

Networks on Pesticide Monitoring (16th meeting) and Chemical Occurrence Data (11th meeting) Minutes of the common session of 4 May 2017

Held on 4 May 2017, Parma

(Agreed on 30 June 2017)

Participants

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

Country	Name
Austria	Roland Grossgut
Austria	Josef Wolf (via web-conference)
Belgium	Jean Francois Schmit
Belgium	Valerie Vromman
Bulgaria	Irena Bogoeva
Bulgaria	Emil Simeonov
Cyprus	Despo Louca Christodoulou
Croatia	Bozena Dezdjek
Croatia	Sandra Bašić
Czech Republic	Radim Stepan
Czech Republic	Irena Rehurkova
Denmark	Pernille Bjorn Petersen
Denmark	Jens Hinge Andersen
Estonia	Kadi Padur
Finland	Carola Ranta
Finland	Johanna Suomi
France	Anne Ochem
France	Laurence Delaire
France	Jean-Cédric Reninger
Germany	Anne Katrin Pietrzyk
Germany	Eva Scharfenberg
Germany	Michael Jud (via web-conference)
Greece	Maria Gaspari
Greece	Leonidas Palilis
Hungary	Istvan Buzas
Hungary	Kata Kerekes
Ireland	Eileen O'Dea

Italy	Roberta Aloï
Latvia	Elina Ciekure
Lithuania	Virginijus Vaiciunas
Lithuania	Agnietė Grušauskienė
Luxembourg	Fabienne Clabots
Netherlands	Henk Van Der Schee
Netherlands	Rob Theelen
Poland	Andrzej Starski
Portugal	Maria Joao Lino
Portugal	Maria Antónia Calhau
Romania	Oana Stroie
Slovakia	Jarmila Durcanska
Slovakia	Angela Světlikova
Slovenia	Ana Ručna
Slovenia	Marjan Markelj
Spain	Alicia Yague Martin
Spain	Victoria Marcos Suárez
Sweden	Anders Jansson
Sweden	David Foster
Sweden	Petra Fohgelberg
United Kingdom	Helena Cooke
United Kingdom	Adam Locker
Iceland	Ingibjorg Jonsdottir
Norway	Randi Iren Bolli
Norway	Inger Halle Skagen
Norway	Hanne Marit Gran
Norway	Per Bratterud

- **Observer Experts from non EU countries:**

Country	Name¹
Albania	Vjollca Vladi
Albania	Merjem Bushati
Bosnia and Herzegovina	Ivana Zovko
Montenegro	Andreja Boskovic
FYR of Macedonia	Slada Drndar
Serbia	Lidija Matijevic
Turkey	Ahmet Bostan

- **EFSA:**

Evidence Management (DATA) Unit: Francesco Vernazza (Chair), Doreen Dolores Russell (Scientific Secretary), Mary Gilson, Jane Richardson, Stefano Cappé, Alessandro Carletti, Giuseppe Triacchini, Davide Gibin (agenda item 4.8)

Pesticides Unit: Daniela Brocca (Assistant Chair), Paula Medina and Alexandre Nougadere

Legal and Assurance Services Unit: Luisa Venier (agenda item 4.6)

1. Welcome and apologies for absence

The Chair, Francesco Vernazza (DATA Unit) welcomed the participants and explained the purpose of the joint session between the two networks which is broadly to explore and discuss areas of common interest.

2. Adoption of agenda

The agenda was adopted without changes.

3. Agreement of the minutes of the meeting of the Network on Chemical Occurrence held on 18-19 October 2016, Parma

The minutes were agreed by written procedure on 19 December 2016 and published on the EFSA website on 20 December 2016.

4. Topics for discussion

4.1 a) Pilot project on the implementation of SSD2: outcome and roadmap for SSD1-SSD2 switch

Alessandro Carletti (DATA Unit) presented an overview of the pilot project for the implementation of the Standard Sample Description version 2 (SSD2). The purpose of the project was to test the updated model for data submission as well as to evaluate the data model's applicability to different data domains. For the Pesticide and Chemical contaminants data domains several countries participated in the project. The final deliverables of the project have now been published and the overall conclusion is that SSD2 is implementable with acceptable effort and without the lack of information compared to SSD1 data transmissions.

