"EURL-Feedback-Survey 2010" - Comments

OVERVIEW

1. Comments concerning additional obstacles hindering lab development:

| Subjects of Concern | No. of comments (out of 93) | ln % |
|---|--------------------------------|------|
| Lack of finances | 41 | 44 |
| Lack of instruments | 28 | 30 |
| Lack of time | 13 | 14 |
| Lack of personnel | 13 | 14 |
| Lack of Support from politics/ hierarchy (e.g. low priority) | 12 | 13 |
| Extensive QC incl. PTs | 12 | 13 |
| Deficient (e.g. inflexible / frequently changing) administration/organization | 9 | 10 |
| Lack of consumables | 8 | 9 |
| Uncertainty about future/ frustration | 7 | 8 |
| Limited lab size | 7 | 8 |
| Lack of training | 4 | 4 |
| Limited space in lab | 2 | 2 |
| Suggestions / Comments / Criticism: | 6 | 7 |

2. Additional comments, suggestions or feedback on the EU-RL-activities

| | | No. | of commen (out of 81) | its |
|------------------|--|-------------|--------------------------|------|
| Topic of concern | Subtopic of concern | By topic | By subtopic | ln % |
| | Reduce No. of PTs /Compulsory PTs | | 7 | 9 |
| | Reconsider Pesticide Scope | | 4 | 5 |
| | Improve Coordination / Merge PTs | | 3 | 4 |
| | Optimize Commodity scope | | 3 | 4 |
| PTs | Optimize Reporting Tool | 27 | 3 | 4 |
| F13 | Improve Communication | | 2 | 2 |
| | Optimize Pesticide Levels | | 1 | 1 |
| | Increase No. of PTs | | 1 | 1 |
| | Speed-up Report Distribution | | 1 | 1 |
| | Other | | 2 | 2 |
| | Translate Documents into local languages | | 5 | 6 |
| Information | About availability/ analysis/ behaviour of pesticides | 14 | 4 | 5 |
| Dissemination | About method validation/ accreditation, QC |] '* | 3 | 4 |
| | Other | | 2 | 2 |
| | Open Workshops for OfLs | | 8 | 10 |
| Workshops | Improve Information Distribution about Workshops | 15 | 4 | 5 |
| Workshops | Optimize Content of Workshops | 13 | 2 | 2 |
| | Coordinate / Combine Workshops | | 1 | 1 |
| | Consider Lab Limitations (in CCP, EUPTs, Method Developm.) | | 4 | 5 |
| | Put more Focus on Feed | 1 | 3 | 4 |
| Other | Comments related to CCP - | 25 | 4 | 5 |
| Other | Comments related to Method Development / Validation |] 23 | 5 | 6 |
| | Feedback on this Survey |] | 4 | 5 |
| | Other (Text in Italics) | | 7 | 9 |
| Positiv Feedback | | | 20 | 25 |

1. Comments concerning additional obstacles hindering lab development:

Topics of Concern:

| | Lack of finances | Lack of instruments | Lack of time | Lack of personnel | Lack of Support from politics/ hierarchy (e.g. low priority) | Extensive QC incl. PTs | Deficient (e.g. inflexible or frequently changing) administration/organization | Lack of consumables | Uncertainty about future/ frustration | Limited Lab Size | Lack of training | Limited space in Lab |
|---|------------------|----------------------------|---------------------|--------------------------|---|------------------------|--|----------------------------|--|------------------|------------------|----------------------|
| Our institute has problem with lack of finances. | X | | | | | | | | | | | |
| Lack of a good equipment! | | Х | | | | | | | | | | |
| We have only 1 GC/MS-MS and 1 LC/MS-MS and 3 well trained people. So, we have really limitated with the available instrumental and we have developed methods for the analysis of pesticides residues on vegetables and fruits, but not for the others foods, like we would like. Regards | | x | | | | | | | | | | |
| Lack of sufficient funds for the acquisition of LC-MS/MS and other back-up instrumentation. | X | X | | | | | | | | | | |
| The bigest obstacle in improving lab performance is not enough appropriate equipment and also old and no longer efficient equipment. The main reason for this is not understanding of this work and needs from the side of the state organ which should give financial support. | x | x | | | x | | | | | | | |
| equipment is a big problem | | X | | | | | | | | | | |
| The enlargement of the scope of analytes in our lab mainly depends on our analytical possibilities (modern instrumentation snd training on new methods). | | X | | | | | | | | | x | |
| We are small laboratory which is a part of Scientific institute, so our main problems are related to the lack of money for instrumentation. We have limited lab scope of substances because we have only one GC equipped with single quadrupole MS and LC that we have is equipped with DAD/FLD which are not appropriate for MRMs. | X | X | | | | | | | | X | | |
| Abcense of new and modern basic and accessory equipment. | | X | | | | | | | | | | |
| No1 obstacle: no LC/MS/MS system in my lab (An Agilent 1100 LC instrument with UV/DAD/FLD maybe nice, but already insufficient for improving lab performance) | | X | | | | | | | | | | |
| The biggest problem is fact, that we are not equipped in LC/MS-MS. The reason is not enough money in our budget. | X | X | | | | | | | | | | |
| We do not have additional obstacles, but I would like to emphasize that we have very big deficiencies on LC field and minor deficiencies on GC field. | | X | | | | | | | | | | |
| Financial is the main issue - underfunded projects from e.g. EU - limits adequate training and competence development | x | | | | | | | | | | x | |
| Currently, the official budgets are not enough for needs of the labs | X | | | | | | | | | | | |
| Due to cutbacks on the budget. | X | | | | | | | | | | | |
| Lack of money for investment in new instruments and personnel. | X | X | | X | | | | | | | | |
| financial problem | X | | | | | | | | | | | |
| Insufficient finance resources on new methods introduction and development | X | | | | | | | | | | | |

