICS	Mária
Ireland	O'DEA	Eileen
Italy	DE MARTINO	Michele
	PASTORELLI	Augusto
Latvia	VILCANE	Dace
Lithuania	PETRAITIS	Julijonas
Luxembourg	STROTTNER	Camille
Macedonia	DAMEVSKA	Lidija
Malta	BUSUTTIL	Ingrid
Montenegro	VUJACIC	Aleksandar
Netherlands	VAN KLAVEREN	Jacob
Norway	HALLE SKAGEN	Inger
Poland	STARSKI	Andrzej
Portugal	OLIVEIRA	Luisa
Romania	MILITA	Nicoleta
Slovakia	SVETLIKOVA	Angela
Slovenia	BOSNJAK	Tomislav
	GROZNIK	Katarina
Sweden	FOSTER	David
The UK	HARGIN	Kevin
Turkey	HANCI	Serap

Observers:

WENZL Thomas (EC JRC)

EFSA staff:

CARLETTI Alessandro (DCM Unit)
CAPPE' Stefano (DCM Unit)
CURTUI Valeriu (DCM Unit)
ESKOLA Mari (Acting Head of Unit- CONTAM Unit)
GERGELOVA Petra (DCM Unit)
FABIANSSON Stefan (Head of Unit-DCM Unit)
GÓMEZ RUIZ José Ángel (DCM Unit)
GUESCINI Chiara (DCM Unit)
IOANNIDOU Sofia (DCM Unit)
POMILIO Francesco (DCM Unit)
ROLDÁN TORRES Ruth (DCM Unit)
VALSTA Liisa (DCM Unit)
VARGA Enikő (DCM Unit)
VERNAZZA Francesco (Chair-DCM Unit)

Acronyms:

CONTAM Unit	Contaminants Unit
DCF:	Data Collection Framework
DCM Unit:	Dietary and Chemical Monitoring Unit
EC:	European Commission
FAO:	Food and Agriculture Organisation
MSS:	Member States
SSD:	Standard Sample Description
TDS:	Total Diet Studies
WG:	Working Group
WHO:	World Health Organisation

1st day, 15th March 2012, from 09.30 to 18.30

INTRODUCTION

1. Welcome and apologies

The Chair welcomed the participants. Apologies were received from Ana López-Santacruz Serraler (Spain).

2. Adoption of agenda and declaration of interests

The agenda was adopted without changes. No additional interest was declared with respect to the approved Dols

3. Chiara Guescini's presentation: 'EFSA administrative procedures'

Administrative and reimbursements procedures were explained.

4. Short information on the new policy on Independence and Scientific decision-making processes / discussion

Francesco Vernazza gave an overview on the policy on Independence and Scientific Decisions-Making processes. New EFSA rules on the policy were presented.

PROGRESS ON DCM ACTIVITIES

5. Stefan Fabiansson's presentation: What did we do in 2011 with your data?

Summary on 2011 DCM data collection activities.

- In 2011 DCM received approximately one million data on different chemical substances. Chemical compounds have been grouped in 8 categories:

Chemical elements and derivatives:

- Cadmium: Work on cadmium dietary exposure. "Scientific report Cadmium dietary exposure in the European population" published in January 2012.
- Lead: Data submitted by several countries, scientific report ongoing.
- Mercury: CONTAM opinion ongoing. Data analysis done, exposure calculations are now in process. EC request refers to total mercury and methylmercury but few data on methylmercury were received. SF encouraged testing also methylmercury in MSs. Problems were found when reporting data on mercury for some fish species due to missing codes in FoodEx1. It was suggested to provide accurate description of fish tested in the element "Product full text description".

Marine biotoxins:

No work is in process in EFSA on this subject.

Mycotoxins:

- 3 EFSA opinions on mycotoxins were published in 2011: T2 and HT2, alternaria and zearalenone.
- Current work on sterigmatocystins, nivalenol, citrinin and ergot alkaloids is progressing.
- Phomopsins: no data were received.

Organic contaminants

- Work on dioxins, PCB and PCBs-like dioxins is ongoing (preparation of scientific report).
- Mineral oils activity will soon reach the conclusion and the opinion will be published. Low number of data was provided by MS national authorities.
- PFAS: 2011 published a scientific report. Based on new data collection, work is ongoing on preparation for report update.
- BFRs: CONTAM panel is working to publish the final opinions.
- Dioxins in sheep liver: Scientific Opinion on the risk to public health related to the presence of high levels of dioxins and dioxin-like PCBs in liver from sheep and deer was published July 2011.

Pesticides

- Separate legislation. DCM receives data but PESTICIDES unit is in charge of pesticides assessments.

Phytotoxins:

No work is ongoing.

- Pyrrolizidine alkaloids: Scientific opinion “Pyrrolizidine alkaloids in food and feed” was published November 2011.
- Opium alkaloids: Scientific opinion “Opium alkaloids in poppy seeds” was published in November 2011.

Process contaminants

- 2011 published both reports on process contaminants: acrylamide (new report 2012 ongoing) and furan (to be revised soon; might be delayed to 2013 if insufficient data will be received in 2012, pending EC approval).

Not in list: Veterinary medicine residues

- Technical report “Residues in live animals and animal products” was published in May 2011.

Questions/Comments

- It was asked if EFSA is planning to collect additional elements (not listed in the presentation) as inorganic arsenic or selenium. EFSA replied that data on selenium and inorganic arsenic are both very welcome. It was highlighted that EFSA has now a request from Greece to review nickel and chromium and MSs are invited to submit data on these contaminants.
- It was asked how pesticides, nutrients and GMO risk assessments are done in DCM. EFSA clarified that some data collections are separate from DCM.
- It was asked about veterinary drugs and pesticides residue data, which are now sent by Veterinary Services to EC in non SSD format. EFSA suggested that MSs could contact EC and propose reporting with the same format as done with EFSA.

6. Valeriu Curtui’s presentation: Other DCM achievements in 2011

A summary of all other activities carried out in 2011 apart from chemical occurrence data collection issues was presented.

- Food consumption and exposure assessments: Comprehensive database including European consumption data was released. Data can be used in exposure assessments.
- FoodEx 2 was released. DCM had a WG on food classification and a scientific report was published, with the support of a technical report describing the system.
- Assessment of dietary exposure in EFSA: a scientific report was published.
- TDS project: a technical report was published on state of the art of TDS. A guidance on harmonised TDS was also published.
- Veterinary drug residues report has been finalised. It will be published soon.
- Pesticides: DCM in charge of pesticides data management. Data analysis is then performed by the PESTICIDES Unit.
- Art.36 projects were launched to implement electronic transmission of chemical occurrence data. 5 final reports from different applicants published. New call will be launched in April 2012.

Questions/Comments

- MS asked about other DCM activities out of Europe (FAO, WHO). EFSA clarified that only data from European countries are received, but that on toxicological issues EFSA has a good collaboration with other countries (i.e furan and acrylamide).

7. José A. Gómez's presentation : Update on the FP7 TDS project

Update on current status of the TDS project funded through the FP7 program. Issues raised during kick-off meeting of TDS project held on 29 February and 1 March in Paris were presented (Background, objectives and organisation of TDS project).

Questions/Comments

- MS suggested that TDS samples should be adapted to SSD and FoodEx2 if possible. EFSA agreed on this and commented that although TDS sampling is not part of the new WG on SSD-extension, the mandate could be updated in order to include also TDS.

8. Alessandro Carletti's presentation: Outcome of 2011 data collection – Strengths and weaknesses of the collected data

Summary of the 2011 data collection was presented. More than 300 files were received in different formats. Overview on data loaded in the EFSA database was presented, including data received by year of sampling, samples by country and food categories, deadline compliance by country and extension. European distribution maps were presented on number of data received by group of contaminants (chemical elements and derivatives, organic contaminants, mycotoxins, pesticides, phytotoxins and process contaminants).

Improvements on data standardisation and traceability done during 2011.

Most common issues/problems with the received data for the 2011 data collection were explained (missing information, type of results, classification, most common business rules errors).

9. Discussion

- Comment from MS on SSD element for analytical method (missing information in 20% of results included in the EFSA database): Data providers do not always have this information in their systems, information on analytical method need to be added manually.
- EFSA clarified that data on pesticides presented in the distribution maps were referred to 'old' pesticides now still present as contaminants (Organochlorine compounds in feed regulated by Directive 2002/32/EC) collected by DCM Unit.
- Discussion on reporting LOQ values: EFSA encouraged MSs to report always LOQ values.

10. Mari Eskola's presentation: CONTAM meets the EG on chemical occurrence.

Overview on the CONTAM Panel work was presented: risk assessments on contaminants and scientific opinions. New occurrence data request from CONTAM panel was announced based on a request from the Hellenic Food Safety Agency on nickel in food and chromium in food and water.

Questions/Comments

- MS asked how exposure assessment in animals is done. If some countries collect data on feed consumption or if an estimation on consumption is done.

EFSA answered that feed consumption data is not collected for all species. It was clarified that for certain opinions on feed (i.e. mycotoxins) feed consumption data can be collected. It was suggested to create a WG on feed consumption.

Roundtable on the availability of data on chromium and nickel

Following the new request on chemical occurrence data from CONTAM Panel; the EG was invited to a round-table discussion to give information on collected data on nickel and chromium in food in their countries. The outcome was:

- Data on drinking water is available in most of the countries.
- Few data on vegetables and food for special use collected in 2 countries.
- A deadline for this data collection will be established soon.
- MS are invited to further check if there are available data in their countries and to provide EFSA with their data.

