Scientific Network on Chemical Monitoring Data Collection Minutes of the 2nd annual meeting

This meeting, originally scheduled as a physical meeting, was converted into a teleconference to avoid travelling to EFSA in line with the measures established to reduce the risk of coronavirus infection.
Network members received a pre-recording of each presentation in advance of the meeting and EFSA requested questions in advance. The meeting was dedicated to discussing and answering questions related to each presentation.

Held on 12 March 2020 via TEAMs Teleconference (Agreed on 26 March 2020)[1]

Participants

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

Country	Name	Surname
Austria	Daniela	Mihats
Belgium	Chantal	Rettigner
Belgium	Jean-François	Schmit
Belgium	Valérie	Vromman
Bulgaria	Emil	Simeonov
Bulgaria	Tatyana	Tihova-Sabotinkova
Croatia	Sandra	Bašić
Cyprus	Eftychia	Christou
Cyprus	Despo	Christodoulou
Czech Republic	Irena	Rehurkova
Denmark	Pernille	Bjørn Petersen
Denmark	Helle	Lindberg Madsen
Denmark	Annette	Petersen
Finland	Kati	Hakala
Finland	Pirkko	Tavast
France	Aurélie	Courcoul
France	Anne	Ochem

1 Minutes should be published within 15 working days of the final day of the relevant meeting.

France	Jean-Cédric	Reninger
Germany	Sfeffen	Naumann
Germany	David	Schumacher
Germany	Andrea	Maldonado
Germany	Katrin	König
Greece	Maria	Alexandraki
Greece	Komninos	Stougiannidis
Ireland	Finbarr	O'Regan
Italy	Roberta	Aloi
Latvia	Elina	Ciekure
Latvia	Daina	Pule
Luxembourg	Danny	Zust
Norway	Randi	Bolli
Norway	Hanne Marit	Gran
Poland	Maciej	Durkalec
Poland	Andrzej	Starski
Romania	Constantin	Iordache
Romania	Bogdan-Florin	Tanasescu
Slovakia	Jarmila	Durcasnka
Sweden	Annika	Forssner
Sweden	David	Foster
Sweden	Karin	Neil Persson
Switzerland	Isabelle	Seger-Sauli

- **European Commission:** Alberto Cusinato (JRC)

- **Pre-accession country observers**: none in attendance

- **EFSA:**

Evidence Management Unit: Mary GILSENAN (HoU); Jane RICHARDSON, Valentina BOCCA, Daniela BROCCA, Alessandro DELFINO, Giulio DI PIAZZA, Ruben FUERTES, Petra GERGELOVÁ, Saba GIOVANNACCI, Sofia IOANNIDOU, Anastasia LIVANIOU, Paula MEDINA, Vaia MITOULA, Marina NIKOLIC, Luca PASINATO, Mariana PEREZ MIGUEL, Adrian CESAR RAZQUIN, Doreen RUSSELL, Giuseppe TRIACCHINI, Jasmin WEHNER

Transformation Services Unit: Eileen O'DEA

1. Welcome and apologies for absence

The Chair welcomed the participants.

Apologies were received from the following network members

Country	Name	Surname
Estonia	Maili	Põldpere

2. Adoption of agenda

The agenda was adopted without changes.

3. Agreement of the minutes

The minutes were agreed by written procedure on 26 March 2020 and published on the EFSA website on 27 March 2020.

4. Topics for discussion

Opening, rules, how to interact – Chair: Eileen O'Dea

The Chair welcomed all participants and thanked everyone for their patience during the re-arrangement of this meeting due to the COVID-19 public health crisis. Participants of this teleconference were representing EU Member States (MS) and EFSA staff. The Chair asked all participants to keep microphones muted and video cameras off except when speaking in order to avoid background noise. Pre-recorded presentations are available to meeting participants in the Chemical Monitoring Network Collaboration platform on SharePoint.

4.1. Chemical Monitoring Reporting Guidance – Eileen O'Dea

The process by which the Chemical Monitoring Reporting Guidance 2020 was developed and published was presented and the main changes introduced from the previous document were explained including the reason for the change, the anticipated impact and the discussion mechanism. The main changes involved modifications affecting the elements progLegalRef, sampMatCode (FoodEx2 catalogue), resUnit and resLOQ, as well as the introduction of the new element resAsses.