| | Lack of finances | Lack of instruments | Lack of time | Lack of personnel | Lack of Support from politics/ hierarchy (e.g. low priority) | Extensive QC incl. PTs | Deficient (e.g. inflexible or frequently changing) administration/organization | Lack of consumables | Uncertainty about future/ frustration | Limited Lab Size | Lack of training | Limited space in Lab |
|--|------------------|---------------------|---------------------|--------------------------|---|------------------------|--|----------------------------|--|------------------|-------------------------|----------------------|
| The effects of the economic crisis, that just started | X | | | | | | | | | | | |
| capacity of laboratory | X | X | | X | | | | | | | | |
| Funding problems. | X | | | | | | | | | | | |
| FUNDS! | X | | | | | | | | | | | |
| capacity of lab | X | X | | X | | | | | | | | |
| There are some financial problems with the aquisition in due time of reagents and standard substances regarding the proficiency tests participation. It is very difficult to have all the substances between different PT. Most of the substances that are the object of a PT but are not in the scope of XXX can't be achieved in due time. | x | | | | | | | x | | | | |
| cost of pesticide residue powder, acces to metabolite compounds, it's not easy to found them | x | | | | | | | x | | | | |
| Decreasing level of government funding particularly in R&D | X | | | | X | | | | | | | |
| Economical support from our administration to improve or keep the quality of management of lab. | x | | | | X | | | | | | | |
| There are no solutions ensuring financial support for NRL from the government. | x | | | | x | | | | | | | |
| Because of the crisis in economy, we fear about the sufficient level of the consumables and the cost of the service of our instrumentation in the future. | x | x | | | | | | x | x | | | |
| I think that the highest obstacle hindering the development of our lab is the lack of financial resources. | x | | | | | | | | | | | |
| The lack of financial resources. | X | | | | | | | | | | | |
| There is always discussion about the personal costs/instrument investments. | x | x | | x | | | | | | | | |
| The biggest barrier is financial difficulty. | X | | | | | | | | | | | |
| Lack of financial resources for participating in scientific workshops and conferences. | x | | | | | | | | | | | |
| Our main problem is lack of money; pesticide's analysis requires expensive equipment. and to stay on top it's necessary to renew equipment. | x | x | | | | | | | | | | |
| Financial deficiency | X | | | | | | | | | | | |
| Unfortunately, the level of officials labs finances are fewer, years by years. At the present time, the instrumentation is more and more significant (and also more and more expensive) in the pesticides area and it's the limit factor of labs developement. | x | x | | | | | | | | | | |
| lack of funds, lack of place to work, small laboratories | X | | | | | | | | | X | | X |
| lack of place to work | X | | | | | | | | | | | X |
| Biggest issue is resources for validation. We are a relatively small lab making it hard to dedicate people fully to validation + equipment use (LC MS) | | | | X | | x | | | | x | | |
| Laboratories have not got enough money for development from our authority | X | | | | X | | | | | | | |

| | | | | | ics/ | | u. | | | | | |
|--|-------------------------|----------------------------|--------------|--------------------------|---|-------------------------------|--|----------------------------|--|------------------|-------------------------|----------------------|
| | Lack of finances | Lack of instruments | time | Lack of personnel | Lack of Support from politics/ hierarchy (e.g. low priority) | Extensive QC incl. PTs | Deficient (e.g. inflexible or frequently changing) administration/organization | Lack of consumables | Uncertainty about future/ frustration | Limited Lab Size | Lack of training | Limited space in Lab |
| | Lack of | Lack of | Lack of time | Lack of | Lack of hierard | Extensi | Deficiel frequer admini | Lack of | Uncert frustra | Limited | Lack of | Limited |
| En las condiciones económicas actuales será imposible mantener el nivel que hemos conseguido; el análisis de residuos de plaguicidas que hacemos es demasiados caro, los controles de calidad exigidos lo hacen inviable. | x | | | | | x | | | x | | | |
| Mangel an Personal, Gerätetechnik und Verbrauchsmaterial auf Grund angespannter Haushaltslage. | x | X | | X | | | | X | | | | |
| Lack of staff in the lab area chronologically badly co- ordinated proficiency test | | | | X | | X | | | | | | |
| Same person working in few different fields, egz.: pesticide residue analysis, alcohol analysis, water analysis and other. | | | | X | | | | | | | | |
| a)In relation to the workshops /trainings we do not have any information about these. b)In relation to personnel the level is syfficient but the two main analyzers (Agronomist and Chemist) are on contract so without them we will be at the part "very big deficiencies" c)In relation to the consumambles and training on methods it happens especially now because of the deficiencies of money | x | | | X | | | | x | x | | X | |
| We are a little lab that have to work in many differents kinds of analyses. That makes that instrumentation and staff are not avalaible to perform all the improvements that we wanted to. The acreditation is sometimes an obstacle also since it is quite close to changes in methodology and improvements. | | x | | x | | x | | | | x | | |
| now, the lack of staff and the whole organization of the laboratory prevent us from reaching the excellent performance, even the laboratory escapes ative always quickly and successfully. | | x | | | | | | | | | | |
| There are deficits only in the personal staffing | | X | | | | | | | | | | |
| Too few persons for method develoment | | X | | | | | | | | | | |
| the main problem we have, is the low number of people whom we can dedicate to the developement of the methods. we have an intensive routinary activity and the ratio between activity and personnel doesn't allow us to improve much more our performance level. | | x | | | | | | | | | | |
| Moyens Humains manqué de materiels et versez développeur fel de la surface du du laboratoire de Chromatographie Totalement saturée | | X | | | | | | | | x | | |
| method development and validation | | | | | | X | | | | | | |
| Limited time for method validation and development. Instrumentation not optimal for screening of unknown analytes. | | X | X | | | | | | | | | |
| Data processing is becoming more time-consuming and arduous. | | | X | | | | | | | | | |
| There is a lot of routine work staying in the focus of our lab so that there is a lack of time do work in the global development of our lab. | | | x | | | | | | | | | |
| lot of routine work | | | X | | | | | | | | | |
| to much desk tasks and not enough time to work on methodes and instruments | | | x | | | | | | | | | |
| Additional analytical main focuses. | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| Too much emphasis on proficiency testing therefore limiting the capacity we have to do routine work and staff training. | | | X | | | X | | | | | X | |