The main benefits for reporting countries and EFSA were outlined; in particular one of the major benefits is the availability of a unique data model allowing data providers to report data to EFSA from different data domains. Among the challenges, describing food with the high detail allowed by FoodEx2 requires more attention and additional efforts respect to a more generic description. The mapping between FoodEx2 terms for both raw commodities and primary derivatives thereof was embedded in FoodEx2 and this will provide support to the pesticide data reporting.

In light of the generally positive outcome of the project, the proposed implementation plan for phasing-in reporting in SSD2 for pesticides data was presented to the attendees:

- In 2017, the data from pesticide monitoring of the year 2016 will be reported in SSD1 format.
- In 2018, the data from pesticide monitoring of the year 2017 can be reported in SSD1 or SSD2 formats. SSD2 will be converted to SSD1 by EFSA.

- In 2019, the data from pesticide monitoring of the year 2018 can be reported in SSD2 and SSD1, but EFSA would like to encourage all data to be reported in SSD2.
- In 2020, data from pesticide monitoring of the year 2019 will be accepted by EFSA in SSD2 only.

To aid the realisation of the implementation plan, EFSA is offering a range of technical support including helpdesk assistance and training, if necessary, at country level. EFSA will provide all available supporting documents. EFSA will also consider extending to Pesticide Residues the Excel-based supporting tool developed for Veterinary Medicinal Product Residues (VMPPR).

4.1 b) Pilot project on the implementation of SSD2: correspondence of FoodEx2 with SSD1 for describing matrix and treatment

Central to reporting in SSD2 is the use of the food classification system FoodEx2. Francesco Vernazza explained how FoodEx2 with respect to the SSD1 enables more details about the food product to be described and reported, such as the possibility of reporting multiple product treatments, thus creating more complete descriptive codes.

An evaluation of the correspondence of the reported FoodEx2 codes in the SSD2 pilot project for pesticide residue data compared to the parallel results reported for the food matrix and treatment (SSD1) was conducted and the results shared with the participants. The speaker explained how the checks were performed and emphasized that FoodEx2 proved to be able to reproduce and improve the coding of pesticide samples done in SSD1. The evaluation also demonstrated that a FoodEx2 code can effectively be automatically transformed to the corresponding SSD1 coding. Since FoodEx2 allows reporting several treatments while SSD1 allows only one treatment descriptor, specific guidance shall be given by the Pesticide Unit on the priority of treatments for Pesticide data when converting SSD2 data to SSD1 format, in particular for primary derivatives of raw commodities.

4.2 Open discussion about proposed roadmap

In view of the timeline proposed by EFSA for implementing SSD2, the opinion of the participants was sought. In relation to FoodEx2, Croatia acknowledged the need of a learning phase at the early stages of use but that the advantages of the new system prevail. In their opinion it is a very good system and the new version and browser is much improved; therefore, they recommend the use of FoodEx2.

The Netherlands shared their experiences of converting FoodEx1/MATRIX to FoodEx2, highlighting in particular, that not all food items may be correctly coded with an automatic system. EFSA confirmed that the experience gathered so far suggests that automatic FoodEx2 coding may be more reliable in case of raw commodities, but appears quite problematic in case of derivatives or composite food.

Sweden asked if it would be possible to report chemical occurrence data in SSD2 in 2017; EFSA confirmed that it is possible but all data from the same data

provider should be transmitted in the same data format (SSD1 or SSD2). Slovenia asked if SSD2 would be used to collect data on VMPP; EFSA confirmed that as VMPP sample based data collection is a new data collection at EFSA, it is already established in SSD2. All countries will report SSD2 in a test phase this year. Ireland supported the adoption of SSD2 for all domains but cautioned that some challenges remain for FoodEx2 as the automatic conversion was not completely reliable thus necessitating some manual coding. To address this issue some statistics on the frequency of use of facets and facet descriptors for base terms (e.g. for meat samples) in a specific sequence would assist with the coding. Ireland highlighted the need to be able to capture this information electronically at sampling stage, and also requested an Excel tool for SSD2 to enable the creation of the xml file to submit data to EFSA. EFSA advised that such a tool is currently not available for pesticides; EFSA is considering the possibility to adapt the VMPP tool, as well as other alternatives (e.g. in the context of the pilot Framework Partnership Agreement with Member States).