The consultation and publication process for the next guidance, which should require less effort, is planned to start earlier this year in order to have a consolidated draft by November 2020, in advance of the beginning of 2021 sampling plans.

2020 Implementation of Business Rules (BRs), DCF components, STX/XSD and registration of users for the DCF (Data Collection Framework) are in progress and will be finalised and available for the opening of the data collection in April 2020.

Excel Data Preparation tools are in the final phase of testing and will be published on EFSA's Knowledge Junction on the Zenodo platform once finalised.

Some MS questioned the decision and timing of making resLOQ dependent mandatory. EFSA clarified that this topic has been under discussion for several years and that sensitivity measures are generally accepted to be essential for risk assessment. A two-year notice period was given for its implementation: mandatory status was formally proposed by EFSA in April 2018 (Chemical Occurrence) and October 2018 (Veterinary Medicinal Product Residue (VMPR)) Network Meetings, and a warning business rule was used for the 2019 data

collection. Colleagues from the EFSA Dietary Exposure Team advised against the suggestion to use a mean LOQ (Limit of Quantification) for a specific matrix/analyte/method when resLOQ is not available, as this would not reduce the bias. EFSA staff asked whether resLOQ reporting has been already implemented at national level and, if so, which initiatives were taken in order to have a resLOQ for all results. Network members were encouraged to liaise with their Focal Points in order to tackle this and improve data quality.

It was also clarified that EFSA does not expect a result value (resVal) in cases where type of result (resType) is "below ccBeta", "below ccAlpha" or "below LOQ".

The difference between objective and selective sampling was briefly discussed and it was agreed to continue the topic in the Network on TEAMS and in accordance to the recent developments in legislation agreed between MS and the Commission.

Finally, it was clarified that data from any year can be transmitted to EFSA; however, only data from the previous calendar year will be used for the VMPR and Pesticides EU annual summary reports. Opening of the DCF for longer periods in the future could be considered, particularly if real-time data is available, but this needs to be further discussed and changes would need to be implemented.

4.2. Business Rules – Valentina Bocca

The Business Rules (BRs) applicable to the 2020 Chemical Monitoring data collection were presented, which ensure quality and usability of reported data stored in EFSA's Scientific Data Warehouse (SDWH). The presentation focused on the main changes implemented from the previous year's data collection, namely:

i) addition of 29 new BRs: 18 inherited from the previous pesticide residues data collection, 4 associated with new data elements, and 7 related to the Legal Limits database for pesticide residues and VMPR;
ii) deletion of 8 BRs: 6 deleted due to slight changes in the data model, and 2 converted into catalogue hierarchies; and
iii) amendment of 3 BRs.

BRs were added this year due to three factors:

1) the inclusion of the pesticide residues domain in the chemical monitoring data collection,
2) the use for the first time of a Legal Limits database for pesticide residues and VMPR, and
3) the addition of the evalInfo.resAsses element.

It was noted that the new BRs CHEMON66 and CHEMON67 are missing in table 7 of the 2020 Guidance (although they are reflected in the corresponding parts of the text) and that this will be corrected in an addendum to the Guidance.

Regarding GBR11 (General Business Rule No. 11), it was clarified that different methods to analyse the same sample is allowed as long as results are different. GBR11 only imposes descriptors for the analytical method (anMethRefCode,

anMethCode, anMethText, anMethInfo) to be constant for all records having the same 'Analytical method identification' (anMethRefId).

EFSA explained that the differentiation between number of samples and number of results in the Annual reports is possible because all data are originally reported at result level, and thus they can be aggregated based on different criteria e.g. at sample level.

Regarding the use of ST20A code ("selective sampling") for the Sampling Strategy (sampStrategy) element, it was clarified that this code needs to be used in cases where the sample was taken as part of a plan to sample from a previously defined 'high-risk' population. This code does not apply for follow-up samples taken after a non-compliant result. This code should be used for VMPR samples; however, for EUCP (EU Co-ordinated Programme) samples the code ST10A ("objective sampling") should be reported. More details can be found in the scope notes of the controlled terminology catalogue.