| | Lack of finances | Lack of instruments | Lack of time | Lack of personnel | Lack of Support from politics/ hierarchy (e.g. low priority) | Extensive QC incl. PTs | Deficient (e.g. inflexible or frequently changing) administration/organization | Lack of consumables | Uncertainty about future/ frustration | Limited Lab Size | Lack of training | Limited space in Lab |
|---|------------------|----------------------------|---------------------|--------------------------|---|------------------------|--|----------------------------|---------------------------------------|------------------|------------------|----------------------|
| Too many different analytical determinations/work areas each with a small number of samples - often more effort for quality assurance is needed than for analyzing samples. | | | x | | | x | | | | | | |
| Development is interesting, but there is not enough time. | | | X | | | | | | | | | |
| Laboratory apparatus has one GC/MS apparatus and a LC/MS/ MS. Perform monitoring and control. Do not have time to introduce new methods and pestitsiid | | X | X | | | | | | | | | |
| Not enough time to do the work | | | X | | | | | | | | | |
| To small number of same origin samples | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| Low flexibility of the administrative processes. | | | | | | | X | | | | | |
| Permanent changes in structure and administrative workflow. | | | | | | | x | | | | | |
| planning dependability | | | | | | | X | | | | | |
| We have problems of organizations. | | | | | | | X | | | | | |
| Continuous reorganisation processes and budget cuts. | Х | | | | | | Х | | | | | |
| Too many management staff changes that make difficult the development of laboratory activity | | | | | | | x | | | | | |
| Pesticides are not a priority for our administration, therefor we do not get the resources we would like. | x | | | | x | | | | | | | |
| because a reorganization of the analytical laboratories, probably aur activity is going to be transferred in a another laboratory, so is very difficult to improve tests an performances. | | | | | x | | x | | | | | |
| Headquaters policy | | | | | X | | X | | | | | |
| Besides the lack of personnel, our main obstacle is the lack of institutional support and serious commitment to help our development. | | | | X | x | | | | | | | |
| It is getting impossible to fullfill the demands of SANCO 10684/2009 for our too small lab! The feeling of having no chance to do it right is frustrating. We are rather thinking of giving up than trying to develop. | | | | | | X | | | x | x | | |
| my lab is part of a 8 labs network; reorganization of that network has a direct impact on ours activities. At this moment the reorganization is not totaly established so it's difficult to have good prospective ideas on different fields (cereals, feeding stuff, fruit and vegetable) | | | | | X | | | | x | | | |
| We have very little institutional support from the Government. The Technical personnel in the Government is helping us in everything that they can, however, there is no support from the Politics to the pesticide residues lab: lack of personnel for the lab and lack of financial support. | x | | | x | x | | | | | | | |
| Our laboratory is a small one and carry out small numebrs of test on a small number of sample is not efficient. We indeed carry out test on residues only on a irregular frequency. We are reorganising our services and we do not know if in the future we will keep this activity alive within our lab or will outsource to another official lab. | | | | | | | | | x | x | | |
| The agency to which my lab belongs is under redeployment, so it's undecided the destiny of my lab. | | | | | | | | | x | | | |

