



## Agenda Item 9

CX/CAC 10/33/8

### JOINT FAO/WHO FOOD STANDARDS PROGRAMME

#### CODEX ALIMENTARIUS COMMISSION

33<sup>rd</sup> Session

Geneva, Switzerland, 5-9 July 2010

#### MATTERS ARISING FROM THE REPORTS OF CODEX COMMITTEES AND TASK FORCES

#### A. MATTERS ARISING FROM THE 32<sup>nd</sup> SESSION OF THE COMMISSION

##### Future work on animal feeding <sup>1</sup>

The 32<sup>nd</sup> Session of the Commission concluded its discussion on future work on animal feeding, recognising the full support for further Codex work on animal feeding. The Commission agreed to establish an electronic working group, hosted by Denmark and co-chaired by the United States of America, to:

- (i) Review of existing Codex risk analysis principles as to their applicability to animal feed;
- (ii) Review of Codex texts on emergency situation and exchange of information on rejected food as to their applicability to animal feed (CAC/GL 25-1997 and CAC/GL 19-1995);
- (iii) Review of the Codex *Code of Practice for Sources Directed Measures to Reduce Contamination of Food with Chemical* (CAC/RCP 49-2001) as to their applicability to animal feed; and
- (iv) Propose suitable mechanisms for addressing the remaining three items proposed by the electronic working group to the 32<sup>nd</sup> Session of the Commission.

The Commission agreed that the report of the electronic working group, circulated for comments under CL 2010/8-CAC, and comments submitted (attached as **Annex**) would be considered by the 33<sup>rd</sup> Session of the Commission.

The Commission is hereby **requested** to consider the report of the electronic working group and the comments submitted, and in particular: (a) the recommendations of the electronic working group concerning the applicability to animal feed of Codex risk analysis principles, CAC/GL 25-1997, CAC/GL 19-1995 and CAC/RCP 49-200; (b) the mechanisms to be used for addressing the (i) development of guidelines for governments on the application of risk assessment methodologies to the various types of hazards related to contaminants/residues in feed ingredients; (ii) development of a prioritised list of hazards in feed and feed ingredients for governments; and (iii) establishment of criteria for the global identification and notification of emergency situations affecting the feed.

#### B. MATTERS REFERRED BY OTHER COMMITTEES

##### 1. Committee on Milk and Milk Products (9<sup>th</sup> Session)

###### Adjournment *sine die*<sup>2</sup>

The Committee agreed to propose to the 33<sup>rd</sup> Session of the Commission to adjourn the Committee *sine die* until such a time as the Commission would require it to undertake new work.

The Commission **is requested** to approve the proposal to adjourn *sine die* the CCMMP.

<sup>1</sup> ALINORM 09/32/REP, paras 170-176

<sup>2</sup> ALINORM 10/33/11 para. 111

### Reference to voluntary application of provisions in Codex Commodity standards<sup>3</sup>

The Committee agreed to retain the annexes / appendices in all 13 standards for milk and milk products and to amend their title and the introductory paragraph to read as follows:

#### Appendix - Additional Information

*The additional information below does not affect the provisions in the preceding sections which are those that are essential to the product identity, the use of the name of the food and the safety of the food.*

The Commission **is requested** to approve the above proposal.

## **2. Committee on Fats and Oils (21<sup>st</sup> Session)**

### **Technical amendment of the Standard for Named Vegetable Oils: Update of Variety of Rapeseed Oil – Low Erucic Acid**

The Committee noted the proposal of Canada contained in Document CX/FO 09/21/11 to amend the scientific name for a species contained in the Standard for Named Vegetable Oils under 2.1.13 “Rapeseed oil” and 2.1.14 “Rapeseed oil – low erucic acid”. The Committee was informed that while *Brassica rapa* was the agreed scientific name for this species according to the International Code of Botanical Nomenclature (ICBN), due to the uncertainty regarding the relations between its subspecies in the past, *Brassica campestris* was still occasionally used to refer to this species, which was the case for its inclusion in Sections 2.1.13 and 2.1.14 of the Standard.

Based on this information, the Committee agreed to request the Commission to adopt the amendments to the Standard for Named Vegetable Oils to replace “*Brassica campestris*” with “*Brassica rapa*” in Section 2.1.13 “Rapeseed oil” and Section 2.1.14 “Rapeseed oil – low erucic acid” (ALINORM 09/32/17, para. 111-112).