The issue of result units (resUnit) being mandatory even when resType="BIN" as in the case of mineral oils (MOAH) was raised. It was agreed that the specific consideration of mineral oils needs to be verified, although in general resUnit has to be reported even for "screening" methods, as it is necessary to quantify parameters such as LOQ or ccAlpha. The case of reporting a single sample with acrylamide results which require the F33 facet for legislative class, together with other results, such as furan, that do not require a legislative class was queried. Since in that case sampMatCode would be different for different results within the same sample, the file would be rejected due to GBR3. EFSA will further discuss this issue and provide a solution prior to the opening of the Official 2020 data collection.

Finally, it was suggested by a network member to implement BRs in the Catalogue Browser, given the usefulness of this tool. This possibility will be discussed, and the feasibility of its implementation analysed by EFSA.

4.3. FoodEx2 catalogue amendments with special focus on feed codes - Sofia Ioannidou and Marina Nikolić

FoodEx2 catalogue amendments performed in 2019 were presented. Updates performed in the catalogue were published in January on Knowledge Junction and are summarised in the FoodEx2 Maintenance Report 2019[2]. Updates from 2019 (Versions MTX 10.1, 10.2, 10.3 and 11.0) refer to the changes in existing terms (86 affected terms), updates in the botanical area of FoodEx2, in the bird section and on the facet F21 – Production-method as well as to amendments in the feed area and on implicit facets (417 affected items).

Furthermore, new terms have been added, the applicability and position of existing terms have been reviewed and five terms have been deprecated or dismissed.

- The bird section was extended by 444 new terms (bird species).

[2] https://efsa.onlinelibrary.wiley.com/doi/10.2903/sp.efsa.2020.EN-1810

- The facet F21 (production method) was amended to ensure a clear distinction between conventional and organic production and between intensive and extensive production methods.
- The feed section of the Reporting hierarchy was updated according to Commission Regulation 2017/1017 that amended Regulation (EU) No 68/2013 on the Catalogue of feed materials. New implicit attributes "EUFeedReg" and 'IFN Code' have been created to enable mapping of FoodEx2 terms with the Catalogue of feed materials and feedstuffs from the OECD Guidance Document on Pesticides in Livestock[3], respectively.
- The facet F23 - Target-consumer was expanded to accommodate data collection within the VMPR domain.

Major releases are foreseen for each January, two minor releases are issued during the year, usually in May and October, unless there is a need for an urgent update in which case additional minor releases are issued in a given year. EFSA welcomes requests from MS data providers for catalogue updates by 31 October each year.

Denmark asked how to implement "wild fish" in FoodEx2. EFSA clarified that wild animals, hence, also wild fish, should be always reported with the specific code A07RY='Wild, gathered or hunted' from the F21 facet catalogue on Method of Production. DE and NL raised questions about the dates of update publications and where they can be accessed. These are available on the EFSA website[4]. EFSA also confirmed that all links to the latest catalogue can be accessed via Sharepoint "Useful documents and links" page. EFSA informed the network that the next updates (minor releases) are planned for end of May and end of October 2020 and any requests about amendments should be communicated by e-mail either to the Catalogues mailbox Catalogues@efsa.europa.eu or ServiceNow data.collection@efsa.europa.eu indicating the data domain and rationale behind the request.

4.4. Data Validation: Do you accept? – Luca Pasinato

The process of data validation and data acceptance through Microstrategy reports was presented (National report, Validation report and Confirmation report), and the main changes with respect to previous years' reports explained. Data visualisation in the Validation report will be clearer compared to last year's dashboard. There will be one general dashboard merging data across domains and another domain-specific visualisation dashboard e.g. for pesticide residues, data will be shown in terms of each data provider organistaion's datasets, sample events, samples, results and non-compliances.

For most chemical domains (chemical contaminants, food additives and VMPR), the National reports will be automatically generated from the data submitted in the EFSA Scientific Data Warehouse (SDWH), while for pesticide residues, the national report will continue to be created through a different process. The

[3] http://www.oecd.org/officialdocuments/publicdisplaydocumentpdf/?cote=env/jm/mono(2013)8&doclanguage=en and https://efsa.onlinelibrary.wiley.com/doi/pdf/10.2903/j.efsa.2019.5896

[4] http://www.efsa.europa.eu/en/data/data-standardisation

National reports show figures of the data submitted and helps to present the data summarised according to legislation needs.

