Network on Pesticide Monitoring
Minutes of the 16th meeting

Held on 3rd of May 2017, Parma
(Agreed by written procedures on 30 June 2017)

Participants

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

Country	Name
Austria	GROSSGUT ROLAND
Belgium	SCHMIT JEAN-FRANCOIS
Bulgaria	BOGOEVA IRENA
Cyprus	CHRISTODOULOU DESPO LOUCA
Croatia	DEZDJEK BOZENA
Czech Republic	STEPAN RADIM
Denmark	BJORN PETERSEN PERNILLE
Denmark	ANDERSEN JENS
Estonia	PADUR KADI
Finland	RANTA KADI
France	DELAIRE LAURENCE
France	OCHEM ANNA
Germany	PIETRZYK ANNE KATRIN
Greece	GASPARI MARIA
Hungary	BUZAS ISTVAN
Ireland	O'DEA EILEEN
Italy	ALOI ROBERTA
Latvia	CIEKURE ELINA
Lithuania	VAICIUNAS VIRGINIJUS
Luxembourg	CLABOTS FABIENNE
Netherlands	VAN DER SCHEE HENK
Poland	STARSKI ANDRZEJ
Portugal	LINO MARIA JOAO
Romania	STROIE OANA
Slovakia	DURCANSKA JARMILA
Slovakia	PIGOSOVA PETRONELA
Slovenia	MARKELJ MARJAN
Slovenia	RUCNA ANA
Spain	YAGUE MARTIN ALICIA
Sweden	JANSSON ANDERS
Sweden	FOHGELBERG PETRA

United Kingdom	COOKE HELENA
Iceland	JONSDOTTIR INGIBJORG
Norway	BOLLI RANDI IREN
Norway	BRATTERUD PER
Norway	GRAN HANNE MARIT

- **Observer Experts from non EU countries: Pre-accession or Potential Countries:**

Country	**Name**[1]
Albania	VLADI VJOLLCA
Bosnia and Herzegovina	ZOVKO IVANA
Montenegro	BOSKOVIC ANDREJA
Macedonia	DRNDAR SLADA
Serbia	MATIJEVIC LIDIJA
Turkey	BOSTAN AHMET

- **EFSA:**

Pesticide Unit:

Hermine Reich (Senior Scientific Officer, team leader)

Daniela Brocca (Scientific Officer, chair)

Paula Medina (Scientific Officer)

Alexandre Nougadere (Scientific Officer)

Evidence Management Unit:

Giuseppe Triacchini (Scientific Officer)

Doreen Dolores Russel (Scientific Officer) only for agenda item 4.8.

1. Welcome and apologies for absence

The Chair welcomed the participants.

Apologies were received from SHIRLEY MIFSUD (Malta) and ANASTASSIADES MICHELANGELO (EURL on pesticide residues).

2. Adoption of agenda

The agenda was adopted without changes.

3. Agreement of the minutes of the 15th meeting of the Network on Pesticide Monitoring held on 12-13 October 2016, Parma

The minutes were agreed by written procedure on 01 December 2016 and published on the EFSA website and published on the EFSA website the following day. No additional comments were received after the minutes' publication or during the present meeting.

4. Topics for discussion

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

4.1. 2015 pesticide monitoring data collection: outcome of the national experts' satisfaction survey

In October 2016 EFSA has launched an anonymous on-line survey among the pesticide monitoring data providers; the objective of the survey was to collect feedback and suggestions for the improvement of the future pesticide monitoring data collections. The survey covered the following aspects of the data collection: from the clarity of the text of Business/Validation rules, the completeness and usefulness of e.g. the EFSA Guidance on the use of the SSD for the pesticide monitoring data collections, the extent of the use and the structure of the MatrixTool, the personal support provided by EFSA in the course of the data reporting season. The survey results were analysed in December 2016; the number of the survey participants amounted to 15. Overall, positive qualitative scorings were received by the survey's respondents and useful additional free text comments were also received. According to the survey replies:

- the national data providers/experts are very satisfied with the personal support provided by EFSA during the reporting season;
- the MatrixTool is considered a useful supporting tool, becoming more and more necessary;
- the SSD catalogues are assessed as easy to be used and understood and
- the EFSA Guidance document on the use of the SSD was recognised to be complete and the sample/pesticide coding examples provided are valuable.

