EFSA
European Food Safety Authority

Brussels, 7 July 2005, revision 1

TASK FORCE ON ZOONOSES DATA COLLECTION

MINUTES OF THE 3. MEETING
Held in Brussels on 21-22 April 2005

AGENDA:

1. Training on the use of EFSA's electronic web-based reporting system for zoonoses
2. Discussion on the type of information and the way of reporting in the context of the web-based reporting system
    - The respective rights of reporting officers and reporters
    - Use of text forms
    - Reporting of analytical methods
    - Adding new animal species and food/feed categories (the use of contexts, programme contexts and notes)
    - Adding comments, footnotes and notes to tables
    - Use of "remark" and "source of information" fields
    - Reporting antimicrobial susceptibility results
    - Creation of new tables for zoonoses
3. Guidance for the timing of reporting
4. Use of the historical zoonoses data from earlier reporting years
5. Reports from the working groups on zoonoses reports and zoonoses reporting tables and manuals
6. New requests from the Commission and possible new working groups
    - *Salmonella* and *Campylobacter* in broiler meat
    - antimicrobial resistance
7. Any other business
    - next meeting
    - joint meeting of public health and veterinary/food zoonoses experts

PARTICIPANTS:

Members and other national or Commission representatives:
Peter Much (Austria), Luc Vanholme (Belgium), Christodoulos Pipis (Cyprus), Petr Satran (Czech Republic), Ole Heuer (Denmark), Piret Priisalu (Estonia), Maarja Kristian (Estonia), Terhi

Laaksonen (Finland), Niina Tammiranta (Finland), Pierre-Alexandre Beloeil (France), Matthias Hartung (Germany), Dimitris Vourvidis (Greece), Toth Balazs (Hungary), Alma Dudgeon (Ireland), Anne Cummins (Ireland), Paolo Calistri (Italy), Alessandro Ripani (Italy), Nicole Werner-Keiss (Latvia), Vaidas Kiudulas (Lithuania), Joseph Schon (Luxembourg), Quentin Lawson (Malta), Rob van Oosterom (the Netherlands), Stasja Valkenburgh (the Netherlands), Merete Hofshagen (Norway), Jacek Osek (Poland), Patricia Clemente (Portugal), Milos Juras (Slovak Republic), Katica Florjanc (Slovenia), José Luis Paramio Lucas (Spain), Luisa Pulido (Spain), José Luis Sáez LLorente (Spain), Jenny Frössling (Sweden), Harry Bailie (the United Kingdom), Birgitte Borck (ZCC), Jean-Charles Cavitte (the Commission, DG SANCO), Sarolta Idei (the Commission, DG SANCO)

Observers:
Dewan Sibartie (OIE), Juerg Danuser (Switzerland), Annemarie Käsbohrer (private expert)

EFSA:
Pia Mäkelä, Frank Boelaert (Zoonoses monitorting), Gwénaëlle Quivy, Dimitri Vanderheyde, Bertrand De Baenst, Michel Derie (Information Technology), Martine Lartigue (Administrative staff)

MINUTES:

1. TRAINING ON THE USE OF EFSA'S ELECTRONIC WEB-BASED REPORTING SYSTEM FOR ZOONOSES

Gwénaëlle Quivy and Dimitri Vanderheyde from EFSA's Information Technology (IT) unit gave presentations and training on the use of the new web-based reporting system for zoonoses. CD-Roms containing a support package for the use of the system was distributed.

2. DISCUSSION ON THE TYPE OF INFORMATION AND THE WAY OF REPORTING IN THE CONTEXT OF THE WEB-BASED REPORTING SYSTEM

P. Mäkelä explained that one dilemma in the construction of the web-based reporting system was to combine the decision to keep the tables from the previous year to the demands of the new IT based reporting system. Therefore there are still some inconsistencies within the system. However, the terminology in the tables was harmonised in order to comply with the logic of the database structure. The system will be revised for the next year, and some new elements will be added to improve the usability of the system.

2.1. The respective rights of reporting officers and reporters

The user rights of both groups were addressed. P. Mäkelä asked those Member States, which haven't yet formally notified the name of their reporting officer, to send it as soon as possible in order to meet the requirements of the legal framework.

2.2. Use of text forms

The reporting of the narrative part of zoonoses reports was discussed. It was agreed that each animal species, and when necessary food category, should be reported by a separate text form.