Poland asked about the applicability of SSD2 for other data domains such as food contact materials, GMO (Genetically Modified Organisms) and microbiological data. EFSA confirmed that to date the data collections of contaminants and additive occurrence in food and feed, pesticide residues, veterinary medicinal product residues, and in principle all chemical occurrence analyses will be accommodated in SSD2. In the microbiological area, epidemiological data for molecular typing data and TSE-BSE prevalence are in SSD2 format. In addition, for microbiological data there is a pilot in place for sample-based reporting; Austria requested information about converting SSD1 data to SSD2. EFSA confirmed that all fields in SSD1 are also present in SSD2 (some of them are integrated in the FoodEx2 code). Denmark suggested the possibility to add new SSD fields in order to, for example, flag the results for which the pesticide residue MRL is directly applicable (without processing factor). The Danish proposals may need to be considered and discussed by the Network before any change to SSD2 is made.

Regarding the acceptability of the SSD2 implementation plan, a tour de table took place to elicit the opinions of the networks. The outcome of the feedback is given below.

Country	Date for using SSD2 and/or agreement with implementation plan	Interest in Training	Further comments
Austria	2019 (parallel use with SSD1)		Would like consistency for reporting in all chemical domains. Will need support in the area of pesticides, but need to examine proposal more closely before deciding on the support proposed by EFSA.

Country	Date for using SSD2 and/or agreement with implementation plan	Interest in Training	Further comments
Belgium	2019 (parallel use with SSD1)		Requested development of the supporting Excel tool for XML generation also for the pesticide food area.
Bulgaria	Broadly agree with the implementation plan	Yes	Need to check with national colleagues about training needed at national level
Croatia	Agree with implementation plan	Yes	Already participated in the pilot project for SSD2 implementation
Cyprus	2020	Yes	Already successfully participated in the pilot project
Denmark	Agree with implementation plan	Yes	Already successfully participated in the pilot project
Estonia	Agree with implementation plan	Yes	No challenges envisaged.
Finland	Agree with implementation plan	Yes	Discussion about training needed at national level
France	Agree with implementation plan		Not ready to submit 2016 data in SSD2 for chemical occurrence but may be ready next year. France is already ready for the pesticide data domain and can supply some tools for FoodEx2 coding (in French language) and can help MSs to implement FoodEx2.
Germany	Agree with implementation plan		

Country	Date for using SSD2 and/or agreement with implementation plan	Interest in Training	Further comments
Greece	Agree with implementation plan		Training needs have to be discussed with all parties involved
Hungary	Agree with implementation plan	Yes	Would be interested in an Excel tool to support SSD2
Iceland	Agree with implementation plan	Yes	Tool for SSD2 needed and support the idea of online training for environmental reasons
Ireland	At the meeting cannot commit due to limited resources		SSD2 supported and welcomed, but if it will be 'institutionalised' e.g. in EU legislation such as in the pesticide monitoring EU-coordinated control programme regulations or in the future in devolved acts implementing the new 882 Regulation on official controls). This would strengthen acceptance at higher level managers
Italy	Agree with implementation plan	Yes	Tool would be useful; will check with the laboratory for training needs
Latvia	Agree with implementation plan	Yes	Training with Lithuania would be useful
Lithuania	Agree with implementation plan	Yes	Training with Latvia is deemed useful