## **3. Committee on General Principles (26<sup>th</sup> Session)**

### Definition of the term “competent authority”<sup>4</sup>

The Committee agreed that there was no merit in having a general definition of the term “competent authority”.

### Co-hosting of Codex Committees<sup>5</sup>

The Committee also agreed that the Codex secretariat would create a specific page on co-hosting on the Codex website to make the information as contained in Appendix VI available to all members.

## **C. MATTERS RELATED TO REQUESTS FROM THE COMMISSION**

### **1. Committee on Fish and Fishery Products (30<sup>th</sup> Session)**

#### Consistency of the Codex Model Certificate for Fish and Fishery Products (CAC/GL 48-2004) with the Generic Model Official Certificate (Annex to the Codex Guidelines for the Design, Production, Issuance and Use of Generic Official Certification (CAC/GL 38-2001))<sup>6</sup>

The Committee considered the request from the 32<sup>nd</sup> Session of the Commission to consider revision of the Model Certificate for Fish and Fishery Products to ensure consistency with the adopted Generic Model Certificate.

The Committee noted the need to limit the number of certificates used in international trade and considered a proposal that the Generic Model Certificate be revised to include specifics related to fish and fishery products and to revoke the Model Certificate for Fish and Fishery Products. This matter will be further considered by the next session.

<sup>3</sup> ALINORM 10/33/11 para. 17

<sup>4</sup> ALINORM 10/33/33 para 63

<sup>5</sup> ALINORM 10/33/33 para 98 and Appendix VI

<sup>6</sup> ALINORM 10/33/18, paras 9 - 10

## 2. Committee on Food Additives (42<sup>nd</sup> Session)

### References to the “Carry-over Principle of Food Additives” in Codex standards<sup>7</sup>

The Committee agreed to establish an electronic working group in order to make a more informed decision on this matter at its next Session.

### Standards for meat products<sup>8</sup>

The Committee agreed to establish an electronic working group to prepare a discussion paper for consideration at its 43<sup>rd</sup> Session with a proposal for the alignment of the food additive provisions of the five Codex standards for meat products with the adopted food additive provisions of food categories 8.2 “Processed meat, poultry, and game products in whole pieces and cuts” and 8.3 “Processed comminuted meat, poultry, and game products” and relevant sub-categories of the GSFA and an analysis of the problems and solutions identified in carrying out this work.

### Provisions for erythrosine in the Codex General Standard for Food Additives (GSFA)<sup>9</sup>

The Committee agreed to request an electronic working group to prepare recommendations for all provisions for erythrosine in the GSFA in the Step process, including those that have been returned to the CCFA by the 32<sup>nd</sup> Session of the Commission, taking into account the latest JECFA exposure assessment, and the information and technological justification for use, for consideration by the 43<sup>rd</sup> session of the CCFA.

---

<sup>7</sup> ALINORM 10/33/12 paras 11-14

<sup>8</sup> ALINORM 10/33/12 para. 162

<sup>9</sup> ALINORM 10/33/12 para. 146

Annex

**Comments on the report of the electronic working group on future Codex work on animal feeding  
submitted in response to CL 2010/8-CAC by  
Australia, Cuba, Egypt, European Union, Japan, United States of America, FEFAC and IFIF**

Australia

Australia is pleased to submit the following comments in response to **CL 2010/08-CAC, Request for Comments on the Report of the Electronic Working Group on Animal Feeding**, to be considered at the 33<sup>rd</sup> Session of the Codex Alimentarius Commission CAC. Australia thanks Denmark for leading the work of the electronic working group and for preparing such a comprehensive report.

**General Comments**

Australia recognises the importance of Codex work in respect of animal feed as it relates to human food safety. We note that the Electronic working group (EWG) continues to struggle with reaching consensus on some aspects of how to conduct future work in this area. In this regard, the Commission in considering the options must be well informed of the likely resource implications of the options proposed by the EWG.

It is our strong view that the option of establishing a new *Ad Hoc Intergovernmental Task Force on Animal Feeding* would require additional resources for both the Codex Secretariat and member countries, while assigning the work to existing committees (CCRVDF, CCCF, CCFA etc) would perhaps only require the addition of specific technical experts to members delegations for the purpose of facilitating those particular discussions.