| | Lack of finances | Lack of instruments | Lack of time | Lack of personnel | Lack of Support from politics/ hierarchy (e.g. low priority) | Extensive QC incl. PTs | Deficient (e.g. inflexible or frequently changing) administration/organization | Lack of consumables | Uncertainty about future/ frustration | Limited Lab Size | Lack of training | Limited space in Lab |
|--|------------------|---------------------|---------------------|--------------------------|---|------------------------|--|----------------------------|--|------------------|------------------|----------------------|
| Although we feel to have sufficient personnel and instrumention, there are still many fields where pesticide residue analysis is challenging and will be challenging in the future, because residue definitions are changing (and sometimes analytical issues seem to be not taken into account!) new pesticides are introduced into the market and new problems arise (e.g. nicotin in mushroom). It is not possible to address all the problems at the same time. That is hard for politicians to understand, but nevertheless this is a fact. | | | | | | | x | | | | | |
| necessity to work in a laboratory expressly devoted for the control of the foods. Currently our old laboratory devoted to the food control has been englobed in an agency for the environmental control where its mission makes marginal such control. | | | | | x | | | | | | | |
| Difficulty in purchase of consumables, reagents and auxiliar instruments. | X | X | | | | | | X | | | | |
| Management of reference substances which are not always commercially available | | | | | | x | | x | | | | |
| Low productivity due to the number of working hours. The wide range of analytes and matrices to analyze. ISO 17025 Accreditation. | | | X | | | x | | | | | | |
| statiscs knowledge for accreditation of pesticeds not included in EN 15662:2009 tabA and B | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| Accreditation requirements ISO17025 for official laboratories make it quite impossible to change for better methodology. Impossibility to implement flexible scope for pesticides residues. Lack of reference material. Extreme difficulty for the validation of methods (very expensive, extremely time consuming) | x | | X | | | X | | X | | | | |
| the management of quality costs very much, and is too time consuming; it is not necessary to aim at pertfection Lack of managerial staff, so too much administrative work!!! | | | x | x | | x | | | | | | |
| Total | 41 | 28 | 13 | 13 | 12 | 12 | 9 | 8 | 7 | 7 | 4 | 2 |

Suggestions / Comments / Criticism:

Suggestions / Comments / Criticism:

We would appreciate to have more opportunities to collaborate more closely with EU-RLs. Specifically single residue lab in Stuttgart is indicating trends in pesticide residue analysis.

It would be very useful if you organize some courses opened to Official Lab and not only to NRL.

More examples for use in laboratory SANCO 10684/2009

Very poor support by NRL

LOW LEVEL OF INTERACTION BETWEEN NRL AND OFL.

Lack of staff in the lab area chronologically badly co-ordinated proficiency test

2. Additional comments, suggestions or feedback on the EU-RL-activities

Suggestions / Comments / Criticism:

| Suggestions / Comments / Criticism | Reduce No.of PTs | Reconsider pesticide scope | Improve coordin. / Merge PTs | Optimize Commodity scope | Optimize Reporting Tool | Improve communication | Increase No. of PTs | Optimize Pesticide Levels | Speed-up Report Distribution | Other (Text in Italics) | Translate info into local languages | More info about availability / analysis behaviour of pesticides | More info about method validation / accreditation QC | Other (Text in Italics) | Open Workshops for OfLs | Improve Info. Distribution about WS | Optimize Content of Workshops | Coordinate / Combine WSs | Consider Lab Limitations (in CCP, EUPTs, Method Developm.) | Put more Focus on Feed | Comments related to CCP - | Comments related to Method Development / Validation | Feedback on this Survey | Other (Text in Italics) |
|--|------------------|----------------------------|------------------------------|--------------------------|-------------------------|-----------------------|---------------------|---------------------------|------------------------------|-------------------------|-------------------------------------|--|--|-------------------------|-------------------------|-------------------------------------|-------------------------------|--------------------------|---|------------------------|---------------------------|--|-------------------------|-------------------------|
| SUBTOPICS | R | 2 | = | 0 | | - Ts | - | 0 | S | 0 | | ≥ ल FORM | | | woi | | | | ОШ | | ОТН | | IĽ. | 0 |
| We would like to suggest to make | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| available official documents in localized language. | | | | | | | | | | | X | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| To avoid any confusion, could you translate the instructions into French. | | | | | | | | | | | X | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| not easy to understand all details because we have not the opportunies to speack english all the time it's maybe a source of mistake it's possible to clik on the french buttom to have the translate Thanks | | | | | | | | | | | X | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| korespondencje w języku polskim | | | | | | | | | | | X | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| We'd appreciate more communication and informational materials in Polish. The numbers of EU-Proficiency Tests is too much for the capacity of our lab. Sometimes the number of enquiries inhibit the daily work. | X | | | | | | | | | | X | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| better coordination of the proficiency test from the different EU-RL would be very helpful! | | | X | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| EUPT's demands lot of lab time so that we would appreciate not more than 2 test per year. | X | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| Development, introduction and implementation of new methods and mandatory scope for monitoring programmes should be adapted more to the limitations of the labs in the 27 Eu countries. Scope of EU-PTs should be reconsidered, taking into account the statements above. Screening PT should not be organised as PT but as a research project with clear aims, only with interested participants. | | x | | | | | | | | X | | | | | | | | | x | | x | | | |
| 2 EUPT's per year should be an objective to have a bettrer calibration | X | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| It would be easier for the lab, if there are not 4 or 5 importen EUPT's per year. | X | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| In the area of high fat content methods and this year with cereals, the choice of matrices for PT's has not been helpful. The last three PT's have been carried out in matrices which represent a very small number of our total samples. But it should be remembered that these PT's are being used to judge our quality systems for accreditation. Problems with the PT's then become general accreditation issues. In the last 3 PT's we have had to do quite a bit of validation work just to take part in the PT's for a matrix which represents a very small number of our total samples. This should not be the primary function of a PT. | | | | X | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |

| Suggestions / Comments / Criticism | Reduce No. of PTs | Reconsider pesticide scope | Improve coordin. / Merge PTs | Optimize Commodity scope | Optimize Reporting Tool | Improve communication | Increase No. of PTs | Optimize Pesticide Levels | Speed-up Report Distribution | Other (Text in Italics) | Translate info into local languages | More info about availability / analysis behaviour of pesticides | | | Open Workshops for OfLs | Improve Info. Distribution about WS | Optimize Content of Workshops | Coordinate / Combine WSs | Consider Lab Limitations (in CCP, EUPTs, Method Developm.) | | Comments related to Method Development / Validation | Feedback on this Survey | Other (Text in Italics) |
|--|-------------------|----------------------------|------------------------------|--------------------------|-------------------------|-----------------------|---------------------|---------------------------|------------------------------|-------------------------|-------------------------------------|---|-------|----|-------------------------|-------------------------------------|-------------------------------|--------------------------|--|-----|--|-------------------------|-------------------------|
| SUBTOPICS | | | | | Р | Ts | | | | | INI | FORN | IATIO | NC | WOI | RKS | НОІ | PS | | OTH | ER | | |
| please fewer mandatory EUPTs, e.g. participation only every 2. year mandatory | X | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| When preparing EU ring trials, a closer view to practice is essential, e.g. the concentration level of spiked pesticides is too high!! Please keep in mind, that OLs have a lot of other tasks to fulfill - so, please, reduce your own demands on OLs (number of ring trials, surveys,) to a minimum. | x | | | | | | | x | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| a combination of the SRM with FV or alternatively C is a good way to minimise the capacities labs need to take part in all EU PT's, which are necessary like in 2009 | X | | X | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| In proficiency tests I would like to see more those compounds that cause most of the MRL exceedings and residues. Method development and method validation done by EU-RLs are very important and useful for us. | | X | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| It would be very helpfull for our lab, if the PRELIMINARY results of the proficiency tests could be available in less than two month. Some of the forms for the transmission of the results could be improved regarding for example sums of pesticides. | | | | | X | | | | X | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| Before adding compounds like glyphosate in test materials it would be helpfull to have first support from CRLs to establish the method, then taking part in validation tests/experiments with other labs and finally testing the own proficiency by attending PTs | | x | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| The information list which OL are expected to participate in EUPT by the EURL should be communicated to the NRL when the announcement in published. | | | | | | X | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| Organize a proficiency test for a selected number of pesticides in a specific matrix class | | X | | X | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| Information list which official labs are expected to participate in the EUPT by the EURL, should be communicated to NRL when Announcement is published. | | | | | | X | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| EUC are really beneficial to us, but I would appreciate an extension of the scope of tested materials, from cereals towards complex feed mixtures. Thank you. | | | | X | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| Please combine several proficiency tests (e.g. SRM and C4) to minimize the work (time!!!) for the labs. We would prefer a single workshop | | | X | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| covering all 4 areas at the same time every year, because it is more efficient with respect to absence from the lab. It would be nice to be organised in one place and then divided into groups, if possible. Also, hands on training is less important than having the possibility to ask specific questions and exchange experience on every day issues. | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | x | X | | | | | |

| Suggestions / Comments / Criticism | Reduce No. of PTs | Reconsider pesticide scope | Improve coordin. / Merge PTs | Optimize Commodity scope | Optimize Reporting Tool | Improve communication | Increase No. of PTs | Optimize Pesticide Levels | Speed-up Report Distribution | Other (Text in Italics) | Translate info into local languages | More info about availability / analysis behaviour of pesticides | More info about method validation / accreditation QC | Other (Text in Italics) | Open Workshops for OfLs | Improve Info. Distribution about WS | Optimize Content of Workshops | Coordinate / Combine WSs | Consider Lab Limitations (in CCP, EUPTs, Method Developm.) | Put more Focus on Feed | Comments related to CCP - | Comments related to Method Development / Validation | Feedback on this Survey | Other (Text in Italics) |
|---|-------------------|----------------------------|------------------------------|--------------------------|-------------------------|-----------------------|---------------------|---------------------------|------------------------------|-------------------------|-------------------------------------|---|--|-------------------------|-------------------------|-------------------------------------|-------------------------------|--------------------------|--|------------------------|---------------------------|--|-------------------------|-------------------------|
| SUBTOPICS | | | | | Р | Ts | | | | | INF | ORM | ATIO | ИС | WO | RKS | НО | PS | | (| OTH | ER | | |
| easier use of the software, now it's time consuming entering the results of PT test | | | | | X | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| Training activities possibly open to national official laboratories to overcome a lack of support by the NRLs | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | X | | | | | | | | | |
| workshops that are organised should always be open for ALL labs or at least the information should be distributed to ALL labs Priority setting of the RL should be clear to all labs. | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | x | | | | | | | | | |
| IT IS NOT SCHEDULED ANY AVAILABLE TIME (i.e 5 min) FOR SELECTED EACH TIME NRLS OR MS TO PRESENT THEIR WORK OR OPINIONS DURING CRL-PESTICIDES WORKSHOPS. DISCCUSSION IS NOT ENOUGH. ADDITIONALLY, SOMETIMES THE PROPOSALS OF NATIONAL REPRESENTATIVES OR PARTICIPANTS TO THE ABOVE MENTIONED WORKSHOPS, REGARDING METHOD VALIDATION, ARE IGNORED. | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | x | | | | | | | |
| Since we are an official lab, but an NRL, we can not attend to the pesticide CRLs training worshops, so we do not access to trainig and information related. It could be a great help for us and other official labs that can not attend to the training worshops, if you could upload in the CRLs portal some video and / or presentations with training on methods, and related information. | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | x | x | | | | | | | | |
| About the events organized by the 4 EU-RLs we would like to highlight the following: Due to official laboratories cannot attend the trainings, we miss all the practical information given there and therefore we cannot take advantage of it is taught. May be the EU-RL could edit a training video to play on the web and the laboratories could pay for it. Related to the Workshops our laboratory was only able to attend the one held in our country. It might be taken into account to conduct this type of event, in addition of the in situ's way, on line too. Our suggestion is to give us the opportunity to register on the web and attend on line, if not on real time, after the workshop has taken place; we let that to your consideration. | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | x | | | | | | | | |
| I think it would be possible for COM to help, not only the NRL but also the other official laboratories, namely those situated on ultraperipheric regions of Europe. This is particulary important for the training and participation on workshops, seminars, etc. Concerning the proficiency tests, it is my opinion that CRL's should not present z-scores to laboratories when the distribution of results are not normal or bimodal. | | | | | | | | | | X | | | | | X | | | | | | | | | |