Country	Date for using SSD2 and/or agreement with implementation plan	Interest in Training	Further comments
Luxembourg	Agree with implementation plan		Would like all the documents beforehand and is interested in the FoodEx2 tool developed by France.
Norway	At the meeting cannot commit, as decision would need to be taken at a higher level	Yes	Require all tools and support offered. The FoodEx2 implementation is ambitious, but acceptable.
Poland	Agree with implementation plan		Support with FoodEx2 needed.
Portugal	Agree with implementation plan		Need to solve some internal issues. The 2019 data may be reported in SSD2.
Romania	Agree with implementation plan		Already participated in the pilot project for SSD2 implementation
Slovakia	Agree with implementation plan	Yes	Would like tools to support this commitment
Slovenia	Agree with implementation plan	Yes	Full SSD2 implementation will be possible in 2020 with 2019 data
Spain	Agree with implementation plan	No	The full SSD2 implementation will be possible in 2020 with the 2019 data
Sweden	Agree with implementation plan		Can provide data in SSD2 by 2018
The Netherlands	Agree with implementation plan		Helpdesk for questions support needed from EFSA. NL can share the tool developed to convert FoodEx1 to FoodEx2

Country	Date for using SSD2 and/or agreement with implementation plan	Interest in Training	Further comments
United Kingdom	At the meeting not able to commit as have no experience of SSD2		Resources are needed at national level to amend the data capture system currently in place. Before taking any decision, EFSA technical specifications on the SSD2 would be needed.
Albania	No date available	yes	Started a monitoring plan for 2017, limited to some food/pesticide analysis. No experience in SSD. A new data repository system will need to be created.
Bosnia	No date available	Yes	Use SSD1 from 2016 – need additional support for SSD2.
FYRM	No date available	Yes	Collect data from national programme. Would like training and expert support for both contaminants and pesticides
Montenegro	No date available	Yes	Collect data from national programme. Requested assistance from EFSA to implement SSD.
Serbia	No date available	Yes	Annual monitoring control already in place. Need support and help and have no experience of the data models.

Country	Date for using SSD2 and/or agreement with implementation plan	Interest in Training	Further comments
Turkey	No date available	Yes	Collect data from national programme. No experience in SSD. Need training and is thinking to adopt the model into their systems.

The Networks' members recognised the need and the benefit of having only one format for the data transmission in the different food domains data collections (SSD2); they also consider the most challenging step the improvement of food coding through FoodEx2. The Networks also appreciated the possibility for the parallel reporting in SSD1 and SSD2 for a transitional period.

A general consensus was expressed on the implementation of SSD2; EFSA support and training are considered a fundamental component for meeting the 2020 timetable; some members of the Pesticide Monitoring Network volunteered as potential trainers for the SSD2 (in particular the FoodEx2) implementation in other countries. In 2019, several countries can already transmit their 2018 pesticide monitoring data in SSD2 format. It was agreed to involve also Member States representatives at PAFF committees (e.g. Pesticide Residue section or a Horizontal PAFF committee section) for updating the legislation. EFSA's Advisory Forum will be kept informed. An email will be sent to the countries that could not reply or commit at the meeting.

Suggestions to enhance the SSD2 data model for use in the pesticide domain

Denmark shared information based on their experience on how to use SSD2 for pesticides, how to map the MATRIX codes to the FoodEx2 and the differences in reporting product treatment between SSD1 and SSD2. Their suggestion was to use FoodEx2 to report product treatment, to include a new field for programme type and that the field 'Conclusion' (created for VMPPR data collection) could be useful also for Pesticides.

Denmark confirmed the suggestion, already expressed in the previous tour-de-table of adding a new SSD field to flag results to which the pesticide residue MRL is directly applicable/applied (without processing factor).

4.3 EFSA Framework Partnership agreement (state of the art of the pilot and discussion of future perspective)

Stefano Cappè (EFSA) gave a presentation on the pilot 'Framework partnership agreement on data Quality' (FPA) with some Member States emphasising that over the years EFSA has invested a large amount of financial resources to supporting different initiatives related to data collections, e.g. support with SSD1 and electronic transmission implementation, support with FoodEx2 re-coding and

support with SSD2 implementation. This experience highlighted certain issues such as the limited duration of funding, fragmented data governance at national level across data domains, and the challenge for data providers to focus on data quality rather than on system implementation.