11. Francesco Vernazza's presentation: FoodEx2 food classification – test phase and implementation

The new classification and description system for exposure assessment FoodEx2, developed by the Food Classification WG, was presented. FoodEx2 includes multiple hierarchies, allows a detailed description, includes scientific names and can be expanded when needed. Scientific report with guidance elements and technical report describing the initial draft of the system were published in December 2011. The system is now under evaluation and pilot activities based on the new classification system are ongoing or will soon be launched (update of food consumption database, nutrient database and tests in chemical occurrence data). After the testing phase the system will be implemented as a standard tool.

FV demonstrated the system using the web browser (choosing a code, source, facets and descriptors). It was highlighted that coding should aim at the finest possible level.

Questions/Comments

- MS expressed concern on future harmonisation of food consumption data and the use of FoodEx2. EFSA clarified that food consumption data will be defined according main names of foods. A mapping table in order to convert existing consumption data from FoodEx1 into FoodEx2 is being prepared.
- Clarifications were provided by DCM unit on the limited current exporting feature of the tool. A second version of the system will be released soon and it will include more information.
- MSs expressed their concern on backwards compatibility during the draft system amendment and implementation. EFSA clarified that the codes will not change.

12. Eileen O'ODEa's presentation: Update of the SSD – working group of DCM/BIOMO/PESTI

Standard Sample Description is being used since 2010 to collect data on pesticides residues and contaminants in food and feed. SSD must be extended to data collection on additives, veterinary drug residues and zoonoses. It must also support the new Food Classification and Description system FoodEx2. To this purpose, a new WG on extension of the SSD was created. Guidance update is foreseen by May 2013.

13. Stefano Cappè's presentation: Article 36 projects and other support activities

Different financed projects to support MSs were presented (3 support activities):

1. Article 36 grants: To transmit to EFSA chemical occurrence data electronically according to the Standard Sample Description. Current situation: 4 grants launched and 17 countries awarded. New call for proposal will be launched in April 2012. Remaining countries are invited to apply.
2. Procurement on pilot implementation of FoodEx2, for countries that already successfully participated to article 36 grants on electronic transmission of chemical occurrence data. The purpose is to test encoding of national databases using the new food classification system, and also to provide comments on Foodex2 and translate it into EU national languages.
3. Workshops in the countries not using the SSD to promote its usage. For MS that not transmit data according to the SSD and need internal support from EFSA.

Discussion/Clarifications:

- Only designated organisation by MSs, with the support of Focal Points can participate to Article 36 grants.
- Budget needed to implement SSD depends on the starting point in each country.
- Ireland and Cyprus briefly explained their experience in implementing the Article 36 project on electronic transmission.

14. Thomas Wenzl's presentation: Cooperation with JRC on data quality

Overview was provided of the project with JRC for update of SSD catalogues and creation of a sensitivity database for the methods of analysis most used for relevant contaminants.

Questions/Comments

- MS asked if JRC database includes also nutrient data or only contaminants, in order to avoid duplication with other EU projects (i.e. TDS). JRC answered that additives and sweeteners will be added in SSD but not nutrient data.
- Uncertainty in chemical occurrence data was discussed and it was suggested to always include uncertainty in the database.

15. Ruth Roldán's presentation: Specific requirements for data submission of chemical contaminants in food and feed

A list of specific requirements for chemical contaminants data submissions according to SSD has been published on the DCM webpage. Two priority levels have been defined: mandatory and recommended fields. Mandatory and recommended SSD fields for all and for specific contaminants collected in the continuous call for data were explained.

Discussion

- The importance of collecting specific information at the first data collection step was highlighted.
- It was observed that specific requirements on recovery and uncertainty information are difficult to meet. Laboratories do not always provide this information.
- Not all requested information is included in the MSs systems to collect data.
- It is difficult to know if analysed cereals are for human consumption or not.

- It was suggested to encourage the Member States, through the Focal points, to collect all needed information.
- Some MS observed that % fat content on samples is not always provided by the laboratories analysing dioxins.
- It was suggested to include a mapping table between FoodEx1 and acrylamide categories. Additionally, the recommended information for acrylamide (additional information on cooking preparation) could be included in the field Product Comment (S.21) instead of Comment on the result (R.32) following the reporting proposed for furan.

The points above were addressed by EFSA:

Fat content for dioxins must be reported as it is compulsory by legislation.

It was highlighted the importance of reporting the analytical method information when submitting data to EFSA.

Remark was given on SSD free text elements such as “analytical method text”. This field should be used to report detailed information on analytical method when the analytical method used is not included in SSD “analytical method code” catalogue (classified as “not in list”).

EFSA clarified that the new list of specific requirements is just a formalisation of specific needed information for exposure and risk assessments. The published document substitutes the previous individual calls for data and specific templates for each data collection published on the DCM website. Correctly applying the new list of specific requirements in data submissions would significantly reduce the time needed for additional clarifications during data analysis.

16. Valeriu Curtui’s presentation on Reporting of data to EFSA (how to address reporting to EC and EFSA)

- EFSA is the central point for data collection. In some cases Legislation requires to report summary data to the Commission at specific deadlines during the year.
- In connection with the previous point, problems have been raised on double reporting.
- Based on legislation, a summary was presented of what have to be submitted separately to EFSA and what is requested to be reported to EC. It was highlighted that in most cases no double reporting is requested.

Discussion:

- A possible problem was identified for reporting data on aflatoxins to EFSA after EC submission.
- For pesticides residues and veterinary drugs residues, extra information not included in SSD is needed.

Overall, the large majority of MSs did not feel the problem of double reporting because much less information is requested in EC template than EFSA requires. EFSA remarked that summaries on aggregated data sent to EC are not relevant for DCM work. Individual results are needed. It was also highlighted that if samples are collected according Commission Regulations, this information can be captured and included in the SSD.

17. A) Enikő Varga's presentation: Reporting data to WHO (issues in conversion and policies on data transmission)

Technical information was provided on how data are transmitted from EFSA to WHO. A comparison between WHO-GEMS and EFSA-SSD systems was also presented, highlighting problems in mapping systems, differences, difficulties encountered and solutions applied.

B) Stefano Cappè's presentation: Proposal on what, when and how submit data to WHO.

A proposal for submitting data to WHO was raised. The proposal included which kind of data could be submitted (only published data), timing, automatic mapping WHO-EFSA and mandate preparation.

Discussion

MS were asked if they agreed with the procedure that EFSA sends directly data to WHO instead of them individually:

Roundtable:

Overall, MS agreed on:

- EFSA to summarise and send chemical occurrence data to WHO.
- EFSA need to clarify with WHO a legal agreement with conditions on usage of the data.
- The countries should be kept anonymous and the possibility of using a country code for Europe should be investigated (suggested code EEA in order to include also Iceland and Norway).

2nd day, 16th March 2012, from 09.00 to 13.00

19. Francesco Vernazza's presentation: General concepts on Networks

The general strategy for cooperation, in particular the concept of networks and legal basis for them were presented. Differences between working groups and networks were highlighted. The mandate of the Expert Group on Chemical Occurrence shall be revised according to the general policies of EFSA for Networks. A draft proposal of new mandate was presented for discussion and endorsement.

20. Discussion and endorsement of the new proposed mandate

Experts were asked if they agreed with the new mandate. Some general comments were received:

- It was requested to delete in the document the term FoodEx2 and include a more general term "food classification system".
- Re-wording of point 2 of the terms of reference was also suggested.

Apart from these editorials, the document was endorsed by the Expert Group.

21. Planning and rationalising Data Collection EU-Wide.

Valeriu Curtui's presentation: Risk based sampling in food and feed – a way forward?

Questions raised by Valeriu:

- *Is the current sampling and analysis of food sufficient?*
- *Does it identify early enough all risk from which the consumer should be protected?*
- *Are resources devoted to a balanced sampling and analysis of food thus avoiding unnecessary duplication, oversampling and to maximise effectiveness?*

Discussion:

- The current sampling and analysis can be improved.
- Sampling should be prioritised according to the risk. There is the need of increasing the sampling of foods which contribute more to the exposure (examples given included mycotoxins, where some major foods contributing to exposure are not sampled enough).
- Minimum number of samples to calculate exposure assessments should be defined.

Questions raised by Valeriu:

- *Would a guidance on ranking foods for sampling for different risks (contaminants) help Member States in designing the national monitoring plans and optimise the use of resources?*
- *Would risk-based sampling be feasible? Is it conflicting with the regulatory requirements?*

Discussion:

- Sampling according to risks and exposure is considered difficult by some MS.
- Several MS have the risk based sampling approach as described above.
- The idea of preparing an EFSA guidance on ranking foods for sampling for different risks (contaminants) to help Member States in designing the national monitoring plans and optimise the use of resources is appreciated by MS.

Roundtable summary:

Each MS presented how the sampling is done in their countries. Overall they agreed on the idea of having a guidance prepared by EFSA. This guidance could provide some advice in designing national monitoring plans and optimising the resources. EFSA remarked that the idea of a guidance is to give support to the countries but not to impose sampling procedures which should be modified for each country.

22. Post-market monitoring of regulated substances (specific focus on additives).

Each MS briefly presented how they monitor additives in their countries (post-market monitoring).