**Specific Comments**

***Proposed Changes to Existing Codex Texts including definitions contained in the Codex Procedural Manual (Annexes I –I V CL 2010/8-CAC) (Relevant Committees CCPR, CCFA, CCRVDF, CCCF, CCFICS, CCFH and CCGP)***

Australia is of the view that it is premature for this session of the Commission to adopt the changes proposed by the EWG without first referring the changes to the relevant committees for their consideration. These committees have spent considerable resources in developing the existing texts and must be provided with an opportunity to review the proposed changes to ensure that they do not impact on, or change, the original intent. In undertaking their reviews, each committee should be asked to determine the appropriate placement for the proposed overarching statement and/or appropriate placement of references to animal feed in their text. In respect of the risk analysis principles and the definitions the Codex Committee on General Principles, whose role it is to review these documents for consistency, should be asked to endorse the proposed changes.

It should also be noted that where changes to definitions are adopted, consequential changes to existing Codex texts will be required.

***Proposal for a Suitable Mechanism for Addressing the Remaining Three Items Proposed by the Electronic Working Group***

**Conclusion to item (iv) a) Proposed Guideline on how to apply existing Codex Risk Assessment Methodologies**

In considering the options for the development of a proposed guideline on how to apply the existing Codex risk assessment methodologies, the Commission should take into consideration the details of risk assessments applied by CCCF, CCPR and CCRVDF, especially with regard to the conduct of an exposure assessment. For example CCPR/JMPR in assessing long-term exposure use consumption figures developed by the GEMS Food of the WHO (cluster diets) whereas CCRVDF/JECFA (vet drugs) uses a default basket of food (300 g muscle, 100 g liver, 50 g kidney, 50 g fat, 1.5 L milk, etc). CCPR/JMPR use median residues of toxicologically significant compounds derived from supervised trials as estimates of residues present in food over an extended period while CCRVDF/JECFA (vet drugs) most often utilise total residues calculated as the marker residue MRL multiplied by a scaling factor. CCCF/JECFA (contaminants) uses an exposure assessment that is closer to the CCPR/JMPR methodology than CCRVDF/JECFA (vet drugs).

Australia is of the opinion that should Codex elect to establish additional standards for feeds (above those considered by CCRVDF for veterinary drugs or CCPR for pesticides) the compounds most likely requiring attention are those classed as contaminants (Cd, Pb, mycotoxins, dioxins etc). As such Australia is of the view that the work on developing the proposed guideline should be assigned to the Codex Committee on Contaminants in Food.

**Conclusion to item (iv) b) Develop a prioritized list of hazards in feed ingredients and feed additives for use by governments**

Taking into consideration recent discussions in the Codex Executive, it is Australia's view that Codex may struggle to reach consensus on the development of a list of hazards of international relevance. The Codex Executive has previously noted the difficulty in reaching consensus on lists had the potential to hold up completion of work and that there are difficulties in maintaining such lists. In view of these observations, Australia would caution against commencing new work on the development of a list but rather could support the development of criteria for determining and evaluating hazards. However, if there is consensus in the Commission supporting the development of a list of hazards, Australia would support the work being assigned to the Codex Committee on Contaminants in Food.

**Conclusion to item (iv) c) Establish criteria for the global identification and notification of emergency situations affecting the feed sector (and ultimately the food sector)**

Australia considers the work of developing criteria for global identification and notification of emergency situations affecting the feed sector should be referred to the WHO and FAO for their consideration. It is our view that the most effective use of resources would be to extend existing WHO and FAO (INFOSAN) procedures in place to deal with food emergencies to include feed. Australia also notes that regional industry feed bodies may already have procedures in place which may help in developing criteria.

***General comments concerning the resource implications of additional expert body input to this work***

Australia considers that in preparing project documents in relation to new work in the area of animal feed the following issues should be addressed.

- Pesticides, including those no longer used such as DDT, should be evaluated by CCPR/JMPR as currently occurs. This would not represent an increase in funding/resourcing. JMPR routinely sets MRLs for pesticides in plant-based animal feeds.
- CCCF currently evaluates contaminants for human food, sets standards and develops guidelines for management of specific contaminants in specific foods and feeds (e.g. chemical elements, plant toxins and mycotoxins, dioxins, PAH etc). The expert panel JECFA (contaminants) has the relevant expertise which could be supplemented with relevant specialists as required. Contaminants often require a holistic approach to their risk assessment and allocating the feed component to another committee would lead to duplication and inefficiencies.
- Commitment by FAO/WHO to support funding for the additional work proposed noting that funding is already an issue for the expert committees in attempting to carry out their current work loads without additional work that may be expected for animal feeds.
- Subject to resourcing, JECFA (veterinary drugs) would be the relevant expert group to look at feed additives such as antibiotics and other compounds intentionally added to feed.