Whereas the different monitoring schemes used for same animal species or food category may be reported either by using one form for all the schemes or by using separate form for each monitoring scheme. In case of using only one form the information related to different monitoring schemes should be clearly distinguished.

The text describing the monitoring approaches taken should be explicit enough to enable the understanding and comparison of the results. The information should as a minimum cover the sample type, frequency of sampling, number of samples taken and the analytical methods used.

2.3. Reporting of analytical methods

EFSA has asked the Community Reference Laboratory for *Salmonella* for advice concerning the information to be reported on the analytical methods used. The advice received is annexed. This advice was found valid and useful. The text will be incorporated into the user manual of the web-based reporting system.

2.4. Adding new animal species and food/feed categories (the use of contexts, programme contexts and notes)

EFSA recommended that the reporters would use the pick lists provided in the wizards as far as possible. If new additions are made, special attention should be paid that the new entries are added at the correct level on the lists (as a main category or subcategories). It was agreed that the note in the wizards of the tables should only be used to specify the animal species or food category sampled. There is a need to agree on the definitions of the terms on the programme contexts list. P. Mäkelä promised that this will be done when the reporting manual is revised.

2.5. Adding comments, footnotes and notes to tables

The “comments” function in the tables is intended to be used for general information related to the results reported in the respective row. The footnote can be used to enter information related to the whole table and information entered into it.

2.6. Use of “remark” and “source of information” fields

It was agreed that the “comments” function would be used instead of “remark” column. “Source of information” column could be used to indicate the institute or laboratory where the information derives from.

2.7. Reporting antimicrobial susceptibility results

The reporting of quantitative test results by the antimicrobial susceptibility quantitative tables is always the preferred choice. Then the qualitative tables can be used to summarise this information. There is a potential problem with the breakpoint tables, if for a same zoonotic agent – category (humans/animals/food) combination 2 different sets of breakpoints have been used. The current system offers only one table to report this information. In this case the breakpoints of the dilution method should be reported in the first place. The other set of breakpoints may be then sent separately e.g. by using e-mail.

2.8. Creation of new tables for zoonoses

The reporting of additional zoonoses and indicators by creating new tables and adding them on the report structure will be very welcome.

3. GUIDANCE FOR THE TIMING OF REPORTING

The Zoonoses Collaboration Centre (ZCC) had prepared a proposal for the timing of reporting, in case a Member State is not able to submit a complete report by the legal timeline, end of May. The reporting tables concerning the first group of zoonoses should preferably be completed first to enable the ZCC to start to work on that data. The information on the second group should be reported by 1 July, at the latest. This does obviously not imply that the Member States should not work on all the tables simultaneously. Some comments were received on the draft guidelines on the timing. The revised guidelines are annexed.

4. USE OF THE HISTORICAL ZOONOSES DATA FROM EARLIER REPORTING YEARS

EFSA gave information on the state of play with the migration of the historical data on zoonoses. EFSA has received from the former Community Reference Laboratory most of the historical data from the previous years. The automatic transfer of this information has proved to be problematic due numerous exceptions in the reporting. Therefore it is likely that the main part of the information has to be imputed manually, which will take some time.

5. REPORTS FROM THE WORKING GROUPS ON ZOONOSES REPORTS AND ZOONOSES REPORTING TABLES AND MANUALS

The two working groups have issued their final reports, which are addressed to the Task Force. The Commission will be formally consulted about the reports. Most members supported the merge of the two reports. The members and observers were invited to send further comments on the reports by e-mail. EFSA will prepare a draft merged report for the next meeting, where the reports will be further discussed.

6. NEW REQUESTS FROM THE COMMISSION AND POSSIBLE NEW WORKING GROUPS

EFSA has received a request from the Commission to draft a monitoring scheme for *Campylobacter* and *Salmonella* in broiler meat, to complete the draft monitoring programme on antimicrobial resistance and to analyse the results from the *Salmonella* baseline study in lying hens. The scope of the mandates and the timetables will still be discussed in detail with the Commission. Most likely new workings groups will be set up and the Task Force will be asked to suggest members for these working groups.

In addition information was given on the 3 working groups that EFSA has already decided to set up. The members of the groups have been selected. The working group on *Salmonella* baseline study in laying hens will have its first meeting in May, the working group on design of monitoring protocols will meet in June and the working group on revision of reporting manual in July.

