

PESTICIDE UNIT

**Network on Pesticide Monitoring
Minutes of the 10th meeting
Held on 16-17 October 2013, Parma
(Agreed on 27 11 2013)**

Participants

- **Network Representatives of Member States:**

Country	Name	Country	Name
Austria	Roland Grossgut	Italy	Roberta Aloï
Belgium	Jean-François Schmit	Latvia	Guntis Cepurnieks
Bulgaria	Lyubina Donkova	Lithuania	Vytautas Tamošiūnas
Croatia	Anamarija Bokulić	Luxembourg	Fabienne Clabots
Cyprus	Agathi Anastasi	Malta	Charles Tanti
Czech Republic	Jana Kachynova	Netherlands	Henk Van der Schee
Denmark	Jens Hinge Andersen	Poland	Bożena Morzycka
Estonia	Eve Rehelem	Portugal	Maria João Lino
Finland	Tomi Kekki	Romania	Oana Stroie
France	Laurence Delaire	Slovakia	Mária Matušová
France	Benoît Ginestet	Slovakia	Jarmila Durcanska
Germany	Anne Katrin Pietrzyk	Slovenia	Aleksandra Jug
Greece	Komninos Stougiannidis	Spain	Alicia Yagüe Martín
Hungary	István Buzás	Sweden	Anders Jansson
Ireland	John Acton		

- **Hearing Experts**
 - Liesbeth Bruckers from Hasselt University, Belgium (for item 5.7)
- **European Commission representatives:**
 - Almut Bitterhof (DG SANCO - Unit E3) (via phone)
 - Veerle Vanheusden (DG SANCO - Unit E3) (via phone)
- **EFSA:**
 - Pesticide Unit (Daniela Brocca (chair), Hermine Reich and Paula Medina)
 - Dietary and Chemical Monitoring Unit (Giuseppe Antonio Triacchini)
 - Scientific Assessment Support Unit (José Cortinas Abrahantes and Jane Richardson) (agenda item 5.7)

- **Others**

- Katrín Guðjónsdóttir (Iceland)
- Lise Gunn Skretteberg and Birgitte Lyrån (Norway)
- Lidija Damevska (The former Yugoslav Republic of Macedonia)
- Miljana Pavličić (Montenegro)

1. Welcome and apologies for absence

The Chair welcomed the participants.

Apologies were received from United Kingdom for not attending the meeting.

Further apologies were received from Commission (COM) colleagues; a phone conference was arranged for the afternoon section of the first day of the meeting to allow two Commission representatives to participate in the discussion covering selected agenda points (items 5.4 - 5.6).

2. Adoption of agenda

The agenda was adopted without changes. Under agenda item 6 (AOB) the Networking Group (NG) asked the COM to provide with an update of the BAC/QAC data collection and with a clarification on the MRLs in place for phosphine/phosphides.

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 the networking meetings and their alternates have been invited to complete and submit an Annual Declaration of interest (ADoI).

EFSA screened the ADoI 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. No Oral Declaration of interest was made at the beginning of this meeting.

4. Agreement of the minutes of the 9th meeting of the Network on Pesticide Monitoring held on 10-11 April 2013, Parma.

EFSA informed that the minutes of the previous meeting were agreed by written procedure on 10 May 2013 and published on the EFSA website 15 May 2013. No additional comments on the minutes were put forward by the NG at this meeting.

5. Topics for discussion

5.1. Review and amendment of the Standard Sample Description (SSD) controlled terminologies to report the 2013 pesticide monitoring data

Compared to the previous data collection season, EFSA acknowledged that fewer results were reported as "not in list" for raw, unprocessed food samples. Wherever this was done, EFSA was often capable to propose a recoding of these results – in

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

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

particular – considering the crop varieties reported in the TAX-SA project listing. EFSA also recognised the need to allocate a few, new PARAM codes for a number of substances reported as “not in list”. After the NG meeting, EFSA will liaise directly with the national data providers to confirm the acceptability of the recoding proposed by EFSA and/or for the need for the allocation of the new PARAM codes in the SSD catalogue.

Besides the recoding proposed by EFSA, Member States (MS) suggested adding a new code for the reporting of the results of “sum of BACs (sum of 10 + 12 + 14 + 16 and 18)”. A MS stated the difficulties of reporting the result of phoshide as this substance is present in two distinct MRL residue definitions in EU legislation: ‘hydrogen phosphide’ and ‘phosphines and phosphides’. Commission was invited to follow up on this issue. Other MS expressed the difficulties in understanding under which residue definition the results of demeton-O-methyl needs to be reported.

