

Food and Agriculture Organization of the United Nations

Centre for Environment Fisheries & Aquaculture Science

Atelier de formation sur le profilage des risques et l'assainissement des coquillages bivalves avec l'appui du Centre de Référence de la FAO 21-23 février 2023 Sénégal

# Monitoring, Classification and data interpretation By Andy Younger

# Definition of monitoring?

- Codex code of practice refers to monitoring water, bivalves or sediments
- Monitoring : routine way that we can collect evidence for presence/absence of hazards
- **Cannot replace** risk profiling or the growing area assessment because:
  - The hazard may not always be there
  - Even if there, concentration may vary with season, weather or time of day
  - The hazard may only be present in high amounts after unexpected events



#### Primary and ongoing monitoring, how should we do this....?

- Understand hazards from Growing Area Risk Profile and Growing Area Assessment
- We have a sampling plan

Production Area: The Elect

Fleet Oyster Farm

Elect Ovster

(Pacific oysters)

B25AI

Local Authority: Weymouth PHA

Sampling plan tells us:





Primary monitoring helps **establish a classification** and determine necessary controls

Ongoing monitoring gathers data to establish and confirm classifications



# Monitor indicators or pathogens for classification?

Decision depends on:

Existing Regulations, intended market

**Faecal indicators** provide an indication of risk from a range of pathogens

•

• More indicator = more risk



If a wide range of animal or human sewage-derived pathogens are expected

Sampling and/or laboratory capability

- Pathogen monitoring
  measures direct risk
  - Multiple pathogens may require multiple tests
- Can be expensive/difficult



If only enteric viruses are expected and may not be controlled by faecal bacteria e.g. intermittent sewage spills

## Monitoring pathogens for classification

- If the risk profile and growing area assessment indicates specific pathogen
- Usually only test bivalve flesh directly
- Specific testing of parts possible where only those parts of the bivalve are eaten
- Influenced by what intended market consumers eat



# Monitor water or bivalve shellfish for classification?

Decision depends on:

Existing Regulations, intended market

Costs of sampling, practicality of sampling Water and bivalve sampling should be:

- at fixed and identified points
- representative of the area
- either random or worse case
- frequent enough to reflect changing conditions

Need to consider health and safety of samplers



# Monitor water or bivalve shellfish for classification?

Could be each species or an 'indicator' species (representative of more than one species)

Reflect the prevailing concentrations in the water

Should be at least 12-15 animals per sample

Collect by 'normal' method of harvest so may need a boat

But can be collected at low tide if necessary







Water sampling usually requires a boat

Results often very variable with time (hours/days/months) and across an area

So may need more monitoring points and take more samples

Generally restricted to *E. coli*/faecal coliforms

#### **Classification - components**

#### Classification categorises risk

- Allows for common risk management procedures
- And, common processing requirements

Estimate of current/future risk based upon past performance



## Classification – definition of the area

- The classification boundaries of the area should be defined using geographical coordinates (ideally 10m accuracy)
- The area should be homogeneous in terms of contamination
- It should have at least one sampling point



#### **Classification - types**

#### **Requirement may be stipulated by trading partners**

If no such requirements exist – define the **public health objective** then decide if criteria need to be **developed** or if existing international criteria can be applied

No treatment before eating live, raw e.g. Codex standard n=5, c=1, m=230, M=700 *E. coli* MPN/100g

Treatment needed	US classification	Microbiological standard in water	EU classification	Microbiological standard in shellfish flesh
None	Approved	GM <14 FC cfu/100ml and 90%ile <43 FC cfu/100ml	Class A	80% ≤230, all results ≤700 <i>E.coli</i> /100g flesh
Purification or relaying	Restricted	GM <88 FC cfu/100ml and 90%ile <260 FC cfu/100ml	Class B	90% ≤4600, all results ≤46,000 <i>E.coli</i> /100g flesh
Protected relaying (> 2 months)			Class C	All samples ≤46,000 <i>E.coli</i> /100g flesh

Moderate treatment before eating live, raw e.g. US restricted areas or EU class B (depuration or relay)

Substantial treatment before consumption e.g. EU class C criterion (relay or heat treatment)

#### **Conditional classifications**

- For areas subject to predictable intermittent/periodic microbiological pollution
- Certain conditions trigger change in classification status (e.g. season, rainfall, river flow, performance of sewage treatment works etc.)
- Areas may be either closed OR classified at two different levels







## Classification – Buffer zones

**Buffer zones** around sources of contamination are **recommended** Buffer zones are **stipulated by some national legislation**/programmes e.g. US National Shellfish Sanitation Program (NSSP)

Buffer zones = prohibited areas around a point source or hazard (marinas or other boating activities)

Size of the area can be established by:

- Dilution calculations
- Salinity studies
- Drogue studies
- Dye tracing studies
- Using tracers
- Hydrodynamic modelling



## Example data interpretation from EU



#### **European Regulations: 2019/627** Classification categories

Classification category	Microbiological criteria
Class A	80 % ≤230, all results ≤700 <i>E. coli</i> /100 g
Class B	90 % ≤4 600, all results ≤46 000 <i>E. coli</i> /100 g
Class C	All results ≤46 000 <i>E. coli</i> /100 g

Three stages of classification:

Initial classification (12 results/6 months)

**Primary established classification** (1 year's worth of results)

Established classification (3 years' worth of results)

# Interpretation of data in a zone with a single sampling point

- For EU: The dataset should be assessed against requirements of EU Regulation 2019/627:
  - Class A 230 E.coli/100g (80% of samples) no result to exceed 700 E.coli/100g
  - Class B 4600 *E.coli*/100g (90% of samples)
  - Class C 46000 *E.coli*/100g
  - 3 year dataset used for established classifications



# Interpretation of data in a zone with several sampling points

- Multiple points may be needed to reflect multiple sources of contamination
- If data is different between points then point showing the <u>highest</u> results for that species (or indicator species) should determine classification - unless a split classification is viable





#### Anomalous results – EU criteria

- Results due to the following may be excluded ('waived') from the classification dataset:
  - 1. Failure to comply with sampling protocol (e.g. temperature/time requirements)
  - 2. Failure of sewerage, sewage treatment systems, animal slurry store (since rectified and unlikely to recur)
  - 3. Rainfall event with >5 year return period



Important to establish a causal association (not just a chance association) before waiving result





#### Seasonal classifications – EU criteria

- At least 3 years' worth of data showing a clear seasonal trend necessary for seasonal classification
- 'Buffer' periods (for 'clean up'):
  - 1 month from class B to A
  - *Buffer* periods must also conform to the improved classification category
- Buffer periods allow time for shellfish to clean up prior to start of harvesting season at the improved classification level





#### Seasonal classifications



#### Summary - Classification and Monitoring

- Monitoring provides evidence for the presence of hazards
- Monitoring data establishes classifications
- Classification standardises risk management and processing
- Protects consumers from risk
- Facilitates trade



## Thank you!

#### Questions?