7. ANY OTHER BUSINESS

The next meeting of the Task Force will most likely take place in September 2005.

EFSA informed that it has been asked to organise, in collaboration with the new European Centre for Disease Prevention and Control, a joint meeting between the public health experts and food and veterinary experts in the field of zoonoses reporting. This meeting should take place in the near future. Most members were in favour of having this meeting in September, possibly combined with the Task Force Meeting.

ANNEX I

Reporting of the analytical methods, the level of detail:

The advice received from CRL *Salmonella*:

The laboratories can use international standard methods such as ISO and CEN, but also national standard methods (such as NEN in the Netherlands and DIN in Germany, etc.), or even own (laboratory developed) methods.
If one would like to compare data it would indeed be necessary to have sufficient detailed information on the methods. You could think of asking for the following information:

For conventional ('classic") methods:

1. If a CEN or ISO method is followed: the number of the CEN/ISO method and the year of publication of the used procedure;
2. If a CEN/ISO method is used with modifications, the information of point 1. would be needed as well as the information on the modifications;
3. If a national standard method is followed it might be sufficient if the laboratory gives the number of the national standard method (and the year of publication), depending on the fact whether EFSA is able to obtain these methods from the national standardisation bodies. If this latter is a problem (also the language might be a problem) and if the method is also not available in international literature, then it might be necessary to ask for a more detailed description of the method (like used media, incubation temperatures and times, method of confirmation);
4. If an 'own' method is used it might be sufficient to ask for the reference in the literature. If this is not available it might be necessary to ask for more details (see point 3.);
5. IF not an ISO or CEN method is used, is the method validated and/or compared to the relevant ISO/CEN method?

If molecular (PCR) methods are used:

6. Name of the test and manufacturer;
7. Use of the PCR in combination with a conventional method. Which step of the conventional method is replaced by the PCR (e.g. confirmation step)?
8. Is the test validated? If so, by which organisation (AFNOR, AOAC, MICROVAL,...)

If immunological (serological) methods are used:

9. Name of the test and manufacturer;
10. Use of the test in combination with a conventional method. Which step of the conventional method is replaced by the test (e.g. confirmation step)?
11. Type of test (see your suggestions);
12. Is the test validated? If so, by which organisation (AFNOR, AOAC, MICROVAL,..)?

ANNEX II

04 May 2005 /BBO

To the reporting officers, reporting national data on zoonosis in accordance with Council Directive 92/117/EEC, The Zoonosis Directive.

Ranking of Zoonotic agents.

This document has been drafted to provide the reporting officers with an order in which to report data on zoonotic agents for 2004. In the Community report on zoonotic agents and the sources hereof for 2003, data for a total of 11 zoonotic agents were reported along with antimicrobial resistance data for some of these agents, including Salmonella and Campylobacter.
In previous years, some of the data has been submitted after 31 May - the official deadline for submitting data in accordance with the Zoonosis Directive. Overdue reporting has delayed the process of compiling and analysing data and has, in turn, delayed submission of the Trends and Sources Report to the European Commission. For the first time, data for 2004 must be submitted using the Zoonoses Online Reporting System and therefor, we foresee that this may cause further difficulty in meeting the official submission deadline.

The new online reporting system allows reporting officers to indicate completedness and allows report submission to EFSA, even though not all tables have been fully completed. We would therefore encourage all MS to submit reports to EFSA no later than the 31 May, even though not all report tables have been completed. An updated, complete report, can then be submitted at a later date, prior to 1 July 2005, at which time the zoonoses data for analysis will exported from the database.

In order to facilitate analysis of the data, we suggest that all MS enter data in the order listed below. This will ensure that reports submitted by the official deadline will, at least, have some complete subsets of data from all MS.

Group 1

- Tuberculosis
- Brucellosis
- Trichinella
- Salmonella
    - Humans
    - Food
        - Poultry
        - Pork
        - Beef
        - Others
- Salmonella
    - Production animals
        - Poultry

Group 2

- Salmonella (continued)
    - Production animals
        - Pigs
        - Cattle
        - Others
    - Wild animals
    - Feed
- Echinococcus
- Campylobacter
- Rabies
- Yersinia
- Toxoplasmosis
- Listeria
- VTEC
- Antimicrobial resistance