



Minutes



One Health EJP



Grant Agreement number 773830

Date	07-08 March 2019
Venue	Sciensano, Brussels, BE
Meeting	NOVA second annual meeting

Attendance list

Attached

Meeting minutes

Day 1 (March 7th)

Welcome and opening - Jenny Frössling, coordinator (SVA)

Words from the hosts (Sciensano) - Hein Imberechts

Hein gave us an overview of the host institution. Hein also gave us an overview of the OHEJP, covering topics such as its organization, objectives, and organisations.

Round of introductions

A quick round of presentations for us to get to know names and participation in WPs.

Data management plan – Valérie de Waele

Valerie (Sciensano) gave us an overview of the DMP, including principles, goals and resources we will have to help achieving a plan. She walked us through the template we will have to fill to write a DMP for NOVA. The DMP is a tool to help us determine how to manage the data, as well as preserve the data used and generated by the project.

All participants were given the template for the DMP, which we need to have a first draft for by March 29th (see actions). It will be a living document and we will be able to update as we go, but we need this first draft by then.

Valerie informed that in conjunction with the first OHEJP scientific meeting there will be a workshop on the DMP – 21st of May 2019. All are invited to consider if it could be used to attend.

Participants inquired about the GDPR and the difficulties to answer some questions because their organisations have not yet finished their own new guidelines on how to handle data in light of GDPR. Valerie advised that we just fill in the template “to the best of our knowledge”, giving the information we do have at the moment and what is known/defined about the data handling.

An online tool is available: DMPonline.be. Users must identify themselves using an ORCIDid (those without one should create one online). The Horizon2020 FAIR DMP template should be the one used.

The presentation was too long to fit into the time that had been allocated in the agenda, so Valerie didn't go through all slides, but she promised to circulate the presentation for all to read. Jenny (coordinator, SVA) asked if anyone in the group had experience with DMP, and Zuzanna (FHI) had. Jenny highlighted that this needs to be a commitment of all institutes and WP-leaders, as the information needed is too detailed to be provided by the coordinator.



Håkan (DTU) raised the question of who is the end user of the DMP, in particular whether it is for us and to facilitate research collaboration, or something we are delivering as an obligation only. Jenny and Valerie highlighted that although this is a request/deliverable, the purpose is for it to be used by US, to facilitate data management and archiving in a way that promotes FAIRness.

Asked about what should be considered data (Thomas, SVA), Valerie replied that everything that we stored in the computer. That includes codes as well as model outputs.

Asked about what is expected, concretely, from each WP leader (Katja, BfR), Jenny answered that she wants the WP groups, during their afternoon discussions, should look at the template that was given to everyone, and start filling it ASAP. It is not expected that we could already fill it in today or during this meeting, but a first draft is expected by march 29th. This means every WP delivering a filled template to Jenny, to be compiled at the project level. [Note that this topic was addressed again Day 2, when a more detailed work plan and deadlines were agreed upon /Jenny]

Gaia (ISS) asked how to consolidate by WP when every institution works in different ways. Valerie answered that the DMP is about the agreements reached within the WP about how to collaborate WITHIN NOVA – how data will be shared, managed, stored, within NOVA across institutions. Each institution may need to have their own DMP, but this is outside our scope.

Eric (RIVM) asked if this is just about new data only, or also cover data from previous project or literature, which are used in the models for instance. Valerie answered that it depends on what the data is being used for. The DMP should include data used (input), not only data produced (output), but they are only relevant for the DMP if they will be shared.

Zuzanna (FHI) suggested that we should share one DMP as an example.

Solveig (FHI) highlights that we should avoid duplication of work, and reuse resources within the institutions. Because however the DMP for NOVA needs to focus on data shared among us, Jenny reinforces that we should start from discussing it within the WP groups today, and then take it back to our home institutions.