Two new concepts for compliance have been introduced:

- numerical compliance - it allows data providers to describe compliance in terms of analytical, numerical results evaluation, and
- assessment compliance - it allows data providers to describe compliance in terms of results assessment.

EFSA clarified that the acceptance of the data cannot be carried out directly from the Validation Dashboard and that therefore data validators need to access the Confirmation Document in Microstrategy to accept or reject the data submitted by their own organisation within the SDWH. Each dataset transmitted from an organisation can be 'Accepted' from the Confirmation Document by different data validators. It was underlined that the acceptance process is a fundamental step of the data validation process because only data accepted in the SDWH can be used for report creation and risk assessment by EFSA. EFSA strongly recommended data validators to carefully check the data before accepting it. A clear definition of the roles of data validators and data providers was also given to the participants and is documented in the Chemical Monitoring Guidance 2020. EFSA also pointed out that the integration of the Confirmation Document into the Validation Dashboard might be considered as a possible enhancement for the future if the necessary features will be implemented in Microstrategy software.

In the case of multiple data validators belonging to the same organisation, it was also explained that there is no possibility to split the data by domain within the Confirmation Document. This is not possible because acceptance is carried out at dataset level and datasets by design can contain data from different domains. EFSA suggested to use the progId in order to be able to separate data by domain; also, the local organisation will allow Data Validators to understand the records they are accepting.

The need for clear documentation of the validation process and the role of data validators and data providers was raised by the participants. EFSA confirmed that a clearer documentation can be provided and also pointed out that instructions have already been given and published on the Network SharePoint site.

4.5. Data Collection Process: from system testing to data transmission to report publication – Doreen Russell and Jane Richardson

The chemical monitoring data submission process was presented with particular regard to data transmission, data validation, production of the reports and collaboration.

The TEST data collection opened the 4 March 2020 and gives data providers the opportunity to test their data against the 2020 business rules. Feedback during the testing phase on how the new data collection has been configured is

welcomed and, based on that, EFSA may consider changing the settings. In the TEST data collection environment datasets that reached the VALID status will be automatically deleted after one day.
In the preparation of the data collection, EFSA created an EU survey where members of the network were asked to provide the names of the appointed data providers and data validators at organisation level by 28 February 2020. It is still possible to provide late registrations to this EU survey and EFSA invited members to do so as soon as possible.

The official data collection (CHEM_MON_SSD2_WF2.2020) will be opened on the 15 April 2020 and EFSA strongly recommends using the official data collection for testing dataset files, as this allows tracking of submissions. A number of initiatives have been taken in EFSA to improve the support during data transmission e.g. new page on the EFSA web site with links to videos, webinars and supporting information soon to be launched, Sharepoint and TEAMs to promote best practices and ideas, to share queries and to access useful documentation. The ServiceNow tickets system was shown. It is used by EFSA to manage incidents and assistance requests from data providers to data.collection@efsa.europa.eu.

A demonstration on how to "submit" data after reaching the "valid" or "valid_with_warning" status in the DCF was also given. For the 2020 data collection, data providers are encouraged to "submit" their data by the 30th of June 2020.

Network members were invited to be prepared for next year, when, in accordance with article 113(1) of Regulation (EU) 2017/625 they must submit the annual report on official controls in their multiannual national control plan (MANCP) by 31 August 2021. In order to comply with this date, the chemical monitoring data collection will need to close by 30 June 2021.
Network Members expressed the opinion that the deadline of 30 June is too early since the deadline for MANCP is by 31st August and there is time for later submission. EFSA highlighted the importance of submitting datasets by the 30 June 2020 because two validation steps are planned. The first step will take place at the time of data transmission. Then, starting from 1 July 2020, EFSA will initiate the data validation support service by means of which EFSA will create the aggregated national reports for data providers and advise on any discrepancy found. The confirmation document will be set to only allow "rejection" of the dataset until mid-July as this will allow data providers to re-transmit corrected files, if needed. Once national reports have been sent by EFSA Data Stewards to data provider organisations, it will be possible for data validators to accept data for their organisation through the confirmation document in Microstrategy.