## Cuba

Consideramos que el Grupo de trabajo electrónico realizó un arduo e importante trabajo con resultados muy encomiables. No obstante tratándose de una temática tan compleja existieron tres aspectos en los que no se pudo llegar a consenso, contenidos en los temas IVa, b y c.

A tal efecto nos pronunciamos que se debe crear un Grupo de acción de duración limitada que tenga como responsabilidad la evaluación de todos los documentos del CODEX relacionados con los piensos para indicar si todos los aspectos del campo de análisis de riesgos de los piensos (producción, uso, higiene, y el proceso íntegro de la producción de pienso) se abordan adecuadamente o si existen lagunas que requieren nuevas directrices del CODEX. De esa evaluación deberá derivarse las futuras acciones a seguir en esta temática.

### Cuba (English version)

We consider that the electronic working group completed a difficult and important item of work with very positive results. Although this subject was very complex, it was possible to reach consensus on three aspects, as reflected in sections IVa, b and c.

In this respect we are in favour of establishing a Task Force with a limited duration with the responsibility of evaluating all Codex documents related to feed to indicate whether all aspects in the area of feed risk analysis (production, use, hygiene, and the whole process of feed production) are adequately addressed or if some gaps exist and require new Codex Guidelines. Future action to be taken in this area should be decided on the basis of this evaluation

## Egypt

1 - **The Egyptian comments** concluded that generally all the changes done by the E-WG and illustrated in its Report **are reasonable and logically accepted**, especially those of the Risk Analysis Approach Codex works and the their applicability to feed, feed ingredients, feed additives, etc., and the other introduced texts needed to completed in the textual meanings.

In this connection, the E-WG has reviewed and made changes and additions to the following documents:

- 1- *Working Principles for Risk Analysis for Application in the Framework of the Codex Alimentarius*. Codex Alimentarius Commission Procedural Manual, Eighteenth edition. Joint FAO/WHO Food Standards Programme. Rome, 2009
- 2- *Risk Analysis Principles Applied by the Codex Committee on Food Additives and the Codex Committee on Contaminants in Foods*. Codex Alimentarius Commission Procedural Manual, Eighteenth edition. Joint FAO/WHO Food Standards Programme. Rome, 2009.
- 3- *Risk Analysis Principles Applied by the Codex Committee on Pesticides Residues*. Codex Alimentarius Commission Procedural Manual, Eighteenth edition. Joint FAO/WHO Food Standards Programme. Rome, 2009.
- 4- *Risk Analysis Principles Applied by the Codex Committee on Residues of Veterinary Drugs in Foods*. Codex Alimentarius Commission Procedural Manual, Eighteenth edition. Joint FAO/WHO Food Standards Programme. Rome, 2009.
- 5- *Principles and Guidelines for the Conduct of Microbiological Risk Assessment* (CAC/GL 30-1999).
- 6- *Working Principles for Risk Analysis for Food Safety for Application by Governments* (CAC/GL 62-2007).
- 7- *Codex Principles and Guidelines for the Exchange of Information in Food Safety Emergency Situations* (CAC/GL 19-1995).
- 8- *Guidelines for the Exchange of Information between Countries and Rejection of Imported Food* (CAC/GL 25-1997).
- 9- *Code of Practice for Source Directed Measures to Reduce Contaminants of Food with Chemicals* (CAC/RCP 49-2001).

2 - **Egypt notes that since it is clear from the E-WG Report the most changes and additions have been confined to the use of the term *feed/feeds* as its relevance to food safety, beside the term *food/foods*, however,** the Egyptian comments **highly supports** the E-WG viewpoint, and moreover, stresses and assures that the terms “*animal feed*” and “*feed*” shall cover only feed for food producing animals, and that feed for

pet animals **or feed for other animals not used for human food**, and feed trade shall be considered outside the scope of the Codex Alimentarius.”

4 - The Egyptian comments include also that “*The Hazard analysis and Critical Control Point (HACCP) System and Guidelines for Its Application*, (Included in the basic texts on food hygiene adopted by the Codex Alimentarius Commission, Annex to CAC/RCP 1-1969, and its Revisions of 1997, 1999 and 2003” shall also be changed, in the same manner such as in all the above-mentioned Codex documents, by adding feed, feed ingredients, feed additives, etc., beside the **term food/foods**, as long as they may affect **food safety and human health**. **The necessary changes in the HACCP Principle I (Conduct the Hazard Analysis ...), mainly hazards arising or present in feed, feed ingredients, and/or feed additives should be also taken into consideration during the analysis.** **Changes in other Principles, 2, 3, etc., may be also needed.**

The changes shall cover also directly or indirectly all the **other Codex documents based on or relevant to HACCP System**, and may include other **Non-Codex International Standards** such as **ISO 2200 (FSMS) and/or GlobalGAP, BRC, etc.**, as long as all these standards based on the Codex HACCP.

