EVIDENCE MANAGEMENT UNIT

Advisory Forum Task Force on Data Collection and Data Modelling Minutes of the 4th meeting

Held on 2 July 2019, Reykjavik
(Agreed on 15th July 2019)

Participants

- **Representatives of Member States**

Name	Country
Ákos Jozwiak (Chair)	Hungary
Flemming Bager	Denmark
Milo Bystrický	Slovak Republic
David Foster	Sweden
Danica Grahek-Ogden	Norway (from agenda point 5)
Alessandra Perrella	Italy (from agenda point 5)
Eva Scharfenberg	Germany
Darja Sokolic	Croatia
Martina Stack	Ireland
Katie Vermeersch	Belgium
Patrizia Colangeli & Maria Girolama Falcone	Italy (teleconference for Agenda Items 1-4)

- **EU Commission:**

DG SANTÉ: Alexandra Tuijtelaars (apologies)

- **EFSA:**

Evidence Management Unit: Eileen O'Dea, Jane Richardson
SCER: Ana Afonso

1. Welcome and apologies for absence

The meeting was opened at 09:00 by the Chair.

The Chair welcomed the participants and thanked them for their work since the last meeting.

Apologies were received from:

- Klemens Fuchs (Austria)

- Charlotte Grastilleur (France)
- Henk de Groot (Netherlands)
- Jesus Alvarez-Pinera (UK)

2. Adoption of agenda

The agenda was adopted without changes. It was agreed that IMSOC & MANCP would be discussed under AOB.

3. Discussion on Inventory of Reporting Needs

The discussion document on reporting data model mapping and associated network diagrams were presented. The existing and potential new connections through which data sharing could enhance transparency and accessibility of food safety data was discussed. The sharing of data throughout the European and worldwide ecosystem was explored.

Data model connections as key enablers of strategic efficiency improvement opportunities were discussed. There is consistency in the key hubs of interoperable connections emerging such as IMSOC & Chemical Monitoring data as well as connections with Food Composition and Food Consumption datasets.

Differences in collection of Food Consumption data were explored. Whilst some standardisation exists in approach, it was also recognised that some datasets are old and may not fully reflect changing consumption patterns. There was agreement on the value of a strategic recommendation for Food Consumption data collection following the end of EU menu funding, potentially including development and availability of new tools to make such studies faster and less expensive. Rapidly changing food patterns make regular renewal important to maintain alignment with real consumption patterns.

Different legislation requires different reporting and hence different data models. Close collaboration between Member States, the Commission and EFSA was seen as important in ensuring as much re-use and interoperability of data models as possible. Rather than harmonisation and standardisation, the discussion advocated alignment of the data models where commonality exists with allowance for specific different data reporting needs as required.

EFSA presented information about the current status of the IMSOC Implementing act to be voted on 11 June 2019. There was discussion of IMSOC as a risk management system as compared with EFSA's interest in risk assessment data needs including the need to conduct rapid outbreak assessments. The group agreed on a recommendation that data systems should facilitate data access and re-use, with appropriate anonymisation, whenever possible.

The group suggested a recommendation to Member States to involve national Data Architects in discussions with the Commission regarding data reporting requirements in legislation. There was a further recommendation for improved accessibility of risk management data in IMSOC on an EU level.

The group discussed data use as a driver of data quality including timeliness as a data quality dimension. It was recognised that if the data flow is one way (from

data providers to EFSA) and underutilised, this can severely impede its use in crisis management. Communication of the value and accessibility of the data would improve data quality, use and utility.

4. Discussion on Data Modelling

The discussion paper on Data Modelling was discussed including two keys ideas:

1. there is no need for additional data models in food safety and
2. there is a need to have clear understanding of where relevant data exists and how it can be connected.

The group discussed a recommendation that data providers should include connections between data models where needed e.g. RASFF notifications should include identifiers for lab records.