The FPA has the following objectives: to improve governance at national level concerning transmission of data to EFSA, to streamline co-ordination at national level, to enhance data quality and to investigate a model of long-term co-funding of data providers. The pilot FPA covers four data collection domains: chemical contaminants, pesticide residue monitoring, zoonoses and VMPP.

EFSA described to the networks the details of the FPA pilot projects – which run from March 2017 to June 2018). In particular, EFSA explained a project sub-objective of measuring data quality Key Performance Indicators (KPIs), which is considered one of the main tasks of the pilot project.

4.4 Public Access to Document (PAD) requests for data disclosure to third parties: update on developments

The key elements of the Public Access to Documents Regulation (PAD) were presented to the Networks. The Networks' views were sought in order to address consistently and efficiently public access requests received on datasets submitted by the Member States to EFSA in view of the increasing number of requests received at EFSA and the related impact on data providers. Aspects considered and discussed by the networks included a streamlining of the consultation process with data providers, the consideration of exceptions that could apply to disclosure and the relevant recent case law on PAD.

For the pesticide residues data, an outline of recent PAD case law developments was provided indicating that EFSA will release the data subject to a PAD request following the publication of the respective Annual Report on Pesticide Residues without consulting MS on further releases in the future.

4.5 Sharing and Publishing Scientific Data (Data DOI project and Knowledge Junction)

Jane Richardson (DATA Unit) presented an approach to sharing and publishing scientific data and stressed that open data should not unduly concern MSs (Member States). Open data is a key objective of the EFSA Strategy 2020. The EFSA Digital Object Identifier (DOI) project and its three work packages (WP2 is MSs monitoring data) was described to the meeting as was the EFSA data sharing community 'Knowledge Junction' (available on the Zenodo platform) and the EFSA Scientific Data Warehouse (SDWH).

The DOI project is motivated by FAIR Principles– Findable, Accessible, Interoperable and Reusable. There is an action evolving from WP2 of the DOI project which is to establish a working group (WG) and produce a technical report. One of the main advantages of the Zenodo platform is the stability of the link to access a document.

Ireland asked for some more information about Zenodo – explicitly how can a MS sign up and use the platform and whether it contains actual data. EFSA explained that Zenodo is available for anyone and is simple to use: all that is

needed is to create a community. Regarding the level of data the system enables the loading of large files but release of data can be discussed by the WG.

Norway asked about the legality of using Zenodo, a platform created by CERN. EFSA replied that it is used extensively by the European Commission but added there could be some risks regarding maintenance of the system; the latter point will be investigated by the WG. Denmark asked where the master version of the documentation will be stored. EFSA agreed that this has to be defined by the WG. The Netherlands asked where the Zenodo documents are physically stored; EFSA clarified that they are stored in the CERN servers.

The link to the working documents that are available on the platform for the pilot VMPPR data collection can be accessed for example via this link

<https://zenodo.org/record/570860#.WQily1V95hE>

4.6 Workflow 2: EFSA's new data transmission/uploading approach

Davide Gibin (DATA Unit) provided an overview of the functionalities of Workflow 2 (WF2) in the Data Collection Framework (DCF) and how data can be uploaded, replaced and partially replaced. He explained that it is possible to download the xml and also how to access the history of a particular dataset. The automatically generated messages regarding errors in a dataset have been moved to the message section. If a data collection is closed then this will be shown as the submit button will no longer be active.

The Netherlands asked if it would be possible for the country coordinators to change a dataset submitted from another governmental organisation of the country. EFSA explained that, at present, according to good data management practices all data submissions and validations are configured at organisation level.

4.7 Universal sample identification and global chemical data collection – opportunity and limitations

Francesco Vernazza introduced an opening discussion to address the issue of duplicates identified for laboratory sample codes 'LabSampCode'. EFSA presented the possibility of having a unique universal identification of the laboratory samples across organisations and countries and prompted the Networks to identify possible solution to address this need. This subject will be further discussed in future meetings.

Any Other Business

No further issues were raised.

Conclusions

The Chair thanked all the participants and presenters for their involvement and participation which have contributed to a fruitful meeting.

Closure of the meeting

The meeting closed at 17:30 as anticipated in the agenda.