5 - The Egyptian comments include also that the E-WG Report shall stress more on the importance of the concept of “**Good Agricultural Practices, GAP**” that evolved in recent years, in the context as an option or a tool for controlling hazards present or arising from the primary production of **feeds, feed ingredients** in addition to fruits & vegetables in the farms, particularly in the Pre-harvest stage.

6 - The Egyptian comments include also that in the E-WG Report, Page 37, Annex II “*Proposed Changes to existing Codex texts on emergency situations and exchange of information on rejected food as to their applicability to animal feed (CAC/GL 19-1995 and CAC/GL 25-1997)*”, under the Title “**NATURE OF THE FOOD SAFETY EMERGENCY**”, **Item #9, the 4<sup>th</sup> line “If the food safety hazard is associated with the feed, the feed and animals that consumed the fee should be identified”.** **A writing correction should be done to be “If the food safety hazard is associated with feed, the feed and animals that consumed the feed should be identified”.**

## European Union

### **1. Background**

This document is the response of the European Union and its Member States (EUMS) to Codex Circular Letter CL 2010/08-CAC of March 2010 requesting comments on the report of the Electronic Working Group on Animal Feeding. The deadline for comments is 15 May 2010.

The EUMS would like to thank Codex and the electronic Working Group, in particular its host and co-chair countries, for their substantial efforts in undertaking this work which has resulted in some extremely valuable outputs with limited resources used.

### **2. Overarching statement and review of existing documents.**

The EUMS support the overarching statement in the report. It is necessary to clarify that the Codex documents reviewed apply to both feed and feed ingredients as they impact food safety. It is also necessary to clarify that the term "food chain" includes feed inputs. It is also important to clarify that the terms "animal feed" and "feed" when used in Codex Alimentarius texts refer only to feed for food producing animals and that feed for pet animals are outside the scope of Codex Alimentarius. It is also essential to clarify that feed trade as such is outside the scope of Codex Alimentarius, without prejudice to the statutes of Codex Alimentarius<sup>10</sup>.

The overarching statement and the suggestions for modification of the reviewed Codex documents should be sent for consideration to the relevant existing Codex Committees (CCCF, CCRVDF, CCFA).

### **3. Amending and adding new definitions to the Procedural Manual**

The EUMS support the transmission of the proposed amendments and new definitions in the report to the Codex Committee on General Principles and the relevant existing committees for endorsement. The information to be sent should include the report of the electronic Working Group.

---

<sup>10</sup> Section I – Foundation Texts and Definitions, Statutes of the Codex Alimentarius Commission, Procedural Manual, Eighteenth Edition, Rome, 2009.

#### **4. Coverage of residues of different feed additives within the Codex definitions of contaminants or food additives**

This matter requires further consideration.

#### **5. Overview of all Codex documents related to feed**

This additional task mentioned during the deliberations of the electronic Working Group, namely to prepare an overview document of all Codex documents related to feed. This would focus on whether all aspects of food safety risk analysis relating to feed addresses food/feed production, use, hygiene, and whether it needs further consideration. The Codex documents and the Code of Good Animal Practice will clearly form the main basis of the review, but there may be other additional documents relevant to animal feeding and thus an overview document along the lines we are suggesting could prove to be most useful.

#### **4. Suitable and specific mechanisms for addressing the identified tasks**

The EUMS believe that the identified tasks should be addressed as soon as possible in an appropriate manner. The EUMS have stated in the past that a time limited *ad hoc* Codex Task Force on Animal Feeding is a suitable mechanism in particular, in those areas where Codex has not started work on feed. The Task Force would allow considering all identified feed related issues in a holistic manner and would make efficient use of the available expertise and resources at its disposal. However, the EUMS could consider assigning permanently all future tasks relating to animal feeding to an existing Codex Committee and are of the opinion that if such an approach is followed, then the Codex Committee on Contaminants in Foods (CCCF) would be the most appropriate body as its terms of reference already contain provisions in relation to feed. The CCCF has already finalized work on animal feed, for instance on melamine, most incidents with animal feed to date concerned contaminants, and the gathered experience would benefit the work in other feed areas. Moreover, the expertise would still be centralized, facilitating the participation of feed experts.

