

Networks on Veterinary Medicinal Products Residues (3rd meeting) and Pesticide Monitoring (17th meeting) Minutes of the common session

Held on 11 October 2017, Parma

(Agreed on 10 November 2017)

Participants

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

| Country | Name |
|----------------|---------------------------|
| Austria | Verena Spiteller |
| Belgium | Chantal Rettigner |
| Belgium | Jean- François Schmit |
| Bulgaria | Lazura Simeonova Doncheva |
| Bulgaria | Emil Simeonov |
| Cyprus | Militsa Hadjigeorgiou |
| Cyprus | Despo Louca Christodoulou |
| Croatia | Bruno Calopek |
| Czech Republic | Jiri Drapal |
| Czech Republic | Oldrich Valcl |
| Czech Republic | Petr Cuhra |
| Czech Republic | Dana Nedvidkova |
| Denmark | Pernille Bjorn Petersen |
| Estonia | Merle Suursaar |
| Estonia | Kadi Padur |
| Finland | Pirkko Tavast |
| Finland | Carola Ranta |
| Finland | Sanna Viljakainen |
| France | Jean-Cedric Rettigner |
| France | Anne Ochem |
| France | Vincent Rieu |
| France | Celine Vidal |
| Germany | Katrin Konig |
| Germany | Ina More |
| Germany | Anne Katrin Pietrzyk |
| Greece | Maria Alexandraki |

| | |
|----------------|-------------------------------------|
| Greece | Komninos Stouriannidis |
| Hungary | Attial Tiran |
| Hungary | Adrienn Vasarhelyi |
| Ireland | Eileen O'Dea |
| Ireland | Janice Whelan |
| Ireland | Finbarr O'Regan |
| Italy | Silvia Ciardullo |
| Italy | Michele de Martino |
| Italy | Francesca Roberti |
| Latvia | Elina Ciekure |
| Lithuania | Snieguole Trumpickaite Dzekcioriene |
| Lithuania | Virginijus Vaiciunas |
| Luxembourg | Jean Brasseur |
| Luxembourg | Fabienne Clabots |
| Malta | Noel Demicoli |
| Malta | Shirley Mifsud |
| Netherlands | Henk Van Der Schee |
| Poland | Kamila Mitrowska |
| Poland | Boneza Morzycka |
| Portugal | Joana Leal |
| Portugal | Maria Joao Lino |
| Romania | Cristina Teodora Ionescu |
| Romania | Constantin Iordache |
| Romania | Oana Stroie |
| Slovakia | Martina Ihnatova |
| Slovakia | Marjan Markelj |
| Slovakia | Ana Rucna |
| Slovenia | Vida Znoj |
| Spain | Inmaculada Mendez Martinez |
| Spain | Alica Yague Martin |
| Sweden | Frida Broman |
| Sweden | David Foster |
| Sweden | Anders Jansson |
| United Kingdom | Myles Munro |
| United Kingdom | Carol Siwicka |
| United Kingdom | Helena Cooke |
| Iceland | Sif Sigurdardottir |
| Iceland | Ingibjorg Jonsdottir |
| Norway | Waleed Ahmed |
| Norway | Per Bratterud |
| Norway | Iren Randi Bolli |
| Norway | Hanne Marit Gran |

- **Hearing Experts**

Representative of the European Reference Laboratories (EU-RLs) for residues of veterinary medicines and contaminants in food of animal origin: Eric Verdon (Laboratoire de Fougères: French Agency for Food, Environmental and Occupational Health and Safety: ANSES France)

- **European Commission:**

Veerle Vanheusden (DG SANTE, Unit E2), Judith Manhardt-Welbers (DG SANTE, Directorate F)

- **EFSA:**

Evidence Management (DATA) Unit: Jane Richardson, Doreen Dolores Russell (Scientific Secretary), Mary Gilsean, Stefano Cappe

Pesticides Unit: Daniela Brocca (Chair), Hermine Reich, Alexandre Nougadere

- **Others**

EU candidate countries: Elmira Mehmeti, Vjollca Vladi (Albania), Daniela Ristoska, Slada Drndar (FYR of Macedonia), Vladimir Zivkovic, Daniela Sukovic (Montenegro), Srdjan Stefanovic, Lidija Ristic Matijevic (Serbia), Ilknur Gonenc, Vjollca Vladi (Turkey) Dinaida Tahirovic, Ivana Zovko (Bosnia and Herzegovina).

8. Welcome and apologies for absence

The Chair welcomed the participants.

9. Adoption of agenda

The agenda was adopted without changes.

10. Topics for discussion

10.1 Update on the ad-hoc monitoring programme for fipronil and related substances

Daniela Brocca (Pesticides Unit) gave an overview of the ad-hoc monitoring programme for fipronil and related substances with the commonality between the pesticide residues and VMPP areas highlighted. The background to setting up this ad-hoc data collection, including member state contacts and guidance documents together with the substances and food items concerned, was presented. She encouraged the sharing of information with colleagues not present who are responsible for the data collection. Fipronil is the same substance irrespective of its use as a veterinary medicine, pesticide or biocide and EFSA explained that the data collection represents an opportunity to align the VMPP and pesticides data collections.

In the discussion that followed Germany requested a longer timeframe as the time to collect and analyse the data is too short. The EC responded that the deadlines need to be respected as the report from EFSA is required by January 2018. Additionally, the timelines were discussed and agreed in the standing committee on plants, animals, food and feed (PAFF) so there is no margin for amendment. Belgium also commented on the short timeline, and the best matrices for identifying misuse. The EC responded that liver is a good matrix to sample but it is the decision for the MSs to make. On this point EFSA reminded that the analysis should be for the full residue definition including the metabolite.