Plan and expectations for this meeting - Jenny Frössling

Jenny reviewed the agenda and the points for each WP to address in the group discussions in the afternoon (also given out to every participant):

1. What will be done to make sure we capture international aspects and use opportunities for international collaboration in our studies?
2. What scientific publications will be produced?
3. How to we deliver on the promise of NOVEL surveillance methods and approaches?

WP presentations - what have we accomplished in 2018, and ongoing work

WP1

Zuzanna (FHI), T1.1 – terminology and glossary. This task was presented individually to elicit a discussion on participation, since this task was intended to involve as partner agencies. Jenny highlights that we agreed that NOVA would not force common definitions or attempt to get one definition for all sectors – rather we planned to document the terminologies used in each sector, and their alignment, so that we can understand each other within the project.

Håkan (DTU) asks was in the intended plan for contribution by participants – what do task leaders expect from others? Solveig (FHI) helped clarify that all WPs are expected to provide the terms and definitions that they want to be involve in the NOVA glossary. It is suggested for this to be done within the WP discussions today, in particular for those WP which represent novel areas that may have a lot of specific terminology, like the food purchase data and syndromic surveillance.

Participants highlighted that this task is also being carried out in other EJP projects, and that there is ongoing collaboration to coordinate the work of glossary across projects. All agree that we should reuse as much as possible and not duplicate the effort, but we should keep in mind what is relevant for NOVA, and our role as a research project.

Zuzanna highlights however that in ORION this is an internal tool, and the glossary is only meant to support agreement within the project, while in NOVA it is a deliverable, so it will be published and a decision needs to be done regarding how it will be published.



It was clear that more discussion is needed, but we moved on, on the interest of time, and the WP will have their discussion this afternoon, and also decide how to involve the others, since in the afternoon the participants will be split into other WPs.

Maria-Eleni (Sciensano), T2.2 – mapping of the food chain.

The need for input from other WPs was once again highlighted

WP2

Katja (BfR) gave an overview of the WP, and specific tasks were presented:

T.2.1 – Ingrid (RIVM) presented the results of a survey carried regarding data availability and barriers.

T.2.2 – Frederik (SSI) literature review on the issue of purchase data for investigations. Developing best practices is clearly still an ongoing process, and any project participants who know of unpublished studies in the field should please forward to task leaders.

T.2.3 – Frederik (SSI) – big data analysis of risk factors for sporadic disease.

T.2.4 – Idesbald (RKI) Food distribution data for hospital outbreaks (focus on health sector)

T.2.5 – Katja (BfR) - Trace back and food risk mapping

WP3

Adeline (ANSES) gave an overview of the WP and presented the progress for specific tasks.

T3.1 – mapping of the opportunities for syndromic surveillance (SyS) in the food chain map – similar to the mapping in WP1, but not as complete, since just focused on SyS.

T.3.2 – create indicators for SyS from the data available. This was done independently within the involved countries. Collaboration will focus on sharing methods, rather than comparing of connecting different systems. All countries focused on gastrointestinal diseases in humans, and adapt from salmonella and campylobacter in animals.

Work will now commence for the tasks 3.3, which is meant to investigate how we can carry our SyS across multiple streams of data. Research will be needed to determine the best methods, as this is an open area of investigation in SyS.

Frederik (SSI) highlighted how different WPs seems to be doing the same type of mapping of data sources across the food chain, and some collaboration across WPs would be beneficial.

WP4

Julio (UCM) represented for the WP leader (Ana). Julio gave an overview of the WP which is split into 3 tasks:

T4.1 - indoor commercial farms (no deliverable from this task). Work done independently in Spain and Sweden.

T.4.2. pig farms and animal feed

T.4.3. outdoor commercial farms

WP5

Håkan (DTU) presented the overall strategy for the WP, which is to evaluate the efficiency of doing surveillance at different steps of the food chain, to achieve better human health. Three main tasks:

T.5.1 – UK modelling of Salmonella in pigs (estimating prevalence); Swedish compartmental model simulating surveillance in a population where the disease is endemic in 0.2% of the herds; Danish model of Salmonella in poultry.