#### **Japan**

Japan would like to appreciate the effort of the electronic working group (EWG) led by Denmark and the United States of America for the work on animal feeding. While recognizing that the discussion held during the EWG is appropriately reflected in the EWG's report, Japan is pleased to express its view and comments on the report as follows:

#### **1. Review of Existing Codex Risk Analysis Principles as to Their Applicability to Feed**

Japan is of the view that the existing Codex documents reviewed by the EWG are adequately applicable to animal feed and that they do not need to be further revised. Therefore Japan does not support the proposed revision on these documents as presented in Annexes I, II and III to the report of the EWG in CL 2010/8-CAC.

#### **Overarching statement**

If the Commission wishes to endorse the recommendation of the EWG to insert the overarching statement in the Procedural Manual, Japan would like to suggest the following;

- Among the nine documents listed in the second paragraph of the Statement (in page 4 of CL 2010/8-CAC in English version), the five documents in 5<sup>th</sup> – 9<sup>th</sup> points should be deleted. These five documents are for use by governments, but not by the relevant committees in Codex, hence it is not appropriate to mention them in the Codex Procedural Manual.
- Consequently, the Commission may wish to ask CCFH, CCGP, CCFICS and CCCF to consider insertion of the similar statement in the respective documents.

#### **2. Proposal on Suitable Mechanisms for Addressing the Remaining Three Items proposed by the Electronic Working Group to the 32<sup>nd</sup> Session of the CAC**

For the items a) and b), Japan supports the first option to establish a time-limited dedicated Task Force to address them, subject to the approval by the Commission to initiate new work on these items. Japan is of the view that consideration of these two items go far beyond the Terms of Reference of the CCCF and CCRVDF.

With regard to item c) on Criteria for Global identification and Notification of Emergency Situations Affecting the Feed Sector, Japan supports the third option to refer the work to WHO and FAO. Japan recognizes that WHO and FAO have already operated their global alert systems, namely INFOASAN and EMPRES respectively, and they should primarily undertake the work to develop their own criteria for emergency situations, with a view to improving their systems for benefit of Member countries.

### **3. Annex IV: Proposed changes to the Definitions of risk analysis terms**

Japan suggests that the Commission should not endorse this proposal to change definitions of risk analysis terms. Japan notes that the terms of reference of the EWG assigned by the Commission last year does not cover the consideration of possible changes to the definitions.

In the meantime, Japan would like to reiterate herein again our comments raised during the EWG regarding the term of “contaminants”, but was not reflected in the report. The current proposed changes to the definition for “contaminants” is not appropriate and create contradiction in the Codex system, they exclude veterinary medicines added intentionally to feed and unintentionally remained in food (e.g. oxytetracycline, a veterinary drug usually added to feed for fish aquaculture). The following is the alternative changes for consideration by relevant committees if Annex IV is supposed to be considered by relevant committees in future:

**Contaminant** means any substance not intentionally added to food *or feed for food producing animals*, which is present in such food *or feed* as a result of the production (including operations carried out in crop husbandry, animal husbandry and veterinary medicine), manufacture, processing, preparation, treatment, packing, packaging, transport or holding of such food *or feed*, or as a result of environmental contamination. **However, veterinary medicine intentionally added to feed remained in food are regarded as contaminants.** The term does not include insect fragments, rodent hairs and other extraneous matter.

### **United States of America**

#### **General Comments**

The United States recognizes that some of the work proposed by the previous electronic working group (EWG), which was co-chaired by Denmark and Mexico, (CL2008/40-CAC Addendum) in its report to the 2009 session of the CAC remains to be completed. The CAC decided in 2009 to establish a second EWG (hosted by Denmark and the United States) to work on the first three items from the report of the first EWG, which would help in identifying the suitable mechanism to carry out the remaining work. The CAC now has before it a decision on the remaining recommendations of the previous EWG. Member Countries put forth several options for completing each of the work items, but similar to the first EWG, the Members of the current EWG were unable to achieve consensus. As we consider the EWG report, we must keep in mind the limited mandate of the CAC for this work group as well as for work on animal feed in general.