However, EFSA took note that the textual description of the validation error/warning messages could be enhanced, that the Data Collection Framework (DCF) platform for the data loading sometime resulted too slow for some large data transmissions and that in 2016 the Guidance Document on the use of the SSD and other supporting tools (e.g. the MatrixTool) were distributed by EFSA too late with respect to the time schedule of the reporting season. Finally, the national experts, who were new in their role as data providers, recognised that the data collection is complex and time is needed to get accustomed with the data coding, data transmission and with the use of the supporting tool. The personal support provided by EFSA was considered essential to manage the correct data coding/transmission within the deadline. EFSA thanked the national experts for their contributions; during the meeting no additional comments were provided on the topics covered by the survey. The feedback received will be considered by EFSA to further improve the future data collections.

4.2. The 2015 EU report on pesticide residues: main results and recommendations

EFSA presented the main results reported in the 2015 EU Report on Pesticide Residues in food and feed, which was published on the 11th of April 2017. Overall, in 2015 more than 80,000 food samples were tested for pesticide residues (744 different pesticides) and the number of single analytical determinations accounted to around 20 million. The main results of the 2015 pesticide control activities were comparable to those of the previous control year, in terms of percentages of both quantifiable residues and MRL breaches.

For the majority of the samples, the acute exposure was found to be negligible or within a range that is unlikely to pose a consumer health concern. For 244

samples of 16,197 samples screened, exposure exceeded ARfD. Most frequent cases of exceedance related to chlorpyrifos in bananas, table grapes, peppers, broccoli and aubergine, imazalil and acrinathrin in bananas, ethephon in table grapes and peppers and lambda-cyhalothrin in table grapes and peppers. Given the conservative method applied, real exposure was expected to be significantly lower. No exceedance of ARfD was identified for orange juice, peas, olive oil, butter or eggs. The probability of EU citizens being exposed to levels that could lead to negative health outcomes was found low, except for a limited number of samples.

Except for one substance, no chronic risk were identified for the residues of the pesticides included in the 2015 EU-coordinated programme; the ADI for dichlorvos was exceeded only under the most conservative scenario; dichlorvos residues were only found in 0.02% of the 66,640 samples. Exceedance of ADI mainly driven by relatively high LOQ that led to a high uncertainty related to the exposure assessment. Dichlorvos no longer approved in the EU and found only sporadically in imported food. However, for bromide ion, fenamidone, hexachlorobenzene (HCB), HCH-alpha, HCH-beta and propargite, no long-term dietary risk assessment could be performed, as there are no internationally agreed toxicological reference values available for these compounds.

Beside the main results reported in the 2015 EU Report on Pesticide Residues, EFSA highlighted the main recommendations and specific conclusions put forward in the same report, in particular:

- EFSA proposes that the exact date of the sampling should be provided by MS, in order to allow a direct comparison of the reported residue concentrations with the MRLs applicable at the day of sampling.
- EFSA suggests collecting a list of scientifically valid Processing Factors (PF) at the beginning of the reporting reference period for the processed products/pesticides covered by the EUCP, to decide whether the residue level(s) measured in processed products are compliant with the MRLs in place, and to refine exposure assessment.
- EFSA notes that further guidance is needed on the reporting of analytical results, e.g. to provide details for unquantified results (<LOD or “traces” between LOD and LOQ) in order to refine exposure assessment.

Finally, EFSA explained the Network the reasons for having recommended the inclusions (or increased control) of some pesticides and/or food in the next control programmes:

- Pesticide for which MRLs exceedances or relatively high quantification rate were reported;
- Pesticides that show high persistence in soils (DT90 greater than 100 days in field studies);
- New pesticides for which MRLs have been recently set by Codex Alimentarius or at EU level;
- Pesticides that are used for mosquito vector control against Zika virus with only limited official controls in the EU;

- Foods samples for which high MRL exceedances were reported or considering the diversity of quantified pesticides, e.g. table olives, teas, tropical fruits, fresh herbs, spring onions, berries, chards, Chinese cabbages, celeries, kale, fennels, peas with pods, limes, lentils, celeriac, cherries, grapefruit and fungi;
- Pesticide residues applied to crops foraged by bees, such as thiacloprid (25% samples analysed);
- Glyphosate and related residues (e.g. trimethyl-sulfonium) in products for which the use of glyphosate is approved and where measurable residues are expected. In particular, the number of samples of soybeans, maize and oilseed rape should be increased.