There was discussion about the possibility of using data provided to EU institutions to reduce double reporting e.g. animal population data is reported to both the Commission and Eurostat but the precision of the statistical reporting is currently not considered sufficient for food safety purposes. Solutions for re-use of data originating from different reporting purposes should be sought at MS and also at European levels.

An important strategic recommendation was advocated by the group for a multi-lingual dimension of catalogues e.g. cataloguing available translations and defining maintenance processes, possibly including citizen science crowd-sourcing or other practical solutions potentially including EuroVoc.

Inclusion of recommendations based on the ISA European Interoperability Framework was discussed. https://ec.europa.eu/isa2/eif_en

There was further discussion about a strategic recommendation regarding food consumption data collections and data architecture including the need for evaluation of Data Models derived from business needs. This would help ensure alignment with existing data models and interoperability of datasets.

5. Discussion on Data Architecture

There was discussion on the current data architecture pipeline which is based on the concept of data providers sending datasets to a central collation point. This model is applicable at both EFSA and Member State levels. This model has a number of pain points in terms of data models (in numbers and evolution) and complexity. Reporting in this way does not add any value for data providers. Pain points are largely on the data provider side rather than the insights derivation side. Provider side pain is one of the reasons EFSA do not receive all the data that could be available.

An alternative approach could include a 'Connected' database approach or 'Smart Ecosystem'. This approach assumes that a large percentage of data providers will have appropriately structured and accessible databases to enable.

Availability of and funding for Data Scientists was discussed since this is a core IT skill needed to enable a Smart Ecosystem approach including a 'Schema on Write' as opposed to 'Schema on Read' strategy.

Lambda architecture was discussed as a transition step allowing data managers to be doing both structure and capture and Machine Learning in a parallel transition phase.

The group agreed on a recommendation that Member States involve their IT in strategic design of systems. This is due to the view that a key role of Member State Food Safety Authorities will increasingly be to ensure data accessibility and data as a driver of their activities.

6. Discussion on remaining topics to be addressed

The Chair presented an overview of next steps for the Task Force Group. This will include completion and presentation of an interim report at the next Advisory Forum meeting in September. This interim report will contain discussion and recommendations on the main themes identified for the group. This will be followed by exploration of specific aspects of the 15 topics identified at the outset of the Task Force and drafting of the final Task Force Report.

7. Any Other Business

EFSA presented their use of RASFF data and its importance in rapid outbreak assessment. Timely availability of this data for crisis activities was seen as important; incomplete information is a risk factor for risk assessment and management. Data sharing between national systems and the iRASFF and AAC systems could facilitate this. The suggestion of taking RASFF as a case study for application of the AFTF recommendations was discussed and could be a recommendation.

MANCP reporting requirements sent to EFSA from the Commission were discussed. There was agreement that, wherever possible and appropriate, data already reported to EFSA should be used to populate MANCP reporting tables.

Timeliness as a dimension of Data Quality was discussed in the context of rapid availability of data throughout business sectors. In order to remain aligned with the speed and diversity of data accessibility, Member States should consider what would facilitate more rapid monitoring data availability.

8. Next Steps

Task	**Target Date**	**Who**
Finalise minutes and publish on EFSA website	15 July 2019	All/EFSA
Arrange teleconferences to progress agreed priority topics.	15 July 2019	All/EFSA
Amend the draft report on data collection with respect to: - Food Consumption & Composition - Scientific Evidence Framework - ORION + NOVA projects	August 2019	 HR and BE all all

Task	Target Date	Who
- US 'move the code to the data' concept (CENTINO) - Data ownership clarifications - ISA International Standards documentation - Data modelling section - Data architecture section		all all all DE SE
Draft report text	1 September 2019	All/EFSA
Convene the next meeting of the AF-Task Force on Data Collection and Data Modelling directly preceding the next Advisory Forum Meeting on 17th September 2019 (Helsinki)	18 August 2019	Chair/EFSA

9. Closure of the meeting at 18:45