T.5.2 – AMR

T.5.3 – optimization of surveillance – modelling effect on human health of surveillance carried out in different points.

Parallel sessions for each WP

WPs met in separated groups to work together. Notes were taken individually by each WP-leader.

Each WP was asked to address the “topics from the coordinator” and the draft DMP.



Day 2 (March 8th)

Presentations from each WP on conclusions from the work in the previous days, and overview of their plan for 2019

WP1

Marilena (Sciensano) gave an overview of the meeting agreements yesterday.

T1.1. is developing a questionnaire, and any extra help with the expertise on qualitative methods is welcomed. An appointed person to connect with each WP was determined.

Questions from the coordinator:

- 1) International collaboration: multi-country WP, which is working across countries with the glossary work as well as the questionnaire which will be applied to multiple countries.
- 2) Publications: aiming for at least one.
- 3) Novelty: focus on opportunities, barriers, new data sources, what is going well in current surveillance.

Estelle (SVA) added that the WP would like feedback from other WPs regarding how we could connect, both in the work relationships between WP1 and others, as well as the publications. WP2 and WP3 volunteered some points of discussion, and highlighted that as the next WPs present individually, WP1 could point out when the work could be beneficial to involve WP1.

Håkan (DTU) asked what is the aim and timeline for the glossary – who it is for, and therefore when should it be ready. All agree that it should be a living document, but a discussion was raised regarding the need for coordination among all the projects that have planned to develop glossaries, in particular ORIO, NOVA and COHESIVE.

Fernanda (SVA) clarified that the ORION work was initially thought to serve as a glossary for internal support of the project, but now that it is planned to be published publicly, there should be a discussion about how to advance the task in WP1 in NOVA, building upon that work. Jenny informed that she intends to address this issue specifically with the OHEJP coordinator.

It was also highlighted that the budget planned for all the institutions to contribute to WP1. Marilena (Sciensano) clarifies that this can be done by each institution helping WP1 to identify the target people for the questionnaire that will come after spring, and help get it distributed and answered.

WP2

Questions from the coordinator, presented by Katja (BfR):

- 1) International collaboration:
 - a. Regular teleconferences to be started from here on. It was identified that so far the tasks have not collaborated/communicated enough, and worked independently. The WP will start having regular teleconferences, and will ask Steen (SSI) if he wants to take the lead on coordinating the work across tasks through these meetings.
 - b. Commonalities in food purchase data (FPD) will help methodologically in an international way, sharing barriers – finding patterns by actually comparing.
 - c. Common terminology to structure food purchase data
 - d. Producing open source tools (BfR and NVI)
 - e. GitHub repository to share codes (SSI)
 - f. SOP for implementation of FPD in the UK (and for others)
- 2) Publications: aiming for at least one.
 - a. Google spreadsheet (SSI) to plan the publishing of outcomes, whether public reports or peer reviewed publications
 - b. T1: there will be a report with the results of questionnaire, not defined if it will be also a peer reviewed publication
 - c. T2: review already published; will produce a “best practices” together with T1, and the deliverable 2.4 is planned as a publication
 - d. T3. E-consent not planned for publication, but CCS for “sporadic” campylobacteriosis and salmonellosis



- e. T4. Structured review on hospital/bursing homes outbreaks finalized this year; next deliverable with IZS possibly
 - f. T5. Collaboration with NVI and Bf will deliver a publication at the end of the project; how to deal with time lag between ongoing outbreaks and tracing results (from a salmonella in berries case).
- 3) Novelty: focus on new data sources, what is going well in current surveillance.
- a. Investigation of the use of private data (retails or household) for PH as a result
 - b. To encourage (policy makers and industry) the use per se is novel
 - i. T1: compilation of the state of the art
 - ii. T2: SOP for routine implementation of FPD in different settings
 - iii. T3: using FDB for sporadic FB-disease investigation
 - iv. T4: using FPB for the hospital setting
 - v. T5: fusion of tools

DMP: Katja (BfR) thinks it is not clear what the WP is expected to do, but will try to the best of their ability to fill in the draft provided as a starting point.