#### **Review of the Codex Risk Assessment Principles as to their Applicability to Animal Feed and Proposed Overarching Statements**

The United States agrees that animal feed—as it relates to human food safety—should be appropriately addressed by Codex Committees. To that end, the EWG has made recommendations for insertion of an overarching statement as well as other changes in the risk analysis documents for several committees. Since the relevant committees have not had input into these proposed changes, the United States believes it is premature for the CAC to adopt these changes at this Session. These committees (CCGP, CCFA, CCCF, CCPR, and CCRVDF) are the best qualified to review the proposed changes since they are the most familiar with the principles in the texts and the conditions under which the principles apply. Most important, they can ensure that the original intent and substance of their committees’ risk analysis principles are not altered.

For these reasons, the United States prefers that the committees that drafted the original texts review the text changes proposed by the EWG and determine the appropriate placement of the overarching statements and the appropriate references to animal feed in the documents.

#### **Mechanism**

The current EWG considered several options for a mechanism for completing the remainder of the work recommended by the previous EWG, but no clear consensus emerged.

For several reasons, the United States recommends that additional work on animal feed be assigned to a standing committee. We are mindful of the discussions at recent Commission sessions on the resource burden created by the number of committee meetings, task force meetings, and work groups, which taken

together, create a very full Codex calendar. Assigning the work to an existing committee minimizes the resource impact on the Codex Secretariat as well as on Member Countries. Equally important, an existing Codex committee provides a permanent forum to discuss appropriate issues as they arise.

We have considered assignment of the work to several committees including the Codex Committee on Food Additives (CCFA) and the Codex Committee on Contaminants in Food (CCCF). However, we do not believe the expertise for the issues relative to animal feed reside in these committees, nor do we believe that either committee has room on its agenda for undertaking the additional work, such as the development of guidelines for governments on how to apply the existing risk analysis methodology as related to animal feed.

The United States supports assigning work on animal feed to the Codex Committee on Residues of Veterinary Drugs in Food (CCRVDF). CCRVDF deals with animal agriculture, and much of its work focuses on the transfer of substances in feed to animal tissue. Thus, animal feed issues fit well within that Committee's scope and existing expertise. Virtually all of the feed-related issues that adversely impact human health are associated with feed additives or contaminants that may migrate to animal tissue; therefore, CCRVDF appears to be the most appropriate and relevant committee to handle the feed additive work.

Many of the Codex delegates to CCRVDF are also responsible for work on animal feed within their own governments. Thus, the need for additional specific feed expertise may result in only minor modifications to the composition of most delegations to CCRVDF. Having CCRVDF manage the animal feed work would be consistent with the Commission's goal of easing the cost burden on Member Countries. Therefore, for practical and substantive reasons, the United States recommends that work on animal feed be assigned to CCRVDF. We would also like to note that in regard to workload, this committee is in an excellent position to assume work on animal feed.

In addition to deciding on a mechanism for addressing animal feed issues, the Commission also needs to consider the scope of work to be assigned. The United States believes that the work recommended by the 2008 work group constitutes the current boundaries of work on animal feed in Codex Committees. Any work beyond that specified in the 2009 EWG report should be addressed through the standard Codex procedures for proposing new work.

One of the recommendations of the 2009 EWG report concerns the development of a prioritized list of hazards in feed. However, several of the comments to the EWG emphasized the difficulties that a task force would have in keeping a list current.

The United States remains opposed to work on a prioritized list of hazards. Lists are difficult to maintain in the Codex process and consume committee time that is better spent developing guidance for countries on how to assess and manage risks from animal feed. Additionally, the United States believes that, due to regional differences, a list of hazards of international relevance would be difficult to develop. Instead, the United States recommends that Codex develop criteria for determining and evaluating hazards, which would provide countries guidance when making individual determinations of specific hazards in the context of the conditions in their countries.

#### **FEFAC (European Feed Manufacturers Federation)**

FEFAC, representing the European compound feed and premix manufacturing industry, would like to share its comments on the report of the Codex electronic Working Group on Animal Feeding to be considered at the 33<sup>rd</sup> Session of the Codex Alimentarius Commission, CAC.

The European feed industry experts have provided direct input to the electronic Working Group through our International Feed Industry Federation, IFIF. The following remarks have been collected by our experts and should be seen as complementary to the comments submitted by IFIF.

After four years of discussion on this topic at CODEX level, we consider that a final decision by the CAC on how to address feed safety-related issues impacting food safety is overdue. We were highly encouraged to see a growing global consensus that Codex must deal with emerging feed safety issues as part of its general responsibilities for food safety and we would like to thank again the electronic Working Group for having contributed to this recognition a very constructive way.