In terms of timelines of the 2020 data collection, it was confirmed that EFSA suggest, where possible, that datasets should be submitted by 30 June 2020 and specifically pointed out that:

- 31 August 2020 will be the deadline for submission for substances under Regulation (EC) No. 396/2005 on pesticide residues and Council Directive 92/36/EEC on Veterinary Medicinal Product Residues (VMPR), and all validation and acceptance shall be complete on 30 Sept 2020 and

- 1 October 2020 will be the deadline for submission of food additives and contaminants and all validation and acceptance shall be complete on 31 October 2020.

EFSA invited participants to provide feedback on these timelines.

Some MS asked about the possibility of the TEST data collection to remain open during the official data collection period (after 15 April 2020). As stated in the presentation, EFSA suggests to test files in the TEST data collection before the opening of the official data collection and to transmit all datasets in the official data collection after 15 April 2020, as this allows tracking of dataset submissions.

EFSA recommended data providers not to submit their datasets in the DCF on the last day of the data submission (see above) as this may cause longer waiting times due to the processing of large numbers of files and records.

EFSA clarified that the activity of the mapping of the data submitted under the MANCP is coordinated by the European Commission, and invited MS to ask the Commission for further details through their national representatives.

4.6. Legal Limits Database – Giulio di Piazza

The functionality and content of the new Legal Limits Database (LLDB) for pesticide residues and VMPR developed by EFSA were presented. The data were extracted from the on-line European Commission MRL (Maximum Residue Limit) pesticide residues database and the Eur-Lex website in different formats (html, Excel, xml) and SAS programs were used to process the data and include it in the LLDB.

Some of the impacts of using the new LLDB regarding the validation of the data are that the catalogues of PARAM and LEGREF have been updated to accommodate use of the LLDB. Food classification catalogues MATRIX, MTXCLS and PARAM are used to link the food with the legal limit value of the relevant pesticide/VMPR. The LLDB will be used to check the consistency of the evaluation reported for each record with EU legal limits, both in Pesticides and VMPR domains, greatly enhancing the data validation. It will also enrich the SDWH flags, facts and classifications that will be extracted from the LLDB and included in the Microstrategy Data Marts used to create analyses and reports.

The need for alternative classification codes for active substances was raised. EFSA remarked that the paramCodes used in the database are available in the Catalogue Browser along with CAS numbers, smiles code, INCHI and others. EFSA explained that toxicological reference values (e.g. ARfD) are available in EFSA's OpenFoodTox open access database and that the data can be retrieved from there. They are not included in the LLDB, and it is not foreseen to include them.

EFSA answered participants' questions about the possibility of extracting the data from the LLDB. An Excel extraction that will include legal limit values is foreseen to be available by 8 April 2020. Also, a MicroStrategy report is foreseen by 30 April 2020 and its availability will notified through the network collaboration platform (SharePoint and TEAMS).

Network members raised a question about the new LLDB classification (MTXCLS) and why FoodEx2 is not used. Reassurance was sought that Data Providers will not be asked to report the MTXCLS. EFSA clarified that MTXCLS reflects the food classification used in legislation and is derived from FoodEx2 codes through algorithms as presented in slide 14 of the presentation. EFSA will share the description of the algorithm and the configuration files which create the MTXLCS classifications by publication on Knowledge Junction on the Zenodo platform. Publication will be notified through the network SharePoint site and is expected by 8th April 2020 . New data will be included in the LLDB through a procedure triggered by the EFSA Data Stewards.

A further question was raised regarding the MTXCLS catalogue, which some users see as empty in the Catalogue Browser. EFSA said that this must be a technical problem and agreed to investigate after the meeting.

In response to additional questions from network members, EFSA explained how the LLDB can be used for national data validation, in a similar way to how this validation was done for pesticide residues records last year. The existence of specific combinations of PARAM and FOOD will be checked in the LLDB and where the combination exists, the result reported and the result evaluation will be checked for consistency. Potentially, reporting of the limit for each record might be not necessary in the future, removing this burden from data providers. The limits are required to enrich the reports EFSA provides to the public. The LLDB will be used mainly by EFSA, but data providers can also link it to their data to perform their own quality checks.

