

## “EURL-Feedback-Survey 2010” - Comments

### OVERVIEW

#### 1. Comments concerning additional obstacles hindering lab development:

Subjects of Concern	No. of comments (out of 93)	In %
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
<b>Suggestions / Comments / Criticism:</b>	<b>6</b>	<b>7</b>

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

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



	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 acquisition 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, access to metabolite compounds, it's not easy to find 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 development.	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							

	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
En las condiciones económicas actuales será imposible mantener el nivel que hemos conseguido; el análisis de residuos de plaguicidas que hacemos es demasiado 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 coordinated 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 sufficient 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 consumables 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 different kinds of analyses. That makes that instrumentation and staff are not available to perform all the improvements that we wanted to. The accreditation 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 active always quickly and successfully.		X										
There are deficits only in the personal staffing		X										
Too few persons for method development		X										
the main problem we have, is the low number of people whom we can dedicate to the development of the methods. we have an intensive routine activity and the ratio between activity and personnel doesn't allow us to improve much more our performance level.		X										
Moyens Humains manqué de matériels 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 to do work in the global development of our lab.			X									
lot of routine work			X									
too much desk tasks and not enough time to work on methods 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 pesticides		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.	X						X					
Too many management staff changes that make difficult the development of laboratory activity							X					
Pesticides are not a priority for our administration, therefore we do not get the resources we would like.	X				X							
because a reorganization of the analytical laboratories, probably our activity is going to be transferred in another laboratory, so is very difficult to improve tests and performances.					X		X					
Headquarters 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 fulfill 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 our activities. At this moment the reorganization is not totally 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 numbers of test on a small number of sample is not efficient. We indeed carry out test on residues only on an 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 instrumentation, 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 pesticedes 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 perfection Lack of managerial staff, so too much administrative work!!!			X	X		X						
<b>Total</b>	<b>41</b>	<b>28</b>	<b>13</b>	<b>13</b>	<b>12</b>	<b>12</b>	<b>9</b>	<b>8</b>	<b>7</b>	<b>7</b>	<b>4</b>	<b>2</b>

Suggestions / Comments / Criticism:

<b>Suggestions / Comments / Criticism:</b>
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



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 ( <i>Text in Italics</i> )	Translate info into local languages	More info about availability / analysis behaviour of pesticides	More info about method validation / accreditation QC	Other ( <i>Text in Italics</i> )	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 ( <i>Text in Italics</i> )
	SUBTOPICS	PTs									INFORMATION	WORKSHOPS	OTHER											
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 is 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.		X																						
We would prefer a single workshop 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 ( <i>Text in Italics</i> )	Translate info into local languages	More info about availability / analysis behaviour of pesticides	More info about method validation / accreditation QC	Other ( <i>Text in Italics</i> )	Open Workshops for OfLs	Improve Info. Distribution about WS	Optimize Content of Workshops	Coordinate / Combine WSs	Consider Lab Limitations (in CCP, EUPs, Method Developm.)	Put more Focus on Feed	Comments related to CCP -	Comments related to Method Development / Validation	Feedback on this Survey	Other ( <i>Text in Italics</i> )
	PTs											INFORMATION	WORKSHOPS				OTHER							
I think that the involvement of the Official Laboratories in EU-RL activities is very important. I have appreciate very much the possibility to participate 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 participation of the OLs, and not only of NRLs, to the workshop/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.																	X							
More training for OF labs on methods of analisys															X									
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>I would appreciate an actualization of the MRM catalog for the AP4000 - a lot of analytes we have in out scope (feedants) are missing.</i>													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 ( <i>Text in Italics</i> )	Translate info into local languages	More info about availability / analysis behaviour of pesticides	More info about method validation / accreditation QC	Other ( <i>Text in Italics</i> )	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 ( <i>Text in Italics</i> )	
	PTs											INFORMATION	WORKSHOPS				OTHER								
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.												X													
<i>To be informed about evolutions concerning the european regulations</i>													X												
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 questionnaire an initiative of the EURLs themselves? I would have expected a harmonised questionnaire 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 control.												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 activities, 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 ( <i>Text in Italics</i> )	Translate info into local languages	More info about availability / analysis behaviour of pesticides	More info about method validation / accreditation QC	Other ( <i>Text in Italics</i> )	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 ( <i>Text in Italics</i> )	
	PTs											INFORMATION	WORKSHOPS	OTHER											
The EU-RL-activities should continue, it is a great opportunity to share the knowledge and identify the challenges for further 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 availability 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 characteristics. 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.																									
<i>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-RI's due to the limited involvement I have had with the EU_RLS for pesticides.</i>																									
<i>It would be useful if a 'visit' scheme to/by appropriate EURLs could be established in order to discuss/identify best practice.</i>																									
<b>Total</b>	<b>7</b>	<b>4</b>	<b>3</b>	<b>3</b>	<b>3</b>	<b>2</b>	<b>1</b>	<b>1</b>	<b>1</b>	<b>2</b>	<b>5</b>	<b>4</b>	<b>3</b>	<b>2</b>	<b>8</b>	<b>4</b>	<b>2</b>	<b>1</b>	<b>4</b>	<b>3</b>	<b>4</b>	<b>5</b>	<b>4</b>	<b>7</b>	

## Positive Feedback:

<b>Positive Feedback:</b>
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 specially 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 biot both 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 knowledge I think their existence was a good initiative, routine labs can save money with the development and investigations that they're doing. we can start with some background info that is always handy
Your work has been very well organized and executed. 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!!!!
Please, go on and thank you for the all information.
I really found useful the NETWORK DATA POOL. Many thanks for the effort in developing 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 workshops 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. Similarly the information within the EU-RL Portal and the Data Pool. The communication between the EU-RL and the NRLs is mainly limited to workshop attendance 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 various challenges.