However, must express our deep concern that most electronic Working Group members considered feed trade being outside the scope of CODEX according to CAC statutes Art. 1 (a) of the procedural manual thus opposing the advice provided by the joint FAO/WHO expert meeting on Animal Feed Impact on Food Safety (Rome, October 2007). We believe this is a completely arbitrary and unpractical interpretation of Art. 1(a) which could lead to future discriminatory CODEX risk management recommendations on feed safety standards and unjustified trade barriers for feed imports. We therefore urge the 33<sup>rd</sup> CAC meeting to seek a broader interpretation of food trade within the scope of Art. 1 (a) by CAC which, to our understanding, should obviously cover feed trade for food producing animals.

We are otherwise very grateful for the positive response and practical proposals of the electronic Working Group on how to address the identified three key working items at CODEX level, i.e. :

- The development of detailed guidelines on how to apply existing Codex risk assessment methodologies to the various types of hazards related to contaminants/residues in feed ingredients;
- The development of a prioritized list of hazards in feed ingredients and feed additives;
- The establishment of criteria for the global identification and notification of emergency situations affecting the feed sector.

We fully recognize that the electronic Working Group did not reach consensus on the most suitable mechanism to carry out this work at CODEX level but would stress the importance to reach a final agreement on this issue at the 33<sup>rd</sup> CAC session.

From our perspective, the electronic Working Group recommendation to assign the work on all three working items to one of the existing permanent committees as one of the key options (CCVRDF or CCCF) does have the merit of establishing a permanent discussion platform inside CODEX on emerging feed safety issues with an impact on food safety, which would allow global feed regulators to establish a regular dialogue on harmonized risk-proportionate risk management responses.

We recognize that a dedicated Task Force for animal feed safety may allow CODEX to deal with the work items identified by the EWG more effectively. However, after the expiration of the mandate of the next potential Task Force, CODEX would still lack the capacity to deal adequately with emerging feed safety issues in the absence of a permanent CODEX “home” for feed regulators.

In balance we are convinced that the electronic Working Group option to assign the identified work items (iv a – c) to a permanent CODEX Committee offers the better long-term perspective allowing to build and expand CODEX knowledge and capability to deal effectively with emerging feed safety issues following the “farm to fork” principle and to develop global feed safety standards where required. This should not preclude CODEX from assigning specific tasks to dedicated expert groups. We would actually recommend the setting up of a joint FAO/WHO expert group consisting of qualified feed safety risk assessors to draw up the guidelines on how to apply existing CODEX Risk assessment methodologies on various feed hazards. We consider such guidelines to be the prerequisite for the future development of risk-proportionate, scientifically based feed safety standards.

### **IFIF (International Feed Industry Federation)**

The International Feed Industry Federation is pleased to submit the following comments in response to CL 2010/08 CAC, ‘Request for Comments on the Report on the Electronic Working Group on Animal Feeding’ and we look forward to participating in the consideration of this report at the 33<sup>rd</sup> Session of the Codex Alimentarius Commission.

First, IFIF supports the Electronic Working Group's (EWG) recommendation to insert the proposed overarching statements in specific Codex Risk Assessment Principle texts relating to the role of animal feeding and its potential impact on food safety. If this recommendation is approved by the Commission, we further recommend that the Commission also direct the Codex Committees, which authored the Principles, to determine how the overarching statements should be incorporated within each of the risk assessment principles.

Second, IFIF supports the option to establish the Codex Committee on Residues of Veterinary Drugs in Food (CCRVDF) as the permanent Committee to handle future work on animal feed.

CCRVDF is the most appropriate Codex Committee to undertake this responsibility because:

- This Committee has completed a majority of work related to feed in Codex to-date, focused on the

potential transfer of residues to animal tissue and has the experience required;

- A majority of potential feed-related food safety risks are a consequence of feed additives or contaminants that may possibly be transferred to animal tissue;
- As a permanent Committee, CCVRDF would also have the potential to consider possible future areas of feed-related work as these are identified;
- If a particular area of work is more appropriate for another Codex Committee, it can be referred to that Committee by CCRVDF within the current Codex process;
- CCRVDF has the capability to determine how to best incorporate this expanded work within the Committee's Terms of Reference and make any appropriate adjustments to meet the requirements;
- CCRVDF has the capacity, and time, to accept this additional workload and this option would also effectively fulfill this need for work on feed without adding the additional administrative and financial burden of a new Task Force or Committee.

In summary, the EWG has provided two very sound options for the Commission's consideration, to most effectively address the present and future work regarding animal feed. IFIF recommends the adoption of the above recommendations.