The Network welcomed the EFSA proposal to include in the future Guidance documents on the use of the SSD for the pesticide monitoring data collection a list of PF for the at least the combinations food item/pesticide covered by the EU-coordinated control programmes. Preferably the processing factors should be provided at the beginning of the reference year to avoid that different values are used for enforcement at national level.

The Network did not object the EFSA proposal to report the sampling date in the framework of the future data collections as this piece of information is available in the data capture systems e.g. of the national laboratories. EFSA also proposed to request reporting of the MRL for unprocessed products in cases where the MRL has changed during the calendar year.

Finally, the Network's members explained the reasons why the results of the reinforced border control food analysis (generated in the framework of Regulation (EC) No 669/2009) are not consistently reported to EFSA. Some experts indicated that these results are only transmitted to the EU Commission as they are covered by another legal framework than Regulation (EC) No 396/2005.

EFSA will consult the Commission in order to decide if in the future EU Reports on Pesticide Residues the 669/2009 results should be reported. The Member States will explore the possibility to report the results to EFSA. Overall, the participants were in favour to report detailed results of import controls in the future reports. However, it must be ensured that the data submitted to EFSA are representative for the border inspections and are consistent with the information provided to SANTE directly.

4.3. **Are LOD available and detailed unquantifiable results reportable for the next monitoring programmes?**

The national monitoring data are reported on annual basis to EFSA according to the directions provided in the EFSA Guidance on the use of the SSD. Until the 2015 pesticide monitoring data collection, the reporting of the details for unquantified results (results below the Limit of Quantification – LOQ) was not requested (when done, this piece of information was reported only on a voluntarily basis).

In order for EFSA to perform better descriptive statistics in line with International and EU approaches (e.g. from Codex Alimentarius) and to refine

the dietary exposure assessment (e.g. in the frame of the Cumulative Risk Assessment), in the future data collections it would be necessary that the reporting countries will also provide the resLOD (Limit of Detection) and would flag the analytical samples 'free of detectable residues'. In particular, EFSA proposed to the Network one possible option for flagging the analytical results for which no chromatographic signals are registered by using the resType LOD.

Currently, only eight countries are reporting the LOD values; from the reported values, it appears that on average the ratio between LOQ and LOD is 2.65. One member of the Network referred that with the modern analytical technique all the laboratories should be able to quantify the LOD values. However, the Network members informed that this piece of information is not always kept in the laboratories data systems. One country representative questioned the EFSA proposal to report the 'undetectable results' by using the resType=LOD; this because a results flagged as 'LOD' would have another meaning according to the data quality standards assessed e.g. by inspector/accreditation bodies. Finally, the Network recognised that if in the Commission 'AQC Guidance document' the LOD is not defined nor provisions are given on its validation, there is not sufficient legal basis for the reporting of the LOD values; as a result, official and private laboratories would not record/report the LOD. The Network concluded that - at the moment - no agreement can be reached on the EFSA proposal to report on a regular basis the LOD values. Additional options should be considered on how to identify and flag the samples as 'free of detectable residues'.

4.4. Update on the project on Cumulative Risk Assessment of pesticide residues

EFSA presented an update on the EFSA on-going activities related to the Cumulative Risk Assessment (CRA) projects. The Network was informed that in the future CRA will be performed also at national level, not only for some projects within EFSA.

EFSA reiterated that if LOD values would be reported – or if the samples are free of detectable residues' could be clearly identified - this would allow to perform more accurate CRA; differently, CRA could results in a large overestimation of the consumer' dietary exposure without the possibility to clearly identify potential risk management options. If in the near future no information on LOD values will be available, also the national competent authorities will face the same CRA issues already anticipated by EFSA.

The PowerPoint presentation on the CRA could not be physically distributed among the meeting attendees as the preliminary results of the CRA are not yet official or publicly available.