- Most MSs have monitoring programs on additives.
- A reasonable quantity of data on different group of additives is available and there was a general agreement from MSs to send the data to EFSA.
- Some MS collected the data according to the EFSA SSD format.

- Major problem is the lack of resources.
- EC does not have a central data collection on additives.

23. Process of collection, help desk and timelines

Stefano Cappè gave an overview of 2012 planning of data collection.

The 2012 data collection will open in April for the test transmissions (in a test environment) and from 1st June to 30th September for the production data collection.

A new function in the DCF will soon be implemented: "Replace function". This function will allow data providers to replace transmissions without deleting and resending a new file. MSs will be informed about the new DCF function and documentation explaining the new function will be distributed. The DCM helpdesk is available to provide support.

The Chair reminded the meeting that EFSA grants and procurements to improve harmonisation in data collection are available and encouraged MSs to consider them.

24. Final discussion and additional proposals from MSs

No additional points were discussed and the MSs did not raise additional questions.

25. AOB

Next EG meeting will be next year 2013 in spring. The date is still to be defined.

The meeting was concluded in line with the agenda

SUMMARY of ACTIONS

WHO	WHAT	BY
EFSA	Action 1: Evaluation of TDS inclusion in the SSD extension project. If TDS will be included, the Mandate shall be updated.	ASAP
EFSA	Action 2: Revision of specific requirements list. Recommended information for acrylamide to be included in the field Product comment (S.21) instead of Comment of result (R.32) as in Furan (standardise the reporting).	ASAP

DCM UNIT

Parma, 10 June 2011

Minutes of the
5th MEETING OF THE EXPERT GROUP FOR CHEMICAL OCCURRENCE DATA
Parma, 6-7 June 2011

Participants

Expert Group Members:

Austria	RAUSCHER-GABERNIG	Elke
Belgium	CANTAERT	Vera
Bulgaria	VRABCHEVA	Tery
Croatia	BASIC	Sandra
Cyprus	KAKOURI	Eleni Ioannou
Czech Republic	RUPRICH	Jiri
Denmark	ANDERSEN	Jens Hinge
Estonia	SEPPER	Kaja
Finland	HALLIKAINEN	Anja
France	RENINGER	Jean-Cédric
Germany	FROST	Matthias
Greece	PALILIS	Leonidas
Hungary	TÚRI SZERLETICS	Mária
Ireland	O'DEA	Eileen
Italy	DE MARTINO	Michele
Latvia	MELNGAILE	Aija
Lithuania	PETRAITIS	Julijonas
Luxembourg	WELSCHBILLIG	Nathalie
Macedonia	KENDROVSKI	Vladimir
Malta	BUSUTTIL	Ingrid
Montenegro	DELEVIĆ	Veselin
Netherlands	VAN KLAVEREN	Jacob
Norway	HALLE SKAGEN	Inger
Poland	STARSKI	Andrzej
Portugal	OLIVEIRA	Luisa
Slovakia	SVETLIKOVA	Angela
Slovenia	BOSNJAK	Tomislav
Spain	LOPEZ-SANTACRUZ SERRALER	Ana
Sweden	FOSTER	David
The UK	HARGIN	Kevin
Turkey	AYLA	Şener

Observers:

LERDA DONATA (EC JRC)

WENZL Thomas (EC JRC)

EFSA staff:

CAPPE' Stefano (DCM Unit)
CURTUI Valeriu (DCM Unit)
FABIANSOON Stefan (Head of DCM Unit)
GUESCINI Chiara (DCM Unit)
HEPPNER Claudia (Head of CONTAM Unit)
MERTEN Caroline (DCM Unit)
PESCI Muriel (DCM Unit)
ROLDAN Ruth (DCM Unit)
SCARAVELLI Elena (DCM Unit)
NOORANI SAADIA (AFSCO Unit)
VERNAZZA Francesco (Chair- DCM Unit))

Acronyms:

Member States: MSs
Dietary and Chemical Monitoring Unit: DCM Unit
Contaminants Unit: CONTAM Unit
Standard Sample Description: SSD
Data Warehouse: DWH

1st day, 6th June 2011, from 13h30 to 18h30

1. Welcome and apologies

The Chair welcomed the participants. Apologies were received from Georgescu Madalina (Romania).

2. Adoption of agenda

The agenda was adopted without changes.

3. Chiara Guescini's presentation: 'EFSA administrative procedures'

Declarations of interest

In accordance with EFSA's Policy on Declarations of Interests, EFSA screened the Annual Declaration of interest (ADoI) and/or Specific Declaration of interest (SDoI) filled in by the experts invited for the present meeting. No conflicts of interests related to the issues discussed in this meeting have been identified during the screening process or at the beginning of this meeting.

Discussion

4. Stefan Fabiansson's presentation: 'Data collection on chemical contaminants'

- It highlighted the need for a better coordination of contaminants data collection.
- Contaminant data sent to EFSA need to be cleaned and adjusted because data providers do not always follow the instructions. To face these challenges, the Standard Sample Description system was developed by the DCM Unit. It will be illustrated during the meeting.
- EFSA received from the EU Commission a mandate to collect on a continuous basis

all available data on occurrence of chemical contaminants in food and feed. Through an annual data collection this data will be harmonised and standardised.

- There is the need of planning the data collection of chemical contaminants. To this purpose a better coordination between EFSA, the EU Commission and the Member States is necessary. This topic will be further discussed during the meeting.
- EFSA funding to the Member States can only be of little assistance in relation to the size of the overall data collection effort; the possibility of appropriate legislation would support funding allocation to the area in the respective Member State.
- Coordination in the process of data submission to EFSA further to the 'Call for continuous collection of chemical contaminants occurrence data' will be explored by the DCM Unit and a specific Working Group might be established to face the challenges of this huge task.

Claudia Heppner, head of the EFSA CONTAM Unit, expressed the view of the CONTAM Panel on contaminants data collection:

- Data should be submitted and presented in a format that fits for the purposes of risk assessment
- Creation of an overall central database repository where MSs data are stored
- Validation of occurrence data to reduce uncertainty
- Commission opinion is required

5. Matthias Frost's presentation: 'Problems/requests raised by Member States and possible solutions'

- Problem of 'double data reporting': MSs are asked by both the Commission and EFSA to send the same data. This generates confusion and extra work, Germany is not prepared to do it. Necessity of one single recipient point (either EFSA or the Commission).
- Issue on 'Reporting dates': disparate reporting dates between EFSA and Commission legislation. Data could be sent spread over the year, rather than focusing on a specific deadline.
- The below questions were raised:
 1. Planned guidelines for the use of the SSD?
 2. What benefit can EFSA offer to member states?
 3. Call for continuous data collection

Stefan Fabiansson addressed the above points. Concerning the double submission issue, duplication is inevitable at this stage as it is a transitional phase. EFSA is the main collection point for the continuous data collection but the Commission will still need to have the data. The Data Warehouse, which will be implemented in EFSA within a year, will be a good tool for MSs and the Commission to view the data. This is beneficial to the MSs as they can have access to an overall European data collection, see their own results and compare them to the ones of other MSs depending on confidentiality requirements.

6. Round table discussion

On the overall, MSs agreed on:

- Need of a legal framework from the Commission so that their operations could benefit from within country financial support to the data collection. Stefan Fabiansson agreed that this issue should be put to the attention of Frans Verstraete who should join on the 2nd day of the meeting via teleconference.
- Need of more coordination between EFSA and the Commission to avoid 'double reporting data'. The need for a permanent cooperation between EFSA and MSs to maintain and update the system to be adopted at national level was also highlighted.
- Need of scheduled plan for sending data to better organise resources.

7. Valeriu Curtui's presentation: 'Overall quality of data from a user's perspective'

- Data quality: general considerations;
- Data sources on chemical contaminants, fitness of data for EFSA's risk assessment;
- Data quality assurance: matrix classification, sampling strategy (targeted vs. random), sampling method (individual samples, pooled samples, TDS data), methods of analysis (analytical performance criteria), checking for outliers, completeness of a defined set of congeners, outdated data.

8. Elena Scaravelli's presentation: 'Definition of contaminant areas and introduction to their specific requirements'

- Examples of mandatory fields and optional fields which can become mandatory for specific data collections.
- Issues for discussion: Are 20 mandatory fields enough? Are specific requirements needed, for contaminants area or for single substance?

Discussion

- Specific information requirements cannot be obtained afterwards, it is necessary to capture such information by the laboratory at data collection level otherwise specific requirement needs cannot be met. It was explained that the intention is to determine the specific requirements together for most substances to meet all needs in the future.
- Files providing specific information for each substance should be combined in one file only, rather than having one file for each contaminant. This file has already been compiled and it will be added to the relevant DCM web page once these specific requirements are defined.
- The Expert Group could prepare a guidance document for laboratories. The list of contaminants cannot be discussed as it is a requirement from the Commission but SSD catalogues can be extended and transmission dates can be reviewed.
- Scope of the current grouping of substances (group 1, 2, 3 and 4) is not scientifically based but it is a way to simplify the reporting. Criteria based on possible common business rules across substances or on type of contaminants could be evaluated in order to create a more suitable grouping of chemical substances in view of data collection/transmission and use.
- When legislative requirements are already set for certain data collection (especially in the case of data coming from official controls), they should be the basis for designing specific requirements for data submission to EFSA and EC.