| Suggestions / Comments / Criticism | Reduce No.of PTs | Reconsider pesticide scope | Improve coordin. / Merge PTs | Optimize Commodity scope | Optimize Reporting Tool | Improve communication | Increase No. of PTs | Optimize Pesticide Levels | Speed-up Report Distribution | Other (Text in Italics) | Translate info into local languages | More info about availability / analysis behaviour of pesticides | More info about method validation / accreditation QC | Other (Text in Italics) | Open Workshops for OfLs | Improve Info. Distribution about WS | Optimize Content of Workshops | Coordinate / Combine WSs | Consider Lab Limitations (in CCP, EUPTs, Method Developm.) | Put more Focus on Feed | Comments related to CCP - | Comments related to Method Development / Validation | Feedback on this Survey | Other (Text in Italics) |
|---|------------------|----------------------------|------------------------------|--------------------------|-------------------------|-----------------------|---------------------|---------------------------|------------------------------|-------------------------|-------------------------------------|---|--|-------------------------|-------------------------|-------------------------------------|-------------------------------|--------------------------|--|------------------------|---------------------------|--|-------------------------|-------------------------|
| | Reduce | Recons | Improv | Optimiz | Optimiz | Improv | Increas | Optimi | Speed- | Other (| Transla | More in analysi | More in accredi | Other (| Open V | Improv | Optimiz | Coordi | Consid EUPTs | Put mo | Comme | Comme Develo | Feedba | Other (|
| SUBTOPICS | | | | | P | Ts | | | | | INF | FORM | ATIC | NC | WO | RKS | НО | PS | | (| ОТН | ER | | |
| I think that the involvement of the Official Laboratories in EU-RL activities is very important. I have appreciate very much the possibility to partecipate to Proficiency tests in the pesticide residues field as those in dioxins and PCBs field. I hope that these activities can be extended to other fields as that of the veterinary drugs residues, because we are an official laboratory involved also in these kind of controls. I have also a request for EU-RL laboratories: is possible to allow the partecipation of the OLs, and not only of NRLs, to the worshop/trainig organized by the EU-RLs? | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | x | | | | | | | | | |
| Due to financial difficulty we cannot afford to participate to yours training or workshops. We would be very glad to receive some material from these workshops, if that is possible to be better informed. More training for OF labs on methods of | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | X | x | | | | | | | | |
| analisys We thing that by now, whorshop are for us of minor impact because we are not able to travel and I know that there are mor labs with the same problem. So we thing that it would be interesting to resume the agreements or the information in the web page. | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | ^ | x | | | | | | | | |
| I would appreciate an actualization of the MRM catalog for the AP4000 - a lot of analytes we have in out scope (feedants) are missing. | | | | | | | | | | | | | | X | | | | | | | | | | |
| Indicazione di disponibilità di materiali di riferimento certificati More examples of the use of representative analytes | | | | | | | | | | | | X | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| EU-RL/NRL/OL for CF: more focus on feedingstuffs, mixed and processed feed material. MRLs for these materials are very often 0,01 ppm (default value), findings on the reporting level may be an exceedance of permitted level. | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | X | | | | |
| more feedingstuff inspection | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | X | | | | |
| - EN 15662 update - improving activity on method development to analyse all pesticide according to residue definitions | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | X | | X |
| - some more information in connection with standard substances (info about stability of standard mixtures, info where to buy some metabolites,) - to focus more attention on difficult matrix/pesticide combinations (within multiresidual methods) | | | | | | | | | | | | X | | | | | | | | | | X | | |
| I am looking for information about analysis on feed | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | X | | | | |
| The lack of reactivity on new matrix and/analyte would be minor if The CRL took in charge with the management of analytical development | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | X | | |