WP3

Adeline (ANSES) presented the WP work plan, which follows these steps:

- 1) Describe the datasets that each country decided that can be used to implement syndromic surveillance in a One-health setting
- 2) Hypotheses generation phase. How do these datasets link and can provide combined evidence to the same questions?
- 3) Univariate analysis of each of those datasets – which indicators and which methods.
- 4) How to combine evidence across data sources (multivariate analysis) – test different solutions, and also consider the geographical aggregation.

Questions from the coordinator:

- 1) International collaboration: we will start meeting more regularly to share experiences, and discuss how we could test methods across countries, and publish the commonalities that can be adopted by other countries.
- 2) Publications: two planned, one on the general context of using syndromic surveillance in a One-Health context (why), and one on the methodological aspects of operationalizing, statistically, the analyses across multi-sectorial datasets.
- 3) Novelty: both the OH use of syndromic surveillance and the combination of evidence across data sources are novel and open research questions.

DMP: we will make an inventory of the datasets used for syndromic surveillance, and highlight specific issues asked in the DMP. Before the end of the month we will deliver a draft of the word document that was distributed to each WP.

Jenny and Adeline (ANSES) agree that the work with identification of the data sources for syndromic surveillance fits well with the work of WP1, and should be published not as WP3 specific output, but in conjunction with that WP.

WP4

Ana (UCM) gave a brief overview of the WP, highlighting the plans for 2019 for each task.

Questions from the coordinator:

- 1) International collaboration: compare models across countries, which have different disease contexts (for instance high and low prevalence).
- 2) Publications: as much as 6 are planned.
- 3) Novelty: spatial distribution models for salmonella applied for the first time in Sweden and Spain, looking for risk factors.

DMP: five groups identified within the WP, covering different steps of the process of developing models (inputs, codes and outputs).

On the issue of international collaboration, Jenny highlighted that other countries may be interested in reusing the expertise brought to the project by UCM/SVA to apply models in their countries. Marilena



(Sciensano) highlighted that if WP4 structures the data that are needed to be able to apply the model, Belgium (and other countries) can see if they could be able to also apply the model.

WP5

Håkan (DTU) presented the results of the discussions yesterday, when every WP member presented the work they are doing in their respective institutions within this WP.

Agreement that the partners would share the code, and each institution would apply their own data, which speaks to the point of “international collaboration”. This will also prevent the need for data sharing – each country will keep their own data, but apply the same model. Models will be kept in the original format they were coded (R, @risk, etc) – it is outside the scope of this WP to rewrite all models into a common language. It is also not the aim to make a tool that can be used without modelling skills, just plugging in the data.

The group has experience reporting disease models, the novelty in this WP is the use of the results of these models for decision making in surveillance.

Wrap-up and discussion:

Revisiting the DMP

Valerie (Sciensano) reviewed the goals of the DMP - how it will help NOVA, what are the considered outputs and what are the points to consider, including metadata.

She also gave an overview of who does what now – a plan for next steps:

- 1) Valerie: will send this afternoon to all participants an Excel file to start collecting information on the data items, as well as examples of finished DMPs
- 2) All partners are encouraged to read the DMP examples and guidelines, fill in the Excel, and send it back to WP leaders
- 3) WP leaders will collect the information in Excel from all participants and aggregate the tables
- 4) DMP leaders will collect the Excel from each WP leader, and answer questions using the DMP online tool
- 5) Valerie will gather all DMPs and table, review the process and answer questions.

Considering the short timeline to a first round of all of these steps, Valerie will send the Excel templates today, and participants are urged to send something to their WP leaders within a week (no later than the Monday morning, March 18th). WP leaders should aggregate those and send to DMP leaders at the latest on the morning of the 21st. Please book time already to do so. DMP leaders will send to Valerie on the 26th.