9. Stefano Cappe's presentation: 'Requirements for data transmissions (XML, Excel and simplified format)'

- The Data Collection Framework is an EFSA tool for transmitting data.
- Currently there is no check for business rules on different data collection but from July 2011, business rules will be automatically checked by the system at the time of data transmission.
- The system produces an immediate (and now improved) feedback to the data providers.
- Different standards to transmit data (XML, Excel and simplified format) are available. Although all formats are supported in this transitional phase, XML guarantee no mistakes and it is therefore the preferred format. The principle is that in the future XML will be the only transmission format.

10. Introducing helpdesk and support

Ruth Roldan is in charge of providing helpdesk support; contaminants@efsa.europa.eu is the dedicated email account for this service.

11. Discussion (see Agenda item #13)

12. Stefano Cappe's presentation: 'Backlog data management'

For the first annual submission, data will be accepted also from years prior to 2010 to make sure that a potential backlog of data not so far submitted to EFSA is captured.

13. Tour de table discussion

- Issue on different data providers sending the same data to EFSA (MSs, Academia, Industries, JRC, Commission, and National Competent Authorities) thus creating double reporting. This point triggered a discussion on the necessity of submitting data to the Commission rather than having EFSA as the only reporting point. It is important to have feedback from EFSA on number of data received and on number of data used.
- All data from the previous collection year should arrive by 1 October of the following year.
- In the future if we agree on the right laboratory sample code it will be possible to have a unique European identifier of individual samples. Currently the correct data information is not available as a harmonised way to code samples at national level is missing. It was suggested to submit any issues to the contaminants inbox so that specific solutions can be found for each MS. Different type of solutions can also be found in the data collection specifications.
- Year of analysis in the Standard Sample Description will be used as reference time-stamp for dividing the data. However, it was requested to have the year of sampling instead of the year of analysis as the applicable identifier as it seems more relevant for assessment. All participants agreed on that.

2nd day, 7th June 2011, from 09h00 to 17h00

14. Presentation of bulleted summary of previous day's discussion

15. Agreement on actions to progress

The meeting discussion was summarised and the Expert Group members were asked to endorse the below points:

- Regulatory Support from the Commission
 - i. Official regulation is needed to provide a stronger legal basis to data collection. This could facilitate financial support and resources to build capacity and sustain it
 - ii. Develop justification for legislation through the need of better data for exposure assessment (EFSA task)
 - iii. Discuss the proposal in the Advisory Forum WG on data collection for resolution (EFSA task)
 - iv. To submit the resolution to the relevant Commission Expert Groups for support and final decision by the Standing Committee on the Food Chain and Animal Health (SCFAH) (MSs task)
 - v. Data Warehouse as a tool to promote the data collection through the provision of MS feedback (EFSA task)

- Coordinating data collection

Data produced are not driven by EU-wide exposure assessment needs.

- i. Steering committee (CONTAM, DCM, MSs, Commission) to set priorities, a group smaller than the full Expert Group, to be more effective (EFSA task)
- ii. Highlight specific needs for data, recommending foods to be analysed and type of supporting data to be gathered
- iii. Planning of data collection looking at representativeness (5-10 years might be needed for smaller countries to be statistically representative)
- iv. To agree with the Commission priorities for a progressive approach to planning
- v. Involvement of the National Reference Laboratories with regard to proper methods

- Minimum reporting requirements

In order to perform exposure assessment, some information describing the sample is crucial, but will vary depending on the class of contaminant. Currently only a partial amount of the available data is suitable for EFSA's assessment needs.

- i. SSD is, from this year's data transmission, a minimum reporting requirement. Other formats are not encouraged
- ii. Guidance for reporting (could be covered by the same group as in previous point)
- iii. Single contaminants-groups of contaminants
- iv. Network of National Reference Laboratories to be also involved at a very early stage
- v. Including the reporting requirements in the Commission recommendations would be important

- Reporting dates

Dates for reporting must be compatible with national data collections and other reporting needs.

- i. Data can be submitted at any time from the 1 January (end of previous year's data collection) to 1st October, final deadline. After this date, the submitted data will be processed and no new data can be added.
- ii. Try to harmonise dates with the Commission (EFSA task)

- Double reporting

- i. Presently, aggregated data are reported separately by the MSs to the Commission as prescribed by specific Regulations. It would be in principle possible for the MSs to provide the compliance data to EFSA together with the annual submission and for EFSA to summarise and provide them to the Commission. Since the deadlines need to be harmonised, this issue has to be discussed in the Advisory Forum and at Commission level.

- Backlog data

Data from previous years, data submitted through different channels. How to avoid confusion?

- i. Unique sample coding
- ii. Sampling year as reference for reporting backlog data.

16. Saadia Noorani's presentation: 'The Information Exchange Platform'

Overview of the Information Exchange Platform (IEP), the EFSA extranet site shared by Member States, EEA/EFTA countries, pre-accession countries and EFSA, to facilitate the exchange of risk assessment outputs.

17. Donata Lerda's presentation: 'Update on the LIMS project'

Background, objectives, methodology, first results and follow up of the project were presented. An interim report will be submitted in the near future.

18. Stefano Cappe's presentation: 'New Article 36 project on data transmission with mentoring (CFP/EFSA/DATEX/2011/01)'

The new EFSA Call for proposal aims at providing financial support to Member States to transmit to EFSA standardised data submissions according to the Standard Sample Description system. Deadline for proposal submission is July 2011. New rules for Art. 36 Grants were implemented as follows:

- EFSA grant is now 90% of total eligible costs
- An individual country can apply for up to 68,000€
- Consortia are now possible which can apply for a larger share of the total funding
- Consortia foresee 'mentor' countries (providing training, software or other support)
- Potential 'mentor' countries are those who have already been awarded with an Article 36 grant for 'Electronic transmission of chemical occurrence data' (Austria, Belgium, Denmark, France, Germany, Hungary, Ireland, Latvia, Romania, Slovakia, Sweden).

As described in section 1.4.3 of the call for proposals, the consortium has to be formed of institutions from different EU countries, not of authorities from the same country.

19. 2011 data collection. Status of the implementation

In relation to the EFSA 'Call for continuous collection of chemical contaminants occurrence data in food and feed', the participant MSs listed the status of their current data submissions with reference to the used format, the expected time frame and the issues (need for help or testing) encountered. SC stressed the importance of sending data in the right format and explained that, to ensure good data quality, senders have to check the information message they receive further to the data submission and to verify any errors with the relevant scientific experts.

20. Elke Rauscher Gabernig's presentation: 'Systems for data transmission: a Member States experience'

Outcome of the Article 36 project on 'Electronic Transmission of Chemical Occurrence Data' (CFP/EFSA/DATEX/2009/01) as implemented in Austria was described.

Matthias Frost's presentation: 'German Food Monitoring 1995 – 2015. A national programme for preventive health protection of consumers'

The programme's objectives, implementation and structure of food monitoring (market basket monitoring and, from year 2003, project monitoring) were described. The project management responsibilities are shared between the Federal Office of Consumer Protection and Food Safety, Federal States and the Federal Institute for Risk Assessment.

21. Elena Scaravelli's presentation: 'Total Diet Studies (TDS) general principles and guidance document'

The WG's aim is evaluating the current situation of TDSs worldwide and developing guidance for future harmonised TDSs.

The WG is working on two documents:

- Joint Guidance of EFSA, FAO and WHO for future harmonised TDSs and
- Joint Report of EFSA, FAO and WHO on the State of the art on Total Diet Studies based on the replies to the EFSA/FAO/WHO questionnaire on national total diet study approaches.

22. Francesco Vernazza's presentation: 'Food classification (current status)'

Current status of the Working Group on Food Classification, aimed at developing a harmonised food classification and description system to enable exchange of data on consumption and occurrence at EU level. Its main objectives are:

- Covering at least the needs of consumption, microbiological contaminants and chemical contaminants and residues data collections;
- Not forcing the different areas to change their data management practices;
- Providing a common platform in case of exposure assessment;

Next meeting date: The meeting expressed an interest in meeting more often than once a year but timing will be a problem. The date for the next meeting is still to be confirmed.

DATEX UNIT

Parma, 23 March 2010

Minutes of the 3rd MEETING OF EXPERT GROUP FOR CHEMICAL OCCURRENCE DATA

Parma, 22 and 23 March 2010

Participants

BASIC Sandra (Croatia)
BASKARAN Christina (UK)
BLAZNIK Urska (Slovenia)
BÜCHERT Arne (Denmark)
BUSUTTIL Ingrid (Malta)
FOSTER David (Sweden)
HALLIKAINEN Anja (Finland)
HERAUD Fanny (France)
KAKOURI Eleni Ioannou (Cyprus)
OLIVIERA Luisa (Portugal)
PALILIS Leonidas (Greece)
PETRAITIS Julijonas (Lithuania)
RAUSCHER-GABERNIG Elke (Austria)
RUPRICH Jiri (Czech Rep.)
ŠANTARE Dace (Latvia)
STARSKA Krystyna (Poland)
SVĚTLÍKOVÁ Angela (Slovakia)

TLUSTOS Christina (Ireland)
TÚRI SZERLETICS Mária (Hungary)
VAN KLAVEREN Jacob (Netherlands)
VAZGECER Betul (Turkey)
WENZL Thomas (EC JRC)

EFSA

ARCELLA Davide
CAPPE' Stefano
CARLETTI Alessandro
CURTUI Valeriu
FABIANSOON Stefan
FERRARI Pietro
MERTEN Caroline
SCARAVELLI Elena
TRACCHINI Giuseppe
VALSTA Liisa
VERNAZZA Francesco (Chair)

Agenda

1. Welcome and apologies for absences
2. Administrative procedures
3. Adoption of the agenda
4. Presentation of participants
5. Presentation of the Data Collection and Exposure Unit
6. Overview of EFSA's data collection activities (arsenic, lead, acrylamide, furan)
7. Overview of EFSA's data collection activities (dioxins, NDL PCBs, BFRs, melamine, other calls in the pipeline)
8. Future structure of chemical contaminant submission forms (guidance on standard sample description)
9. Data sharing with international organisations (FAO, WHO)
10. Future structure of reporting formats for chemical contaminants
11. Progress report from the food description and classification Working Group
12. Progress report from the "Total Diet Study" Working group
13. Report on the handling of left censored data
14. State of the art of the comprehensive and EXPOCHI food consumption database

Minutes

1. Welcome and apologies for absences

The Chair welcomed the participants to the third meeting of the Expert Group for Chemical Occurrence Data. Apologies for absence were received from the invited experts from Germany, Romania, Spain, Belgium, Italy, Bulgaria and Norway.