EFSA highlighted that the database is new and that feedback is welcome. EFSA asked if any MS had created a database of legal limits especially in the VMPR domain. Poland replied that they have a database in Polish and Germany can share a German database. EFSA invited all Member States, to share their available databases and to provide feedback on EFSA's LLDB. Sweden proposed to share XML-files from SANTE for several years back as EFSA are scraping data from the same sources. EFSA will consider implementing this in the future. Development, in the future, of an EFSA API (Application Programming Interface) for the LLDB could be considered but is not a priority for this year.

4.7. Reporting - the future of Annual Reports – Paula Medina

EFSA presented details of data collected under different pieces of legislation for which annual European summary reports are required: Regulation (EC) No. 396/2005 on pesticide residues and Council Directive 92/36/EEC on Veterinary Medicinal Product Residues (VMPR). Every year more samples are sent to EFSA in these data collections and EFSA has developed improved tools to view and visualise the data, to allow more automation and to reduce report creation time and errors. Some data visualisation has been included in 2018 ARPR (Annual Report on Pesticide Residues). The tools aim to be self-explanatory, to satisfy user needs, to allow the best use of data and to avoid double reporting.

EFSA informed the network that, under Article 113 of Regulation (EU) 2017/625, annual reporting of official controls (formerly MANCP report) will be mandatory by 31 August 2021. EFSA will need to prepare a process by which DG SANTE can

extract the necessary data to populate, on behalf of MS, Table 1.4 of the Official Controls report, according to Regulation (EU) 2019/723. This means that data must be accepted by the data validators into the SDWH and available for EFSA's use before 30 June each year, starting from 2021.

MS questioned why the deadline for contaminants data transmission will be30 June each year if there is no requirement for a contaminants annual report. EFSA clarified that now two different reports are requested from EFSA: VMPR and ARPR but from next year, data to populate Table 1.4 of the official controls report should be available to DG SANTE. EFSA would also like to explore the possibility to produce more public facing reports which is a possibility now due to the harmonised chemical monitoring data collection. Feedback from MS on this new type of report is requested. One network member commented that the visual nature of the reports of 2018 data is good idea and could be more useful for the public.

MS requested information about the annual Official Controls report and whether it will be based on the categorisation under the legislative classes of food additives under FoodEx2. They commented that this coding is only used for samples where an additive analysis is done so it will be empty for all other domains; network members also queried how DG SANTE will do the mapping. EFSA informed network members that of an ongoing activity with DG SANTE to use the EFSA SDWH data. MS contributions are welcome through the MANCP network.

Some clarifications regarding the Official Control report were requested as regards Article 114 of Regulation (EU) No. 2017/625. The annual reports by the Commission referred to in this Regulation, are not those produced by EFSA. EFSA confirmed the need to avoid duplication in data collection and reporting.

A MS queried whether a list of analytes for inclusion in the 2018 annual report is available. EFSA replied that the 2018 MatrixTool was used to check what was included or excluded from the annual report. This information was also provided in the pesticide Validation Dashboard. Discrepancies may be because of the use of ParamType value P002A; records with this value are accepted into the SDWH but are not included in the annual report.

4.8. Lessons learned from Pesticide residues data collection and the way forward

EFSA presented the activities and reports for Pesticide Residues in 2019. For the MOPER2018 data collection, 33 countries contributed by submitting data. In 2019, it was the second year of combined data reporting in SSD1 and SSD2. When performing a comparison between the data coded in SSD2, there was an increase with respect to 2017 (from 16% to 52%). This was accompanied by an increase in the number of analytical determinations and analysed samples in the latest years. The publication of the raw data will be done on Knowledge Junction (Zenodo platform) immediately after the 2018 Annual pesticide residues report publication.

For ChemMon 2020, the pesticide residues submission is adapted to the new harmonised data collection. It will include VMPR, contaminants, food additives

and pesticide residues. All the chemical monitoring is to be transmitted to EFSA through the same workflow; therefore, double reporting is eliminated. It was stated that data will only be collected in SSD2 and the new harmonised business rules will be implemented as well as a common LLDB. The foreseen closing date for pesticides residues records is on the 31 August 2020 and both the European Commission and EFSA will strictly adhere to the deadline this year.