5.2. Annual review of the EFSA Guidance Document on the use of SSD for the pesticide monitoring data submission

A few proposals for the annual revision of the Guidance Document (GD) on the use of the SSD for the pesticide monitoring were received in advance of the meeting. During the meeting additional, minor amendments were discussed and agreed among the members of the NG.

A Member State expressed the wish to modify the description of the SSD data elements reported in Table 1 of the Guidance Document (GD) on the use of the SSD for the pesticide monitoring (data element L.02 “labAccred” and R.12 “accredProc”). If - after consulting with EFSA colleagues dealing with other food domains data collections - this change will not be possible, a footnote will be added in the GD with further explanation on the meaning of the data element R.12.

The GD paragraph concerning the correction of the analytical results for recoveries will be reworded so it will be stated that results for which the analytical recoveries fall outside the range of 70 % – 120 % will be accepted, providing that additional information on the recovery percentage will also be returned.

It was agreed to change the header of Column G of the Validation Report from ‘Method Status’ to ‘Determination Status’.

Upon a request of a MS, two examples on how to report the control results on fresh and dried herbs will be included under the paragraph ‘Product treatment (S.17)’ of the revised version of the GD.

The NG also proposed to make reference in the GD to the change of the pesticide MRL food classification, which was introduced in April 2013 with the enter into force of Regulation (EU) No 212/2013 repealing Regulation (EC) No 800/2010.

Finally, the NG also agreed that results concerning the baby food analysis should be reported as if the pesticide residues were measured in the reconstituted sample according to the manufacture instructions.

5.3.2012 Pesticide monitoring data collection: EFSA and MS feedback

EFSA gave a presentation on the 2012 data collection, which formally was closed on 31/08/2013. EFSA thanked the MS who respected the data collection deadline. Compared to the previous data reporting season, an improvement with regard the date of data submission was observed. Nevertheless, the validation of the 2012 pesticide monitoring data is till ongoing. It appears that the error rates noticed on the 2012 data sets so far received and validated in EFSA has decreased.

On the basis of the experience gained in the last data collection seasons, MS requested some changes to the Validation Report. EFSA will investigate the possible

implementation of the MS proposals, taking into account the limitation imposed by the structure and layout of the report and the limited time resources available in EFSA.

5.4. News from the Commission/EURLs (e.g. timeframe concerning the new monitoring Regulation)

Commission informed that in the next SCoFCAH meeting (18-19 of November 2013), the draft 2015-2017 EUCP Regulation will be presented to all MS delegations.

EFSA informed COM of the different approaches used by MS when reporting to EFSA baby food results and the challenges for EFSA to evaluate this information. COM communicated that in the new Regulation (EC) No 609/2013 the pesticide residue definitions that will need to be followed when analysing baby food will be the one in Regulation (EC) No 396/2005.

A MS requested the COM to provide an update on BAC/QACs data collection and MRL setting. COM informed that EFSA already published a report on this issue and that due to the fact that it is not possible to set specific MRLs on the basis of the monitoring data received, a provisional and achievable legal limit is set to 0.1 mg/kg. A new mandate will be sent to EFSA to conduct risk assessment on the proposed default MRL.

Upon request to a MS, COM informed that the issue on the existence of two residue legal definitions – both including phoshydres - will be raised in the next SCoFCAH meeting.

A MS suggested to COM the possibility to amend the DG SANCO MRL database by adding food items codes. COM informed that currently the revision of the structure of the MRL database has no higher priority.

5.5. EFSA recommendations to MS in the Annual Reports on Pesticide Residues

EFSA briefly presented the meeting participants with the recommendations for the MS put forward in the 2011 EU Annual Report on Pesticide Residues. In particular, it was highlighted that the information concerning the country of origin of the samples analysed is becoming very valuable information for policy making. EFSA suggested putting more effort in reporting this information, when available. A MS explained that sometimes retrieving this information is very difficult because of e.g. sample mislabelling or because of food marketed as composite.

5.6. Assessment of the consumer's risk to pesticide residues: what is exposure and its assessment, chronic vs. acute exposure, single substance vs. multiple residues exposure, pre-authorisation vs. monitoring exposure

As a request from a MS in previous NG meeting, EFSA gave a presentation on the risk assessment conducted in the framework of the Annual Report preparation and/or in the context of the MRL setting.