2. Administrative procedures

Changes in administrative procedures for indemnities payment to Expert Groups members were presented by Muriel Pesci – EFSA.

Questions/comments:

Anja Hallikainen questioned the change related to the special allowance.

Stefan Fabiansson stated that it was a change to EFSA rules issued by EFSA's Executive Director and nothing the meeting could influence.

3. Adoption of the agenda

The agenda was adopted without change and a quick introduction to the work program of the two-day meeting followed.

4. Presentation of participants

Each EG member shortly presented her-/himself

5. Presentation of the Data Collection and Exposure Unit

Presentation 1: Stefan Fabiansson (EFSA) – *"The DATEX unit – an introduction"*

6. Overview of EFSA's data collection activities (arsenic, lead, acrylamide, furan)

Presentation 2: Elena Scaravelli (EFSA) – “Data collection on arsenic in food”

Questions/comments

Sandra Basič asked if EFSA develops specific software for coping with calculation of exposure assessment based on such a wide number of records and what kind of data processing/analysis is applied.

Elena Scaravelli explained that in EFSA the mean data is used for occurrence and individual data is used for consumption, combining deterministic and probabilistic method.

Anja Hallikainen, referring to the original data of the arsenic study, asked what the future need is with so little details on organic vs. inorganic arsenic.

Elena Scaravelli stated that the data reported in the opinion are calculated on the basis of total arsenic. The data on inorganic arsenic (919 samples) were not enough for a comprehensive exposure assessment.

Jiri Ruprich, referring to scenario 5, asked the reason for the value related to fish. He asked how this kind of conversion factor could be justified. He also stated that he has worked with US FDA in the past, and according to his experience he would not be able to compare results from EFSA with those from FDA, but he would like to understand how to interpret results.

Elena Scaravelli explained that a lot of time had been spent to set conversion factors. Conversion factors for inorganic arsenic were applied for 7 food categories, other than fish. For fish and fish products EFSA used real concentrations and fixed values of occurrence. Using scenario 5 EFSA made a kind of compromise, the most realistic one when compared with literature data.

Jiri Ruprich asked if the exposure work was done by EFSA staff or by the CONTAM Panel.

Elena Scaravelli explained that the CONTAM Panel established a working group for arsenic with collective responsibility for the work supported by DATEX staff for the exposure assessment. It was disappointing that not enough data on organic arsenic was provided, necessitating the estimation of the inorganic arsenic proportion of total arsenic.

Presentation 3: Stefan Fabiansson (EFSA) – “Lead Data collection – exposure assessment part of opinion”

Questions/comments

Jiri Ruprich asked what is meant by “adjusted” in the context of this presentation and what factor was used?

Stefan Fabiansson stated that detailed data are aggregated into higher level groups, then adjustment factors are applied on these groups. DATEX is currently preparing a document explaining how the adjustment factors work and how to use them.

Jacob Van Klaveren, referring to the EXPOCHI project and related calculations, asked how EFSA takes into account and calculates uncertainty on so many data.

Stefan Fabiansson explained that the most relevant issue is handling of LOD-LOQ.

Arne Büchert pointed out that EFSA receives data from many laboratories and asked how laboratory accreditation is taken into account.

Stefan Fabiansson answered that laboratory accreditation is a compulsory field in the schema for reporting data.

Fanny Heraud pointed out that EFSA mentioned data from commercial industries and asked if EFSA uses such data.

Stefan Fabiansson explained that they are initially treated separately to make sure that all data are compatible before pooling the information.

Eleni Ioannou Kakouri remarked that they did not receive specific calls from EU for these surveys on metals.

Stefan Fabiansson explained that in these cases the EU Commission had given a mandate to EFSA and the calls were only published on the EFSA website

Presentation 4: Caroline Merten (EFSA) – *“Results on the monitoring of acrylamide levels in food”*

Questions/comments

Arne Büchert drew the attention to the possible geographical differences within the EU countries which should be taken into account for exposure assessments.

Caroline Merten answered that EFSA compared data country by country for the two years using regression analysis. No significant influence of country was observed so results were examined by food group and not at individual country level.

Eleni Ioannou Kakouri remarked that compared to the call for arsenic, the call for data for acrylamide was much better organized because it was issued through an EC recommendation.

Presentation 5: Caroline Merten (EFSA) *“Results on the monitoring of furan levels in food”*

Questions/comments

Anja Hallikainen remarked that baby foods are the most important in exposure calculations and she asked how consumption of baby foods involved with furans was calculated.

Caroline Merten explained that consumption levels were available for general the general baby food category but not for individual foods.

Jiri Ruprich, referring to the high volatility of furan, asked how the issue of analytical methodology could be solved.

Thomas Wenzl replied that most laboratories use one of two main analytical methods: GC–MS or GC-SPME. The problem of volatility is well known and there are recommendation from the European Commission on how to handle the samples and how to face volatility issues doing analysis.

7. Overview of EFSA’s data collection activities (dioxins, NDL PCBs, BFRs, melamine, other calls in the pipeline)

Presentation 6: Pietro Ferrari (EFSA) - *“Monitoring of Dioxins”*

Questions/comments

Jacob van Klaveren: pointed out that dioxin samples are often taken in polluted areas and this implies some specificity of the samples to be taken into account.

Pietro Ferrari answered that the only way to deal with these specificities is just to consistently report the origin of samples. At EFSA we try to scrutinise the data and to identify targeted samples as opposed to random samples.

Jiri Ruprich pointed out that if we use data without knowing the origin of the data we risk a consistent shift of results.

Anja Hallikainen asked if on the basis of changes in TEF values, toxicological reference doses and legislated maximum level should be updated.

Pietro Ferrari answered that a revision of recommended maximum levels is part of risk management which is beyond the scope of the present work.

Arne Büchert stated that it is difficult to make easy and simple this issue because we need not only to know if dioxin comes from fish, but also from what kind of fish and from where in Europe. It is difficult to make the dioxin analysis simple. Very detailed information is needed, not an easy task for the data suppliers.

Presentation 7: Alessandro Carletti (EFSA) – *“Monitoring of non dioxin-like PCBs in food and feed”*

Questions/comments

Stefan Fabiansson informed that we are still working on the report of non dioxin-like PCBs but will present some results at the PCB meeting in Sweden in June. Valeriu Curtui pointed out that EFSA collaborates with the EU Community Reference Laboratory in relation to data submissions.

Presentation 8: Elena Scaravelli (EFSA) - *“Data collection on brominated flame retardants”*

Questions/comments

Anja Hallikainen asked who can provide funding for data submissions to EFSA from MS.

Stefan Fabiansson informed that the founding regulation of EFSA is mostly based on collaboration. Sometimes EFSA does specific calls but not for mandatory issues which can come only from the European Commission.

Jacob Van Klaveren asked if EFSA focuses also on other ways of contamination and exposure for the calculation of exposure.

Elena Scaravelli answered that EFSA currently focuses on food only.

Presentation 9: Francesco Vernazza (EFSA) *“Data collection and exposure assessment on melamine and analogues”*

Questions/comments

Eleni Ioannou Kakouri asked if the presentations of this meeting will be available on the EFSA extranet.

Francesco Vernazza answered that the presentations will be downloadable from the extranet as soon as possible.

Presentation 10: Valeriu Curtui (EFSA) *“Calls for data”*

Questions/comments

Anja Hallikainen stated that she will consult the colleagues in her institute in order to know what they think about submitting their data. She thinks they have to discuss on how the data can be used by third parties once submitted.

Valeriu Curtui reminded that data submission to EFSA is just recommended and it is not a matter of legal constraint.

8. Future structure of chemical contaminant submission forms (guidance on standard sample description)

Presentation 1: Stefano Cappé (EFSA) – *“Future structure of chemical contaminants submission forms – guidance on Standard Sample Description”*

Questions/comments

Arne Büchert asked if it is planned to include also toxicological data in the data warehouse.

Stefano Cappè answered that it is not planned to add toxicological data in the data warehouse.

Anja Hallikainen pointed out that special care should be taken to the scientific level of analysis of chemical occurrence and food intake. The methodology used should be shared with evaluators at country level.

Stefan Fabiansson specified that DATEX is working on a manual to cover the whole exposure assessment part. This manual will probably be presented to the expert group on chemical occurrence during the next meeting.