Portugal stated that sampling laying hens should not present any difficulties but the collection of muscle and fat samples may be problematic due to slaughter cycles. Ireland questioned the inclusion of the substance Amitraz in the list of

substances and the EC replied that it was included due the evidence discovered in the misuse of fiprinol investigations. The Netherlands asked about sampling products containing eggs such as salads and biscuits. EFSA said it would like to have this data but the inclusion of composite foods within the scope of the ad-hoc data collection was not possible, so the results from these other analyses should be sent to EFSA by email. Sweden highlighted the use of fiprinol by hobby keepers of hens as it easy to acquire the product while Norway clarified that as a veterinary medicine it cannot be bought directly from pet shops.

10.2 Harmonised chemical monitoring: the data providers' perspective

Hungary and Ireland provided information on their work to develop their national data collection systems. Hungary advised that the merging of different authorities covering different food sectors and their different LIMS (laboratory information systems) into the National Food Chain Safety Office (NFCSO) necessitated the implementation of a new LIMS to cover different food sectors. The project identified that the data model must be horizontal and general to facilitate the reporting in all data domains and thus referenced the EFSA SSD2 as a well-established and complex data model. However given the different remit of the competent authority to operate within risk management and official controls the model requirements would need to be different. The present structure of the NFCSO data model was presented to the meeting, though work is still ongoing.

In Ireland the national authority developed as system to integrate all the data from different laboratories. Electronic recording of sampling and reports was introduced as well as electronic analysis results. The system can link with SSD but some of fields are not needed from the SSD data model. An overview of data integration was presented including not only the sampling component but all the connection to investigations and food incidents as in line with Hungary, the national authority is not only involved with risk assessment. Using SSD as a reference, challenges to include all data variable fields is addressed by the use of cloud data capture.

EFSA complemented Hungary and Ireland for developing a common data model for different domains.

The Czech Republic informed the meeting that it attempted a similar exercise but the EFSA catalogues do not always fit with what is available in the legislation. Hungary advised that it has attempted to build hierarchies based on the legislation but that it required a lot of effort.

Austria asked if there is any validation of the system and Hungary replied that it is still working on the data model. The Netherlands asked Ireland about FoodEx2 coding: Ireland advised that the coding should be done at the time of sampling by the sampling officer but a tool is not yet available though there are some applications that can read bar codes. For the EFSA validation codes (Business rules) the codes are available in SAS while Sweden informed the meeting that it uses C sharp for this purpose.

EFSA indicated the importance of data standardization which Ireland agreed was good; Ireland also highlighted the need to take into account data protection issues in relation to data transference.

10.3 Analysis of existing legislation residue definitions, food items and residues to be included in annual reports

The Chair presented an analysis of the legislation in place for pesticides and VMPR highlighting the common features as well as the differences. A particular issue concerns the residues' MRL and the absence of an MRL database for VMPR which is available for pesticides and is a central tool for reporting pesticide residues. Several countries concurred that a MRL database, similar to the Matrix tool that is available for pesticides is highly desirable, though the difficulties in creating the database were acknowledged given that the MRLs for VMPR are not consolidated in a single piece of legislation as well as the regular maintenance required.

Norway reminded participants that different MRLs for the pesticides and VMPR derive from the different uses of the substances. Sweden asked if a risk assessment is performed on the animal treated with the substance to which Norway replied that the assessment is different due to use on food animal (VMPR) and insects (pesticides), and the differences in the assessment performed by the European Medicines Agency (food baskets) while EFSA looks at the high level consumption. The Netherlands pointed out that for copper content in kidney there is no MRL for VMPR while one exists in pesticides and suggested that the MRLs should be harmonised with respect to the product and that alignment between the legal frameworks is needed.

10.4 Standard Sample Description Version 2: an opportunity to increase alignment

Jane Richardson (DATA Unit) presented an analysis of the similarities and differences between the data models SSD (currently used to report pesticide residues) and SSD2 (which will be used to report VMPR). Inputs and comments were encouraged from participants in relation to both the difference and ideas or suggestions for harmonisation.

Austria proposed that reporting the LOQ (limit of quantification) is mandatory for both data collections while the Netherlands commented that the composite fields used in SSD2 are complicated and asked whether it would be possible to incorporate facets as single entities. On this point Austria advised that this could be possible if the facet is exported as an XML file. In relation to the laboratory accreditation, Ireland indicated that accreditation for the method at the level of the parameter (substance) level is useful information.

10.5 Moving forward with Standard Sample Description Version 2: respecting legal requirements while minimising the reporting differences between the two data collections

The networks discussed whether common guidance documents would be helpful: it would be the responsibility of EFSA to ensure the documents are aligned. Cyprus commented that there will always be differences between the data collections. EFSA suggested exploring at the laboratory level if similar approaches can be implemented. Ireland commented that with cca and cc β there is a non-alignment in relation to enforcement and asked how banned substances would be addressed for VMPR whilst there are threshold levels for pesticides.

The participants stressed the importance of building a MRL database for VMPR data reporting, to further align pesticides and VMPR and to resolve the issue of

reporting dual use substances. On this latter point EFSA advised that it is not possible to solve this matter yet but is fully aware of this issue. EFSA would like further input from the networks on how to align and harmonise the data collections and work towards a resolution of this issue.

11. Date for next meeting

The precise dates will be confirmed in the near future.

12. Conclusions

The Chair thanked all the participants for their contributions to the meeting.

13. Closure of the meeting

The meeting closed at 18:00 as anticipated in the agenda. Following the pesticide residues network meeting on 12 October 2017, EFSA delivered training to the EU candidate countries on 13 October on reporting pesticide residues and VMPP data.