The business rules modifications aimed towards harmonisation, therefore reducing the overall number; in some cases, business rules have been replaced by reporting hierarchies in the related catalogues. Reported records will use both the general and the specific business rules.

There was discussion with different MS about the handling of resLOQ and when this field does not need to be reported. It was clarified that it is considered mandatory if the attribute is flagged as "Not Summed", and then, the value "Y" should be used instead. It was reiterated that no other values should be used to avoid errors. However, an exception is made when dealing with multicomponent residues.

EFSA clarified the availability of reporting tools, which were updated, in order to generate XML files. Further questions pertained to the current stage of the Excel reporting tool. It was confirmed that the simplified tool (flat) is ready for testing, however refinements are foreseen. In addition, the table including methods and the possibility to report negative results is close to being ready.

One network member asked to be able to distinguish data on cereals collected for aflatoxin testing from those collected for pesticide residue testing. It was clarified that when a sample has been tested under different legislations, it becomes relevant to report two or more legal references (progLegRef). The field concerning legislation is repeatable and different codes can be reported. It is also possible, when appropriate, to report different progLegRef for different result records in the same sample. An important note is that aflatoxins are considered contaminants and will only appear in reports when the selected category includes contaminants.

Finally, network members raised questions regarding the possible interconnection between EFSA's reports and the Commission regarding VMPR. EFSA clarified that the reports are created from the same data which is collected by EFSA and accessed from the EFSA SDWH.

4.9. Lessons learned from VMPR data collection and the way forward

This presentation provided some highlights of the preparation of the EFSA publication, 2018 EU report for Veterinary Medicinal Product Residues (VMPR) in live animals and animal products and products of other nature. The publication is expected on the 19 March 2020 including the report in the EFSA journal and also raw data publication on EFSA's Knowledge Junction (Zenodo). Thanks to colleagues from MS, the data have been reported with better quality and in a more timely manner compared to previous years. Specific difficulties related to the SSD2 coding of VMPR samples and data related to the following data elements were discussed: sampY, sampMatCode, classification of game birds

and, coding of wild animals samples, VMPR animal group classification, progLegalRef, resType, paramType, numerical result compliance vs overall result compliance. These issues were identified in the previous data collection and have been addressed during the harmonisation of data reporting and analysis. More detailed information can be found in the Chemical monitoring reporting guidance: 2020 data collection document (the Guidance).

Two countries questioned how to address the issue of the national sampling plan years not coinciding with a calendar year. EFSA highlighted that the Commission has confirmed in writing to EFSA that they require each EU VMPR annual report to include only results of analysis of samples taken during the calendar year, which runs from January to December. This applies to both National and EU VMPR Annual Reports so there is no discrepancy between the Commission and EFSA as they both work per calendar year. Network members are advised to reach out to the Commission in case they need further clarifications. EFSA reminded network members that records of VMPR results from all years can be reported to EFSA in 2020 but only those from one single year (January-December) will be used in each single EU VMPR report.

Regarding the application of BRs to VMPR, EFSA clarified that business rules are structured in a harmonised way. There are General Business Rules (GBRs) that apply to every data domain (e.g. including Zoonosis), a set of BRs that are ChemMon specific (CHEMON) and some that apply only to specific domains e.g. only to VMPR records. All clarifications and details for VMPR specific BRs and examples on how to structure data can be found in the guidance. In case a BR has an exception for VMPR it is specifically mentioned in the body of text in the Chemical Monitoring Guidance 2020 document and also in the BRs table in the guidance document.

4.10. Use of chemical occurrence data in EFSA outputs

An overview of the occurrence data used in EFSA's dietary exposure assessments and the CONTAM Panel and Evidence Management unit mandates completed in 2019 were presented. There are several mandates in progress that will be delivered throughout 2020. In addition, the forthcoming CONTAM mandates were presented and the MS were requested to provide their data, if available. EFSA requests that data is carefully checked during data validation thereby ensuring the representativeness and quality of the data in order to achieve a proper result.