Christina Baskaran states that even if she has not actually used this submission process up to now she wanted to know if the submission form is the same one discussed in December 2009 or it has changed. Her institution had some difficulty to fill in some fields.

Stefano Cappè answered that the form is the same that was presented for the BFR data collection in December and invited people who encounter difficulties to send to DATEX an email with comments. To facilitate data transfer he encouraged people to respond to an EFSA Article 36 call to provide practical training and experience for this very task.

9. Data sharing with international organisations (FAO, WHO)

Presentation 1: Stefan Fabiansson (EFSA) – “Data sharing with international organisations”

Discussion

Jiri Ruprich highlighted that there is not enough capacity to have resources to change the classification systems and this is the big challenge. You need to have some legislative instrument to push the nation to supply data. At the same time they push national organisations to change the format of their databases to be able to send data to a central level. They try to use the format proposed by EFSA and hope this year to succeed with this format.

Eleni Ioannou Kakouri pointed out that the food classification system of GEMS/Food is proposed by the expert committee on additives in Brussels. It is important to have this in mind and in the future we have to be more international than just European.

Francesco Vernazza agreed that MS should not have to code food with more than one coding system and that we are already trying to mix food and pesticide classification systems.

Christina Baskaran stated that most of the data sent by the UK to EFSA have already been published.

Betul Vazgecer informed that Turkey has recently introduced an online database but it is quite difficult to use at present, so she is now writing a document to explain to submitters in the Turkish provinces how to send data to the national authority through the database.

Angela Světlíková pointed out that they have been collaborating with WHO since 1986.

Luisa Oliveira pointed out that it will be easier in the future to send data because the responsibilities will be more centralised.

Krystyna Starska said that the condition of use and share of results have to be agreed.

Jacob Van Klaveren stated that the Netherlands are used to share data around the world. The critical point is to agree on the work load to recode and transform the data format.

Ingrid Busuttill said that in general Malta had no problem sharing the data.

Julijonas Petraitis stated that he doesn't see a big problem to implement SSD in his institute.

Elke Rauscher-Gabernig stated that the Austrian Ministry of Health can share data with EFSA and these data can be shared with other organisations as they have already sent data to WHO. Eleni Ioannou Kakouri agreed in relation to Cyprus.

Sandra Basic stated that in Croatia they normally don't share data with other institution but considered it a good idea to have a specific program to share data.

Arne Büchert, Mária Túri Szerletics, Leonidas Palilis, Christina Tlustos and Dace Šantare stated that they are in favour of sending data to EFSA and they also want to support WHO.

Fanny Heraud informed that the data France sends to EFSA are public and can be shared with the European Commission and the Member States and for international purposes France use to send data to WHO.

Stefan Fabiansson stated that DATEX could think about the possibility to include, for each data collection, if the data providers are agreeable to share the dataset.

10. Future structure of reporting formats for chemical contaminants

Presentation 1: Valeriu Curtui (EFSA) – *“Reporting formats for data on chemical contaminants”*

Questions/comments

Jiri Ruprich stated that one can easily imagine that contaminant by contaminant the description used for specific fields can be changed a little bit during the time, but the attention has to go to the national data senders who have each time to ask to their control organisations to change one full year of data into the newest suggested format. Then if a new slightly changed format will be issued it will be impossible to expect from the data sender another data conversion into the new format.

Valeriu Curtui replied that the reporting formats are generated from the generic one and they maintain the same structure. He invited people to consider that in these forms the columns are never deleted, they are just hidden for the purpose of data entry because some variable is not applicable to some contaminant, but they are still there in the spreadsheet as it is not allowed to cancel columns.

Stefan Fabiansson remarks that, in general, there is one fixed format (apart for correction of mistakes fixed in some forms during the time) but with the aim of filling the forms manually it is helpful to hide columns which can potentially confuse the operator doing manual data input.

Arne Büchert remarked that during both the meeting days only LOD and LOQ have been mentioned, but many monitoring systems use a “reporting limit” instead which is sometime more useful. He then asked if the Excel file is already available on the web.

Valeriu confirmed that the file is available on the web and that the EFSA web site should shortly include all these new files.

11. Progress report from the food description and classification Working Group

Presentation 1: Francesco Vernazza (EFSA) – *“Development of a food Classification and Description System for exposure assessment”*

Questions/comments

Dace Šantare asked if the food classification system takes into account the nutrition surveys needs for food intake monitoring? (e.g. fat contents of food, labelling, food treatment, etc.)

Liisa Valsta confirmed that it does it.

Jiri Ruprich remarked that according to his experience from previous projects he thinks that when final results like guidance's are published they will serve just to science, but the big issue of implementation costs of what scientific document include remains unsolved.

Francesco Vernazza ensured that the working group took into consideration also the issue of money.

12. Progress report from the “Total Diet Study” Working group

Presentation 1: Elena Scaravelli (EFSA) – *“Pan-European Total Diet Studies for harmonised data collection and exposure assessment – report from 1st WG meeting”*

Questions/comments

Anja Hallikainen asked who are the responsible for monitoring, risk assessment and risk management at country level.

Elena Scaravelli replied that the situation can be completely different from country to country. Control activities (monitoring programs and total diet studies) can be complementary, but in some cases total diet studies can drive the process as a guide for monitoring. The role of total diet studies is considered differently in the member states.

Arne Büchert suggested having a guidance document on how to start with TDS. He stated to feel reluctant in replacing monitoring with TDS studies, for both scientific and financial reasons. He exemplified that if in Denmark he would try to ask money for this purpose to the central government the answer would probably be a cut of the monitoring activity. So he proposed to implement TDS in the Member States as art 36 projects.

Jiri Ruprich answered to the issue just opened by Arne Büchert and he stated that it's a mistake to think that TDS can replace monitoring programs as TDS looks more at the scientific aspects of the program. He gave the example of the analysis of aluminium in monitoring programs focused on data taken from the food national market and he remarked as many foods imported from China contain high aluminium concentrations but they will never be analyzed. This is the real gap in the daily work of monitoring systems. Monitoring systems need an orientation and TDS can be used for this purpose. In the situations in which acute evaluations are requested, they can be done with TDS according to how, in each country, things are organized.

Elena Scaravelli expressed her agreement regarding the financial aspect confirming that monitoring programs will not be replaced by TDS and founding cannot be used for TDS instead of monitoring. She also stated that in the future EFSA could help organizing project under art. 36 and she invited people to consider that also European research founding is a possibility and that for the moment the guidance is the operative basis, but in the WG the possibilities for future development and implementation were discussed.

Eleni Ioannou Kakouri expressed her opinion that the official control and the monitoring are compulsory for member states, big or small they are. TDS is complementary and under this point of view it is a support as guidance for monitoring activities.

13. Report on the handling of left censored data

Presentation 1: Pietro Ferrari (EFSA) – *“Handling of left censored values in occurrence data of chemical contaminants”*

Questions/comments

Fanny Heraud stated that in her institute they will see if they are able to implement these recommendation at national level and she asked if TDS specific cases were taken into consideration in the work presented, and how are these guidelines apply to TDS.

Pietro Ferrari answered that there is WHO publication under development for TDS. The implementation of such technique is drafted into a specific chapter. He specified that the group of co-authors had an interesting internal discussion and they would suggest that the next generation of TDS will require a larger number of samples. Because when too many individual samples are aggregated into one single composite a dilution effect takes place. Then if one single estimate of occurrence is considered no estimation on variability is available.

Thomas Wenzl asked why there are about 30% of zero values in the lognormal distribution as in nature you don't have zero values and how to deal with this. He also asked if a situation with background contamination were modelled.

Pietro Ferrari answered that a background contamination was not taken into account and the distribution with the zeroes was not meant to tackle chemical contaminants but rather pesticides on crops, and the zeroes are justified by the presence or not of crops treated with pesticides.

Jiri Ruprich pointed out that it should be emphasized that statistics cannot be used with inappropriate data.

14. State of the art of the comprehensive and EXPOCHI food consumption database

Presentation 1: Davide Arcella (EFSA) – *“State of the art of the comprehensive and EXPOCHI food consumption database. The EU Menu survey”*

Questions/comments

Luisa Oliviera asked when the PANCAKE project is supposed to finish.

Davide Arcella replied that this is a two year project, started in 2009 and planned to finish in 2011. There will be workshops, interim reports and exchange of information. DATEX planned to have more discussion with the other expert groups (e.g. food consumption data). The idea was to have a closer contact with the others before reporting results. He also offered to keep interested people updated on the ongoing activities.

Conclusions

Stefan Fabiansson thanked everybody for the patient participation and for following all the presentations.

He mentioned that over these two days the DATEX team tried to give a picture of how the collected data were used and some of the applied methodology. He also informed that meeting that the team is trying to develop a manual covering the relevant methodology: from data collection to the output of an exposure assessment. It was finally pointed out that at EFSA there are no laboratories or analytical facilities and that EFSA's work strongly depend on the collaboration of Member States.

