SmartLabel Update

Pesticide Program Dialogue Committee Meeting

Patricia Parrott

Office of Pesticide Programs

October 31, 2018



What is SmartLabel?

- Master pesticide label as structured data
- Part of OPP Vision for instantaneous access to quality information
- Beginning of a comprehensive IT plan
 - Paperless workplace



Characteristics of the SmartLabel

Not just a Structured Label

- Delineation of product Use Patterns, by the registrant Replaces EPA interpreted data entry
- Standardized/Formal/Public OPP Vocabulary
 A common understanding of all terms for the first time
- A process to improve label review and risk assessment workflow Increased label/review consistency, and faster review process
- A scalable plan for OPP data management and access
 Linked to other OPP documents/information
 Options for OPP, Federal/State partners, and Public access views



Benefits/Goals of Structured Electronic Content

Increased label quality/consistency

- Structured Label → consistent format
- Use Pattern Index → text as data
- Standard Vocabulary → no ambiguity
- Improved access to previous reviews → consistency with similar labels

Improved access to registration information

- Search across products → Increased ability to respond to public health inquiries
- Direct to PPLS upload → access to approved content in real-time

Save Resources

- Less paper
- Electronic validation



Terminology Development & Management

Develop vocabulary

- Build → Defined and developed by OPP staff
 - e.g. majority of lists
- Borrow

 Sourced from external stakeholders
 - e.g. pest lists
- Merge → Lists merged and coded between FDA and EPA
 - e.g. ingredients list

Manage Vocabulary

- EPA Terminology Services: Synaptica
- Central repository to maintain terminology for EPA/OPP



Terminology Example

Traditional "use site" described by combination of two terms

- Use Site is the plant/building/animal/etc.
- Use Site Location qualifies where the site is found
 - o Conceptually clarifies label information
- Simplifies sorting/filtering/aggregating

Example Label Site	Use Site	Location		
Residential Lawns	Grass/Turf	Residential/Recreational/Schools/ Institutional/Retail (Outdoor)		
Grass Around Oil Wells	Grass/Turf	Occupational/Manufacturing/Processing/Industrial Area (Outdoor)		
Sod Farm	Grass/Turf	Agricultural (Outdoor)		

1400 non-agricultural sites can be described with

- 140 sites
- 10 locations



Benefits of Structured Label

Increased consistency in reviews

- Compare to other labels and other versions
- Compare to supporting documentation
 - Use Index, MRL, CSF, etc
- Reduced need for interpretation

Reduced review time

- Easily identify only what has changed since prior submission
- Machine validation
 - Within label (currently active)
 - Across documents (in development)



Benefits of Use Index

Increased consistency in reviews

- Reduced need for interpretation
 - What does the registrant think the label allows
- Easy identification of data gaps
- Compare use pattern data to label during registration

Reduced review time

- Easily identify only what has changed since prior submission
- Machine validation
 - Within label (currently active)
 - Across documents (in development)



Pilot Participants

- Bayer CropScience
- Clorox
- Dow AgroSciences
- EcoLab
- Marrone Bio

- Reckitt Benckiser
- SePRO
- Syngenta
- United IndustriesCorporation



Pilot Feedback

Overly complicated model Phase 1 Benefit unclear to registrants 2014 Simplified the data model Phase 2 separated label and use index 2015 **Updated User Guide Document** Production ready builder Phase 3 Improved guidance 2016 Made builders more user friendly Phase 4 Cont. work with FDA to harmonize AI terms 2018 **Updated Vocabularies** Soft launch: voluntary submissions from pilot registrants Phase 5 EPA test of internal storage and workflow 2018



Soft Launch

Test of the entire system

- Builder
- Submission portal
- Database loader
- New database
- OPP electronic review tool
- Label approval and processing to PPLS



Next Steps

- Production ready environment available for registrants
 - Integration of <u>SmartLabel structured data</u> into current workflows
 - Begin to build database of all registrations
 - Develop requirements for submission of SmartLabels for all registrations
 - Outreach, promotion, marketing/advertising
 - Encourage voluntary adoption & provide assistance



Next Steps Cont.

- Leverage SmartLabel work to further OPP IT modernization
 - Establish governance to maintain vocabulary
 - Expand to include additional information in structured format
 - Develop new tools for access
- Complete MRL work with FDA
 - Structure/standardize tolerance data currently in CFR

SmartLabel Benefits Us All!



Benefit	Registrants	EPA	States	Public
Curated Vocabularies	✓	✓	✓	✓
Structured Labels/Use Index	✓	\checkmark	✓	✓
Improved label quality & consistency	✓	\checkmark	✓	✓
Fewer data gaps	✓	\checkmark	✓	✓
Automated data extraction into EPA databases	✓	✓	✓	✓
Smart Database	✓	\checkmark	✓	\checkmark
Easy comparison of label, use patterns, and supporting information	✓	✓	✓	✓
More consistent EPA reviews	✓	\checkmark	✓	\checkmark
Reduced EPA review time	✓	\checkmark		✓
Agency/Public Advanced Querying Ability	✓	\checkmark	✓	\checkmark
Electronic comparison of labels and claims (in field)	✓	\checkmark	✓	✓
Efficient & accurate response to inquiries/emergencies	✓	\checkmark	✓	\checkmark
State access to master label data to review state label submissions	✓	✓	✓	✓



Contacts and Resources

Pilot web page

http://www2.epa.gov/pesticide-registration/pesticide-smartlabel-pilot

Comments are welcome

Smartlabel@epa.gov

Patricia Parrott

Parrott.patricia@epa.gov