Participants asked if they should list in the Excel also data they intend to USE; not just generate – Valérie explains that YES, if they already know. So, all data known to be used and generated. If it is still uncertain whether some data will be used, Jenny suggests that we keep the plan to a minimum and exclude descriptions of such data for now.

Participants asked how often this living document needs to be updated. Valérie says annually, and Jenny suggests we will revise the DMP as part of the 12-month reporting.

Coordination and communication

A. The website

Not all participants are members – should we use this as a sharing space?

Participants agree that final documents should be put there, so that there is one place where we can always count on finding important documents. But the group doesn't think this is ideal for routine communication – that can continue by email. Jenny will “clean up” the group, keeping it open only for people truly involved in the NOVA work. When new people are brought into the project, the WP leaders and coordination should be informed. The group will not be used as a place to publish deliverables for others to see – when we deliver to the OHEJP coordination, it is explicitly marked whether this should become a public deliverable or not. For our internal work, we just want a restricted space where ALL documents can be found.

Jenny will also upload the templates provided by the OHEJP, and send by email to all participants.

B. List of participants and contact persons



Jenny will upload a spreadsheet of contacts to the website.

C. Sharing documents

Including presentations from this meeting and documents – will be sent by email, as per agreement above that internal project communication should be done by email. A “final package” of files for this meeting will also be put on the website.

Each WP should take a decision on this individually, as the nature of the documents shared is very varied.

Fanny clarifies that members are free to start their own closed groups on the OHEJP websites, so WPs can create specific working groups.

D. Meetings

We have WP-leader meetings monthly, but full consortium meetings only when we meet in person annually. Should we have more whole consortium meetings as web-conferences? There didn't seem to be a need raised from the group for such meetings, but Jenny highlights that we can have ad hoc meetings when needed.

The WP-leader meetings notes will be put on the website.

E. EFSA

EFSA has assigned Ana Afonso as their contact person for this specific project. She is mainly interested in WP1, which should try to set up an individual telco with her. We will also meet during the OHEJP scientific meeting in May.

F. AOB

Time for each WP in this annual meeting – some WPs would have liked to have more time to progress in the work and get to scientific outputs.

Submission of deliverables and reporting to OHEJP – Fanny Baudoin

Ten deliverables received for NOVA in 2018. After the DMP is prepared, and it is defined which of those should be made public, they will be published on the OHEJP website.

Fanny also reviewed the reports that we deliver annually, and highlighted that they are used by the OHEJP coordination in key tasks.

Deadlines / Action plan:

Actions and decisions	Responsible Partner	Deadline
Send all presentations to Jenny	All WP leaders and Valerie (DMP)	ASAP
Put all presentations and documents from the meeting in the NOVA private group in the OHEJP website. Lists of contact persons + project participants, and templates will also be uploaded. All these documents will also be sent by e-mail.	Jenny	ASAP
Register at the OHEJP website and request to be a member of the NOVA group.	All participants that did not already register	ASAP
Remove members from the NOVA website that are not actual participants of the NOVA project	Jenny	ASAP
Share one completed DMP as an example	Valérie de Waele	ASAP
Send all participants an Excel template to fill in information about each dataset used/generated	Valérie de Waele	ASAP
Fill in the Excel and send to WP leaders	All participants	March 18 th morning



Compile the WP Excels and send to DMP leaders	All WP leaders	March 21 st morning
Compile Excels and fill in the DMP online	DMP leaders	March 26 th
Upload notes from WP leaders' meetings to the NOVA group, OHEJP website.	Jenny	ASAP
Set up a telco with NOVA's contact person at EFSA (Ana Afonso)	WP1	June 1 st

List of documents attached to the minutes:

- Attendance list
- Agenda
- DMP points (distributed to all participants)
- NOVA overview of tasks (distributed to all participants)
- Topics from the coordinator for discussion (distributed to all participants)
- Presentations
- Group photo