Several MS stated that the publication of ad hoc calls for data and opinion publications could be managed more effectively by EFSA and the Commission, since short deadlines do not always allow network members to collate and send the data available. EFSA recognises this concern, and there are internal efforts within EFSA and the Commission to revise the mandate process; however, it is not always foreseen when mandates will arrive, so short deadlines cannot be excluded. EFSA encourages MS and other data partners to share all available chemical monitoring data on a regular basis.

Questions were raised regarding the procedure to add data providers and data validators to the 2020 data collection. In response EFSA advised that network

members should have provided data provider and data validator information by 28 February 2020; however a late registration opportunity still exists through the EU Survey on Sharepoint News.

For chemical contaminants, as there is no annual report, the network asked if the reports on occurrence data collection will be revived. In relation to the production of an annual report on chemical occurrence data, EFSA will consider this suggestion but reminded the network that organisation level data reports are available in Microstrategy.

There was general concern from MS regarding the high LOQs set within the screening programmes for the purpose of checking compliance with legal limits. EFSA understands the economical limitations and the resource constraints in laboratories which limit the opportunity to lower LOQs unless there is a specific need to do so. However, most of the data were collected within the screening programmes. Some of the submitted data are not considered reliable, since the high LOQs together with high proportion of left-censored data have an important impact on the exposure assessment.

There was a suggestion that the data collection could stay open all year. EFSA confirmed this is not the current approach and agreed to further discuss if data providers find it useful.

EFSA suggested that network members continue to work with their national EFSA Focal Points to ensure complete and timely transmission of available national data to EFSA. This should include, where possible, data provided by academia and industry which may require a different approach to national official control data. It was acknowledged that some contaminants data is not used in risk assessment until after some time and this can result in data quality issues which could be a useful topic to discuss amongst national data providers.

4.11. Summary of the meeting, Conclusions and Any Other Business

A summary of the topics presented in the pre-recorded presentations and the virtual meeting was given by the chair. Network members were reminded to please keep in touch with EFSA regarding your transmissions, validation, and suggestions to improve the data collection process both between data providers and EFSA as well as at national level. Your feedback on these topics is valuable. All data collection components and support tools and materials will be available through links on the Sharepoint collaboration platform. Please let EFSA know if you spot things that can be improved. Our goal as a network is continued online collaboration to improve the quality of data available. EFSA suggests that this can be supported by collaboration with National Focal Points on their data tasks and is enabled by an annual physical meeting with EFSA and up to 3 members/alternates per country.

It was proposed that the 2020 annual physical meeting be moved to 10-12 November 2020. It was further proposed that thereafter, the annual meeting would be held in the autumn so that updates are agreed earlier, prior to sampling beginning each January. This would better fit the cycle of the data collection, the guidance and other materials which can be prepared in early autumn after the closing of the data collection and then be available for

discussion and ready before Christmas. Many Member States supported these proposals and there were no objections. The decision was taken to move forward with the change. Details will be communicated by EFSA. From 2021, the deadline for data submission will be advanced to end of June for all data domains. As a result, the annual network meeting could be held before November.

Network members were asked to send EFSA feedback regarding the meeting and the scheduling of the next meeting through the EU survey. The Chair thanked members for their collaboration, understanding and patience. The pre-recorded presentations and PowerPoint PDFs are available for the use of network members through SharePoint.

The Chair thanked Network Members and EFSA colleagues for their adaptability, persistence and their focus throughout network telemeeting.

5. Date for next meeting

The tentative date for the next meeting is 10-12 November 2020.

6. Closure of the meeting

The meeting ended at 17:30 as scheduled in the agenda.

Actions from the meeting

Action owner	**What needs to be done**	**Deadline**
EFSA	Send draft minutes for consultation and publication	19 March 2020 27 March 2020
Network members	Comment on the draft minutes	26 March 2020
EFSA	Prepare and publish Addendum to ChemMon Guidance 2020	15 April 2020
EFSA	EFSA to further discuss the issue of different sampMatCode for different results within the same sample and GBR3 and provide a solution.	15 April 2020
Network Members	Participate in one of the network's themed Task Forces on TEAMS collaboration	Ongoing throughout the year
Network Members	Take initiatives for data quality improvement at national level with network member and in collaboration with Focal Points.	Ongoing throughout the year