DRAFT Minutes of the

2nd MEETING OF THE EXPERT GROUP FOR CHEMICAL OCCURRENCE DATA

Parma, 19 February 2009

Participants

ANDERSEN Jens Hinge (Denmark)	SPINDURA Jillian (UK)
BASIC Sandra (Croatia)	STARSKA Krystyna (Poland)
BITENC Katarina (Slovenia)	SVĚTLÍKOVÁ Angela (Slovakia)
FOSTER David (Sweden)	TLUSTOS Christina (Ireland)
FROST Matthias (Germany)	TÚRI SZERLETICS Mária (Hungary)
GEORGESCU Madalina (Romania)	VAN KLAVEREN Jacob (Netherlands)
HALLIKAINEN Anja (Finland)	VRABCHEVA Tery (Bulgaria)
HERAUD Fanny (France)	WIBORG MarieLouise (Norway)
KAKOURI Eleni Ioannou (Cyprus)	WENZL Thomas (EC JRC)
KENDROVSKI Vladimir (Macedonia)	ARCELLA Davide (EFSA)
MARCOS SUÁREZ Victoria (Spain)	CAPPE' Stefano (EFSA)
MØLLER Anders, (Denmark)	CARLETTI Alessandro (EFSA)
MOONS Emmanuelle (Belgium)	CURTUI Valeriu (EFSA)
OLIVIERA Luisa (Portugal)	FABIANSOON Stefan (EFSA)
PASTORELLI Augusto (Italia)	FERRARI Pietro (EFSA)
PETRAITIS Julijonas (Lituania)	KONINGS Erik (EFSA)
RAUSCHER-GABERNIG Elke	MERTEN Caroline (EFSA)
RUPRICH Jiri (Czech Rep.)	SCARAVELLI Elena (EFSA)
ŠANTARE Dace (Latvia)	VERNAZZA Francesco (EFSA)
SIROT Veronique (France)	

Agenda

1. Welcome and apologies for absence
 2. Administrative Details
 3. Adoption of the Agenda
 4. Presentation of participants
 5. Total Diet Studies carried out by Member States
 6. LOD and the handling of left censored data
 7. Report from Member States' IT experts meeting
 8. Food description and classification
 9. On-going EFSA data collection activities
 10. Collection of food consumption data at EU level
 11. Future activities
 12. Other business
-

Minutes

1. Welcome and apologies

The Chair welcomed the participants to the second meeting of the Expert Group for Chemical Occurrence Data.

2. Adoption of agenda

The agenda was adopted without changes.

3. Declarations of interest

The DoI and Declaration of commitment were presented

Presentation 1: Sira Gonzalez Hevia (EFSA) – “Expert Group on Chemical Occurrence Data” – administrative procedures were explained.

4. Presentation of participants

Each EG member briefly presented themselves.

5. Total Diet Studies carried out by MSs

Presentation 2: Jiri Ruprich (National Institute of Public Health - CZ) – “Total Diet Study in the Czech Republic 09”, “Global Environmental Monitoring System/Food Contamination Monitoring and Assessment Program (GEMS/Food): Total Diet Study”

Questions/comments:

Anja Hallikainen stressed the need for using the appropriate terminology; TDS were born for nutritional studies only, and then extended to contaminants. TDS is about what people eat, but not aimed at exposure assessment.

Jiri Ruprich confirmed that the terminology is crucial. TDS are particularly useful when the target chemicals are present in different food products. The design of the study is crucial; it must be based on the expected results and not on the available lab infrastructure.

Presentation 3: Anja Hallikainen (Finnish Food Safety Authority Evira) – “The FINDIET 2007 Survey, National Institute for Health and Welfare (THL)”

Presentation 4: Jacob Van Klaveren (RIKILT Institute of Food Safety - NL) – “*Total Diet Studies*”

Jacob Van Klaveren pointed out that the TDS methodology is not suitable for all kind of substances. In particular, TDS is not especially appropriate for pesticides because of their high variability in the occurrence.

Presentation 5: Jillian Spindura (Food Standards Agency- UK) – “*Total Diet Studies UK Food Standards Agency*”

Presentation 6: Veronique Sirot (French Food Safety Agency) - “*2nd French Total Diet Study*”

Presentation 7: Victoria Marcos (Spanish Food Safety Agency) – “*Total Diet Studies Spain*”

Presentation 8: Elena Scaravelli (EFSA) – “*Total Diet Studies: EFSA’s perspective*”

Discussion

Jacob Van Klaveren strongly recommended further collaboration on TDS.

Anja Hallikainen stated that most often in Finland TDS are not targeted to contaminant occurrence analysis but to dietary nutrition studies, e.g. dioxins from fish: In intake estimation in fish we do need fish physiology experts. To put everything into a TDS (with all the expertises needed) requires a huge effort in coordination. She stressed the importance of harmonisation as a major goal, the fixing of priorities among chemicals and the need of using food control studies.

Emmanuelle Moons noticed that variability of contaminants in food from year to year in TDS is not taken into account mostly (e.g. especially for deoxyrivalénol contamination which depend on weather conditions). Lack of financial resources for a comprehensive monitoring (targeted monitoring is then the common option) which results in a lack of information in Risk Analysis. Official monitoring is designed to check compliance with regulation and TDS can be of help to obtain more reliable estimation in order to carry out an exposure assessment.

Jiri Ruprich suggested that EFSA should not limit or push countries towards the adoption of a specific methodology, but highlight case by case advantages and limitations.

Sampling in TDS should be random (consumer-like). TDS data should not be pooled together with data collected within the food control due to the different levels of uncertainty. It is important to consider that often LOQ cannot be reduced because of the costs.

Proposal to take TDS as main methodology and highlight advantages in adopting parallel food control methods.

Christina Tlustos confirmed that harmonising methodologies is not possible since the study design must take into account seasonal/regional variation. However a handbook or guidelines on TDS could be of great help for Member States. A group should be committed to draft it.

Anja Hallikainen stressed the importance of food control studies, this must not be cancelled and neither reduced.

Fanny Heraud pointed out that national strategies for TDS depend on information available at country level. This information is not often available at EU level. She also confirmed the difficulties in setting analytical limits. Guidelines could be an interesting issue. They could also include a list of chemical compounds of concern which should be possibly included in a TDS.

Tery Vrabcheva noticed that TDS are expensive and not all MSs are able to carry out these kinds of studies. There is therefore the need of keeping doors open to alternate approaches (national traditional). Analysis of foods as consumed is more complicated and expensive.

Davide Arcella stated that EFSA is not trying to impose a standard methodology to MSs. The core point is that results are needed from as many countries as possible, and these should be comparable. This requires at least a common terminology and a harmonized approach in collecting data under similar conditions. Thus, EFSA just supports MSs to find a common agreement on these two points.

Stefan Fabiansson also supported the need for more coordination among MSs. He also suggested to specialise some laboratories in order to make them the reference for TDS in order to reduce costs. Moreover he suggested the creation of an EFSA working group aimed at drafting guidelines on TDS.

Eleni Kakouri expressed interest in the WG since some of the MS have no experience in TDS and need support. TDS could also be an important source of information in order to carry out risk/benefit analyses.

6. LOD and the handling of left censored data

Presentation 9: Thomas Wenzl (JRC) - "LOD and LOQ"

Presentation 10: Pietro Ferrari (EFSA) - "Handling of left censored values in occurrence data"

Questions/comments:

Jacob Van Klaveren, Pietro Ferrari and Matthias Frost discussed about the need for modelling occurrence data and the importance of having information about limit of detection and/or quantification.

Jiri Ruprich invited EFSA to provide recommendations about the use of left-censored occurrence data.

On this topic Fanny Heraud suggested to consider WHO guidelines and the experience from France. Information about the uncertainty linked with the analytical result is also important for the risk assessment. Emmanuelle Moons suggested to also consider/adapt the guidelines on the reporting of official monitoring data. This document is written by Frans Verstraete (European Commission)

7. Report from Member States' IT experts meeting

Presentation 11: Stefano Cappè (EFSA) "*Report from Member States' Expert Group Meeting*"

Anders Møller informed the audience that the European Standard Organisation is setting up standards for food data collection and analysis. EFSA should possibly be involved on it. In particular the European Standard Organisation started similar work for compositional data. Sweden is the coordinator and another 8 EU countries are involved.

Matthias Frost highlighted the importance of standardising at the very beginning of the process, when data are collected, before the sending to EFSA. In particular, data must be in the right format (terminology) before their transmission. Using the same structure for contaminants and pesticides is a good idea, but contaminants are more flexible whereas pesticide data are more demanding. It is very complicated, if not impossible, to identify which data are going to be needed in the future. He suggested cooperation with Eurostat which is also active in the field of food safety.

Stefano Cappè stated that the system EFSA is developing tries to be flexible with respect to the terminology, this is especially important during the developing phase. Experience from other EU countries show that different substances can fit in a unique database. Changing continuously the format can create problems. A single format is more cost-effective. Eurostat will be involved in the WG.

Stefan Fabiansson informed the audience that a meeting between EFSA and EC aimed at finding agreement on data collection has already been scheduled.

In reply to a question from Jiri Ruprich, Stefano Cappè informed that feed are currently included in the EFSA system. Veterinary medicines could be included as well. This is the reason why it is important to have a broad system.

8. Food description and classification

Presentation 12: Francesco Vernazza (EFSA) – "*Building a Standard Common Language for food risk assessment*"

Presentation 13: Valeriu Curtui (EFSA) – "*Food description and classification*"

Presentation 14: Matthias Frost (DE) – “A test of a new food classification and a data model for data transmission”

Anja Hallikainen supported the use of “Marketing data” in order to complement those collected within dietary surveys since they cannot capture certain details.

Stefan Fabiansson informed that EFSA is in favour of using marketing data as a proxy for certain kind of information. EFSA is also trying to collect data from marketing research companies.

Anders Møller pointed out that the real challenge is not the classification but the food matching. Classification changes rapidly. Food items listed in the national food composition tables can be used as a shortlist of food consumed in EU.