EFSA also informed that in the near future a revised version of the PRiMo model will be available to estimate potential consumer's risk to pesticide residues; this model will be presented at the next SCoFCAH meeting (November 2013). After this, public consultation will be launched and probably further refinements to the model will be needed.

5.7. EFSA mandate on monitoring data representativeness and review of the EU-coordinated control programmes design: objectives and timeline.

The Commission sent a mandate to EFSA on the monitoring data representativeness and on the review of the EU-coordinated control programmes design. The project has been outsourced and the contractor explained to the meeting participants the project

objectives and timeline. The contractor used this opportunity to retrieve information on the criteria applied by MS in designing their national control programmes.

5.8. Agreements

No formal agreements were sought at the meeting. EFSA agreed to distribute the revised version of the Guidance Document on the use of the SSD after the meeting and to contact the single MS for the confirmation of the need to allocate new SSD codes (see point 5.1) and on the codes proposed by EFSA for the “not in list” entries.

6. Any Other Business

6.1. SSD2: update on the pilot project for possible future implementation

EFSA informed MS of the launching of a procurement project to test the potential future collection of the pesticide monitoring data using the SSD2 data model. EFSA asked MS their intention to apply for this call for procurement.

Due to the fact that this tender was published overlapping with the tender for contaminant data collection, MS were not clear if the participation to one tender would be a criterion for excluding the participation to the other call for tender. EFSA informed MS that they could apply to both tenders independently.

Many MS expressed their interests in the participation to the SSD2 pilot project; however, concerns on the short deadline for the offer submission was expressed by the majority of the MS. As a result, the meeting participants requested a possible extension of the deadline for the offer submission. EFSA informed that will check if an extension of the deadline will be possible; if this will be the case, then it was anticipated that the possible extension of the deadline would only be informed during the week of the 4th of November.

6.2. Draft Regulation 2013/0140 (COD) on official controls and other official activities performed to ensure the application of food and feed law, rules on animal health and welfare, plant health, plant reproductive material, plant protection products and its implications on pesticide residues monitoring

EFSA informed the meeting participants that a draft for a new framework Regulation on food control activities is under discussion at the Council level. This new piece of legislation will cover different food area domains, including the pesticide residue area. The main objective of this Regulation is to review Regulation (EC) No 882/2004 on official controls performed to ensure the verification of compliance with feed and food law, animal health and animal welfare rules. EFSA informed that was not involved in the drafting of this piece of legislation. Almost the totality of the MS attending the meeting was not aware of the new draft Regulation. It appears that in the new draft Regulation the deadline for MS to submit the monitoring data will be anticipated to the 30th of June each year and that some articles of Regulation (EC) No 396/2005 covering the pesticide residues control activities will be impacted by the new legislation (e.g. the accreditation status of the analytical determinations reported and screening methods). EFSA suggested the MS to liaise with their national colleagues if they wish to provide their inputs on the draft document.

6.3. New Regulation (EC) No 609/2013 on food intended for infants and young children

EFSA informed MS that baby food Directives are being reviewed by DG SANCO (Unit E4) and that it is expected a new legislation coming into force in 2014. For the time being, only a new framework baby food regulation has been adopted (Regulation (EC) No 609/2013); this regulation will be accompanied by delegated acts, in which specific implementing measures and requirements will be detailed reported.

6.4. Checking MRL compliance for complex residue definitions

EFSA explained the approach used by EFSA when MRLs are proposed to the COM in case of complex residue definitions. Whenever the residue levels for individual substance of a complex residue definition are all below the single LOQs, EFSA adds up the LOQs values for the sum. The MRL of a summed residue definition, which is marked with an asterisk in the MRL legislation, refers to the sum of LOQs of all the substances that contribute to the residue definition.

EFSA asked MS if this approach was followed when checking for MRL compliance. The MS informed that the sample compliance with LOQ MRLs for complex residue definitions is always not checked in line with the EFSA approach. Some MS suggested different alternatives for checking such compliances, e.g. the use of the statistical parameters $Cc\alpha$ and $Cc\beta$, or using the lower LOQ among all the single LOQs for the individual substances. The meeting recognised that further discussion on this topic would be needed.

7. Next meeting(s)

Two meetings will be held next year:

- 19 – 20 March 2014 in Parma
- 15 – 16 October 2014 in Parma