| Suggestions / Comments / Criticism | Reduce No.of PTs | Reconsider pesticide scope | Improve coordin. / Merge PTs | Optimize Commodity scope | Optimize Reporting Tool | Improve communication | Increase No. of PTs | Optimize Pesticide Levels | Speed-up Report Distribution | Other (Text in Italics) | Translate info into local languages | More info about availability / analysis behaviour of pesticides | More info about method validation / accreditation QC | Other (Text in Italics) | Open Workshops for OfLs | Improve Info. Distribution about WS | Optimize Content of Workshops | Coordinate / Combine WSs | Consider Lab Limitations (in CCP, EUPTs, Method Developm.) | Put more Focus on Feed | Comments related to CCP - | Comments related to Method Development / Validation | Feedback on this Survey | Other (Text in Italics) |
|--|------------------|----------------------------|------------------------------|--------------------------|-------------------------|-----------------------|---------------------|---------------------------|------------------------------|-------------------------|-------------------------------------|---|--|-------------------------|-------------------------|-------------------------------------|-------------------------------|--------------------------|--|------------------------|---------------------------|--|-------------------------|-------------------------|
| SUBTOPICS | | | | | Р | Ts | | | | | INF | FORN | IATIO | ИС | WO | RKS | HOI | PS | | (| OTH | ER | | |
| As NRL, we appreciate greatly the CRL's work in all areas (EUPT, workshop, publications)and also in resolution of analytical problems. Just a suggestion, we need more informations about the metabolites and their analyses. To be informed about evolutions | | | | | | | | | | | | x | | x | | | | | | | | | | |
| concerning the european regulations EURLs could be more active in arranging metabolite standards which are not commercially available. EURL-AO could be more proactive in selection of analytes included in EU coordinated monitoring programme and rational behind it. Is this questionaire an initiative of the EURLs themselves? I would have expected a harmonised questionaire applicable to all EURLs from the COM | | | | | | | | | | | | x | | ^ | | | | | | | x | | x | |
| We are expecting training courses in methods developed by CRLs. | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | X | | | | | | | | | |
| More R&D support from CRLs e.g. methods for individual dithiocarbamates widely used | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | X | | |
| We would like to have better communication and support from the EU-RLs in relation to the drawing of the Community Monitoring Program, taking in to account both the real needs to be monitor and the workload of the labs (especially of the small countries) | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | x | | x | | | |
| Provide information on analytical methods, their validation, information and tools for quality conrol. | | | | | | | | | | | | | X | | | | | | | | | | | |
| More training on methods and instrument operations! | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | X | | | | | | | | | |
| I have completed this questionnaire as an individual- I suspect that other individuals in the same organisation may also complete the survey which could bias the overall results. It would be more appropriate to obtain a single response for each laboratory. | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | X | |
| I would suggest initiating a higher level of dialogue with the national laboratories with a view to ensuring that the work carried out by the EU-RL deals with issues that are relevant to the work of these laboratories. When advice, relevant to pesticide control activites, is provided to the Commission it would be useful if this advice is shared with the member states so that they are aware of the advice and can comment if they consider this necessary. In many cases the advice relates to the co-ordinated monitoring programme and it would be useful to know why certain recommendations are made to the Commission. | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | x | | X | | | |

| Suggestions / Comments / Criticism | Reduce No. of PTs | Reconsider pesticide scope | Improve coordin. / Merge PTs | Optimize Commodity scope | Optimize Reporting Tool | Improve communication | Increase No. of PTs | Optimize Pesticide Levels | Speed-up Report Distribution | Other (Text in Italics) | Translate info into local languages | More info about availability / analysis behaviour of pesticides | | | Open Workshops for OfLs | Improve Info. Distribution about WS | Optimize Content of Workshops | Coordinate / Combine WSs | Consider Lab Limitations (in CCP, EUPTs, Method Developm.) | Put more Focus on Feed | | Comments related to Method Development / Validation | Feedback on this Survey | Other (Text in Italics) |
|---|-------------------|----------------------------|------------------------------|--------------------------|-------------------------|-----------------------|---------------------|---------------------------|------------------------------|-------------------------|-------------------------------------|---|-------|-----------|-------------------------|-------------------------------------|-------------------------------|--------------------------|--|------------------------|--|---|-------------------------|-------------------------|
| SUBTOPICS | | | | | Р | Ts | | | | | INI | FORM | IATIO | WORKSHOPS | | | | OTHER | | | | | | |
| In my opinion, it is not ideal to do this survey / evaluation for all EU-RL together, because there are differencies among them and overall evaluation avoid to distinguish between good and poor EU-RL. Therefore my evaluation has to be taken as an average view In addition, I have two concrete comments 1. The level of instructions for participation in PT's is sometimes (only from some of EU-RL) not fully clear and unambiguous and then we have to ask for clarification 2. Regarding submission of PT results, the inserting of reporting limits (RL) for non-detected results into web application is time consuming (and from our point of view maybe useless). Couldn't be possible to "pre-fill" fields for RL using either values from our previous test or by MRRL values which would be edited / changed by laboratory according to the actual situation? The next option would be to leave these field blank and fill in them on request only in case of fals negative (similarly like is currently for fals negative in case of method of analysis). I have a question: When you plan to give a | | | | | x | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | x | |
| suggedtion to increase the active ingredient list in the EN 15662:2009 EU standard.We check aqbout 100 compaunds and metabolites which working very well with the QUECHERs method. Very sorry, but my staff is little, we are at present six and we have not time to prepare a validation report from these compounds. | | | | | | | | | | | | | x | | | | | | | | | | | x |
| Elaboration of a pratical and sensible guide for accreditation on a flexible scope for pesticides residues for the rest of us ordinary official labs that have to make control analysis. Lower drastically the price for proficiency testing and increase drastically the number of them Elaborate and distibute reference samples covering most of the field at a reasonable price Create a favorable environment (animation, management etc.) for validation of methods according to ISO 5725 We have a difficulty with laboratories being forced to implement a method for Amitraz | | | | | | | X | | | | | | x | | | | | | | | | x | | x |
| before it is fully validated - we have yet to see the complete report on the ring trial conducted last year. | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | X |
| I want to see pesticides beeing prioritated! We would like help from EU. How about the work about synergy-effects/coctaileffect? Our administration feels that pesticides are not a health problem and therefor one can find it far down on the list of prioritated areas, unfortunally. | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | X |