Problem is in matching between classification in Consumption studies and Occurrence ones.

Stefan Fabiansson stated that interoperability is a major task.

Jiri Ruprich suggested that biological biomarkers can also be used to validate exposure estimates.

Stefan Fabiansson agrees on this and informed that EFSA is currently exploring the possibility of using biomonitoring data.

Valeriu Curtui highlighted the need of a common food description system within EFSA.

Stefan Fabiansson pointed out that the DATEX Unit is trying to improve the visibility of EFSA calls for data. Some MSs are not informed still. DATEX will try to give feedbacks to data providers about the use of the data.

Eleni Kakouri suggested involving EFSA focal points. They could inform MSs about the issue of calls for data.

Jiri Ruprich stressed the importance of representativeness of the occurrence data collected by EFSA within the calls. Occurrence levels can sensibly vary from country to country (uranium as an example) and it might not be possible to identify if the available data are representative of the different geographical areas.

Stefan Fabiansson confirmed that bias currently exists; in particular German data often represents about 50% of the total raising serious problems of representativeness.

Matthias Frost suggested that EFSA should approach the federal state in order to get support for identifying the representative institution for veterinary drugs.

Anja Hallikainen supported close cooperation between EFSA and EC with respect to the collection of occurrence data.

9. On-going EFSA data collection activities

Presentation 15: Erik Konings (EFSA) – “On-going EFSA data collection activities”

10. Collection of food consumption data at EU level

Presentation 16: Caroline Merten (EFSA) – “Overview of EFSA activities in the field of food consumption”

Anders Møller asked about the possibility of having access to the food consumption data for children collected within the EXPOCHI project. Davide Arcella replied that these data are not owned by EFSA and access from third parties should be discussed with the national institutes that collected the data.

Croatia expressed interest in the “Guidance document giving recommendations on methods and protocols for future national dietary surveys in Europe” under preparation by a DATEX working group.

Fanny Heraud suggested that EFSA should better coordinate their requests to national institutions. In particular food consumption data have been recently requested by the DATEX Unit and PRAPeR. More links between the different guidelines for the exposure assessment would also be welcomed.

Anders Møller suggested that EFSA should get in contact with the EFCOVAL project. Davide Arcella informed that EFSA is already following this project.

11. Future activities: Stefan Fabiansson (EFSA)

There was not much time left to discuss future activities.

12. Other business

Since there was no other business the meeting was closed.

DATA COLLECTION & EXPOSURE UNIT

**MINUTES OF THE 1st MEETING OF EXPERT GROUP
FOR CHEMICAL OCCURRENCE DATA**

Meeting date: 19 June 2008
Venue: Parma
Meeting Room: MTG DUSD 00/003
Time: 9h00-17h00

Participants:

Emmanuelle Moons (Belgium)	Julijonas Petrakis (Lithuania)
Tery Vrabcheva (Bulgaria)	Anders Møller (Denmark)
Jiri Ruprich (Czech Republic)	Thomas Wenzl (EC)
Fanny Heraud (France)	Lila Vodeb (Macedonia pre-accession country)
Matthias Frost (Germany)	Darja Sokolic Mihalak (Croatia pre-accession country)
Mária Túri Szerletics (Hungary)	Stefan Fabiansson (EFSA)
Christina Tlustos (Ireland)	Francesco Vernazza (EFSA)
Marie-Louise Wiborg (Norway)	Pietro Ferrari (EFSA)
Maria Antónia Calhau (Portugal)	Davide Arcella (EFSA)
Erika Dobrikova (Slovakia)	Stefano Cappè (EFSA)
Victoria Marcos Suárez (Spain)	Mari Eskola (EFSA)
Jacob Van Klaveren (The Netherlands)	Chiara Bianchi (EFSA)
Madalina Georgescu (Romania)	Hubert Deluyker (EFSA)
Anja Hallikainen (Finland)	
Urška Blaznik (Slovenia)	
Elżbieta Brulińska-Ostrowska (Poland)	

Apologies:

Kakouri Eleni Ioannou (Cyprus)
Büchert Arne (Denmark)
Stacchini Paolo (Italy)
Astor Elsa (Sweden)
Spindura Jillian (UK)
Dace Santare (Latvia)

Agenda:

1. Welcome and apologies for absence
2. Adoption of the agenda
3. Presentation of participants
4. Purpose of the Expert Group
5. Presentation of Member States organisations and activities
6. Presentation of new IT tool for DOIs
7. Food description and classification
8. Data structure
9. On-going data collection activities
10. Future activities

Minutes:**1. Welcome and apologies for absence**

The chairman welcomed the members of the Expert Group.

2. Purpose of network and adoption of the agenda

The chairman pointed out that as part of the EFSA Scientific Cooperation (ESCO) activities a need was identified for the creation of a chemical occurrence network of experts between EFSA and the national authorities. The objectives of the Expert Group include the sharing of scientific information and provision of scientific advice as key priorities. The final output of the Expert Group will be a report to the EFSA Executive Director.

The Agenda for the 1st meeting of the Expert Group was adopted.

3. Introduction of participants

Each participant briefly introduced themselves.

4. Purpose of the Expert Group

The chairman emphasized that according to EC Regulation 178/2002 EFSA shall search for, collect, collate, analyse and summarise relevant scientific data in close collaboration with Member States (MS). The activities of the Data Collection and Exposure Unit (DATEX) include all aspects of data collection from farm to fork, and from harmful to beneficial dietary constituents, except pesticides and microorganisms covered by other units.

The structure of EFSA was described. Many activities in the DATEX Unit are done in collaboration with EFSA Panels. The DATEX Unit receives information through cooperation with MS.

The European Commission, or one of the MS, addresses a request to one of the EFSA Panels (80% of requests involving DATEX go through the CONTAM Panel). The Panel asks DATEX to open a call for data to MS. Some requests come directly to DATEX. Since the information will be used for data analyses to perform exposure assessment, and ultimately to produce an opinion, individual data are necessary. Sometimes data have already been submitted to the Commission but in aggregated form. This is not sufficient for the needs of DATEX and although a call seems repetitive it is necessary.

DATEX main objective is to coordinate and facilitate data collections for the occurrence of contaminants or nutrients in food, beverages and feed and associated consumption data for the same categories.

The Terms of Reference established by the EFSA Advisory Forum request that the Expert Group review the priorities for the collection of occurrence data specified in the Commission Regulation 1881/2006. A crucial aspect will be the identification of a common food classification system to harmonise data coming from different European countries with different languages.

The Expert Group will look at ways of facilitating data submissions. Excel files are probably the easiest way to send data but involves a lot of manual handling. As an alternative, the XML format is an option. Important details of any data collection are the quality of input, representativeness of data, analytical sensitivity, and survey methodology used. For data exchange it is important to define system compatibility, repository functionality, automated validation, standardised coding system, data submission format, and future access rights.

5. Presentation of Member State organisation and activities

Participants in turn presented their institutions and the activities of each represented country. Copies of PowerPoint presentations have been circulated separately.

The Head of Scientific Cooperation and Assistance (SCA), Hubert Deluyker, presented the structure and activities of the Directorate to which the DATEX Unit belongs. He also pointed to the fundamental importance for participants to complete the EFSA declaration of interest (DOI). It was stated that interest is part of participants' expertise. Potential conflict of interest can arise and will be identified on a *case-by-case* basis to ensure impartiality of activities.

6. Presentation of new IT tool for DOIs and Expert Database

Ernesto Guisado (IT project manager) provided an in-depth description of the annual declaration of interest. Experts are given a username and password to give access to the DOI page. He also presented the Expert Database. The same entry details can be used to access the Expert Database.

7. Food description and classification

Francesco Vernazza emphasized the importance of establishing an EFSA classification system. Matthias Frost presented the two systems currently used in Germany. Efforts are made to create a unique compatible system in the near future. A facet system is being developed.

The chairman stated that EFSA management is pushing to create an EFSA system that can be universally applied, and announced that a working group will be created with representatives from all relevant sectors.

The Expert Group for Chemical Occurrence Data supported the development of a European food description system. In particular:

- the need for a ‘new fashion’ classification system was acknowledged, that could possibly be very flexible and open. The GS1 standard system used by industry was mentioned, more information is needed and possible collaboration could be organised.
- an interest was expressed in a system with multiple levels with respect to the details. The system should be compatible with the data collected within dietary surveys and easily usable in laboratories of analysis. Food fortification should be taken into account.
- some participants found it to be very useful to have a unique identifier for foods but others expressed concerns about it.
- hope was expressed that a new classification system could integrate information on food and recipes (e.g. aggregate items). The EPIC-soft system could indeed be very useful in this direction. Sharing this view it was nevertheless pointed out that in some classification systems food grouping was a huge problem.
- Finally the need for a simple codification system was highlighted since a complicated system will increase the amount of resources needed to analyse food and feed.

8. Data structure

Stefano Cappé and Chiara Bianchi (Infrastructure, EFSA) presented and described a coherent framework for data structure and storage

Matthias Frost expressed interest in this project and proposed to liaise with current similar activities initiated in Germany.

9. On-going data collection activities

Davide Arcella presented an exhaustive list of activities on occurrence data currently ongoing in the DATEX Unit. Pietro Ferrari illustrated some statistical considerations in relation to dietary exposure assessment of chemical compounds.

10. Future activities

The chairman gave a quick overview of future topics to be covered by the Expert Group.