4.5. 2016 pesticide monitoring data collection: guidance document, tools, technical changes introduced and status

EFSA informed the Network that except the 2016 MRL compilation all documents and supporting EFSA tools needed for the 2016 national data results coding and transmission are available for download on the EFSA DMS. For the 2016 pesticide monitoring data collection a new functional mailbox has been

specifically created and can be used for any information and clarification that may be needed by the national data providers: data.MOPER@efsa.europa.eu. EFSA invited the Network to communicate the new functional mail address to all the concerned national colleagues. Thus, should the data providers/managers need to get in contact with EFSA on any issue related to the 2016 pesticide monitoring data collection, the use of the above indicated mail address is strongly recommended (please put also in copy also Giuseppe Triacchini: giuseppe.triacchini@efsa.europa.eu).

EFSA informed that the 2016 pesticide monitoring data collection will open on 15 May 2017 and the legal deadline remains unchanged: 31/08/2017.

4.6. **2014 and 2015 pesticide monitoring results: EFSA online dashboard**

EFSA notified the Network that the results of the 2014 and 2015 pesticide residue monitoring are available on the new EFSA Pesticide Residues Dashboard: https://dwh.efsa.europa.eu/bi/asp/Main.aspx?rwtrep=703

The dashboard is accessible by any user, no credentials are necessary to view it. EFSA invited all the Network experts to access it and provide their feedback on the layout and the results presented; the feedback can be sent to: daniela.brocca@efsa.europa.eu

4.7. **Hands-on training on the correct SSD coding of food samples and their results**

The Network members participated to a practical exercise, in which they were presented with some real food samples and were asked to identify the correct SSD codes to describe the samples according to the SSD requirements.

The food items selected for this exercise concerned food commodities for which recurrent coding errors have been identified during the data validation step in the frame of past data collections, e.g. baby food, spices, cereal bran, fresh herbs and pulses.

The practical exercise was appreciated and the Network agreed to carry out in the course of the future Network meetings similar hands-on training for the correct SSD coding of e.g. the pesticide residue definitions and related analytical results.

4.8. **Reporting back from the meeting of the Veterinary Drug Residues Network**

EFSA informed the Network on the outcomes of the 2nd meeting of the Veterinary Drug Residue (VMPR) Network, which was held in Parma on 14-16 February 2017.

During the above meeting the reporting countries reported-back on their experiences of the 2016 pilot data collection on VMPR, the schedule for the test phase before it becomes mandatory to report VMPR data in 2018 and updates the guidelines. The second part of the meeting was dedicated to training on data submission, including Business Rules and the data controlled terminology for the

VMPR data collections. The main part of the training concentrated on a mapping tool developed by EFSA to compile VMPR dataset, to create an xml file and upload the file to the DCF. The mapping tool and data upload was also tested by participants who were provided with assistance on understanding/interpretation of DCF error messages.

After the 2nd VMPR Network meeting, EFSA refined the mapping tool to address some issues identified in the hands-on training and opened the pilot data collection on VMPR; in case of need and upon request, EFSA will offer additional training to any VMPR reporting country requesting assistance.

The next meeting of the VMPR Network will be held in Parma in October 2017; there will be a joint session of the VMPR and Pesticide Monitoring Networks organised in order to discuss topics common to both food residue domain data collections.

4.9. SSD2 data model for the pesticide monitoring data collection: proof of concept (pilot outcome and perspectives for implementation)

This agenda item was presented and thoroughly discussed during the second day of the meeting, during the common session of the Networks on Chemical Occurrence and Pesticide Monitoring (please, refer to the separate minutes).

5. Date for next meeting

5.1. Date and topics' suggestions for the next meetings

EFSA confirmed that the next meeting of the Network will be held in Parma on 11-12 October 2017. The meeting will be dedicated to the implementation at national level of the SSD version 2 (SSD2), in particular on the use and mapping of the food item codes from the MATRIX catalogue (SSD1 catalogue) to the FoodEx2 food coding system.

The 2017 October meeting of the Pesticide Monitoring Network will be organised back-to back with the 3rd Network meeting on Veterinary Drugs Residues Network. Thus, a common session of the two Networks will take place during one of the two days above indicated to enable a joint discussion on common topics for the data coding and data reporting in the two data collection domains. Detailed information on the logistic and agenda will follow.

For the future meetings, the Network suggested the following items:

- How the national pesticide residues control plans are organised in order to take into account both the national needs and the EU-coordinated control programme requirements.
- Summing-up the LOQs in case of the legal Complex Residue Definitions.
- Additional hand-on training on the identification of the correct SSD coding e.g. for the legal residue definitions specific for some food items.

6. Conclusions

7. Closure of the meeting