| Suggestions / Comments / Criticism | Reduce No.of PTs | Reconsider pesticide scope | Improve coordin. / Merge PTs | Optimize Commodity scope | Optimize Reporting Tool | Improve communication | Increase No. of PTs | Optimize Pesticide Levels | Speed-up Report Distribution | Other (Text in Italics) | Translate info into local languages | More info about availability / analysis behaviour of pesticides | More info about method validation / accreditation QC | Other (Text in Italics) | Open Workshops for OfLs | Improve Info. Distribution about WS | Optimize Content of Workshops | Coordinate / Combine WSs | Consider Lab Limitations (in CCP, EUPTs, Method Developm.) | Put more Focus on Feed | Comments related to CCP - | Comments related to Method Development / Validation | Feedback on this Survey | Other (Text in Italics) |
|--|------------------|----------------------------|------------------------------|--------------------------|-------------------------|-----------------------|---------------------|---------------------------|------------------------------|-------------------------|-------------------------------------|---|--|-------------------------|-------------------------|-------------------------------------|-------------------------------|--------------------------|--|------------------------|---------------------------|---|-------------------------|-------------------------|
| SUBTOPICS | PTs | | | | | | INI | FORM | IATIO | ИС | WORKSHOPS | | | | OTHER | | | | | | | | | |
| The EU-RL-activities should continue, it is a great opportunity to share the knowledge and identify the challenges for futher improvements. In this respect mainly proficiency tests are highly valuable. Regarding the space for further improvements, I would propose to strengthen integration of "new" member states into EU-RL work. At the moment they are not actively participating in respective activities. this should be changed since this is the only way how to reduce gaps. Regarding methods, their avalability is, undoubtedly, highly valuable, the limiting aspect maybe is that they are associated with specific instruments, probably not available in all EU labs. E.g. alternative detection technologies exist to MS/MS which may provide the same performance charactristics. I am, of course aware that this is a difficult issue to solve. Therefore the EU-RL activities should not be ceased. The progress in area is very rapid and permanent communication is needed. | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | x | | | | | |
| We test a very small number of samples of animal origin each year for a range of pyrethroids and carbamates. Our chief involvement is with the Pesticides Laboratory in XXX. My main contact with the Pesticides EU-RLs is through obligation to participate in proficiency tests, these I find very well organised. However as a whole I find it very difficult to assess or comment on the performance of the EU-Rl's due to the limited involvement I have had with the EU_RLS for pesticides. | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | x | x |
| appropriate EURLs could be established in | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | x |
| order to discuss/identify best practice. Total | 7 | 4 | 3 | 3 | 3 | 2 | 1 | 1 | 1 | 2 | 5 | 4 | 3 | 2 | 8 | 4 | 2 | 1 | 4 | 3 | 4 | 5 | 4 | 7 |

Positive Feedback:

Positive Feedback:

the contribution of all EU-RL was (and still is) very important in our laboratory activity: development of methods, proficiency test....Thank you for all your support!!!!

Our opinion is that work of CRL-s is very useful. We can get information as soon as possible. Also all CRL-s workshops were very useful specialy regarding information circulation. I would just like to give the comment about the methods which were developed in CRL laboratories. Unfortunately the differences in lab equipment are so big, that many of difficult methods are not able to transmit in other labs with other equipment like it is in CRL.

Very useful and informative EU-RL/NRL/OL-Network. Exchange of information is fast and sure.

very well performing CRLs for pesticides. What you did really well is the feedback on PT participation and scores to the Commission. That really triggered improvement and commitment from bioth CRL side and NRL side. This approach should be made compulsory for other CRLs as well.

The network helps to address the many challenges in pesticide residue analysis. Especially the information in the CRL-datapool helps in the daily work, analytical behavior of pesticides or method validation data are extremely valuable. We wish the work to be continued.

EURL is a good source of knowlegde I think there existance was a good initiative, routine labs can save money with the development and investigations that they're doing, we can start will some background info that is always handy

Your work have been very well organised and excecuted. We are very satisfied with the work the CRLs have done, and are very satisfied with the communication between the EU-RL and the NRL.

They do an excellent job. They collected and provided a lot of useful data during the last years

CRL-Datapool is very helpful, containing a lot of useful practical analytical information!!!!!

Plese, go on and thank you for the al information.

I really found usefull the NETWORK DATA POOL. Many thanks for the effort in develop it!

Thank you very much for your attention and quick responses that I asked you

We are very satisfied with activities EU-RL.

The information given on workhops are very helpful, I can use it in everyday work.

It is a pleasure to work and cooperate with the people of CRL.

I think the Pesticide EU-RL network with its 4 EURLs got a "face" during the last 4 years. This was not evident due to 4 EURLs in the 'same' domain. One can see a red line in their work which was not evident at the beginning. Good job.

We would like to thank for all your activities and helpful information, although we have to invest a lot of time and know how in analysing the 4-5 EUPT's.

good work

No suggestions, absolute satisfaction with your work.

EU-RL dissemination of information/discussion during workshops are very useful. Similary the infomation within the EU-RL Portal and the Data Pool. The communication between the EU-RL and the NRLs is mainly limited to workshop attandence and filing information. While this is important, it would also be beneficial if the EU-RL concentrates more on interacting with individual NRLs. In this way the EU-RL will be in a better position to assist different NRLs with their valous challenges.