

# codex alimentarius commission



FOOD AND AGRICULTURE  
ORGANIZATION  
OF THE UNITED NATIONS

WORLD  
HEALTH  
ORGANIZATION



JOINT OFFICE: Viale delle Terme di Caracalla 00153 ROME Tel: 39 06 57051 www.codexalimentarius.net Email: codex@fao.org Facsimile: 39 06 5705 4593

## Agenda Item 12

### JOINT FAO/WHO FOOD STANDARDS PROGRAMME

#### CODEX ALIMENTARIUS COMMISSION

##### *Thirty-first Session*

*International Conference Centre, Geneva (Switzerland), 30 June - 4 July 2008*

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

##### Matters Arising after 15 March 2008

### I. MATTERS FOR ACTION BY THE COMMISSION

#### THE 29<sup>TH</sup> SESSION OF THE CODEX ALIMENTARIUS COMMISSION

##### **Future Work on Animal Feeding <sup>1</sup>**

1. Comments from Australia, Peru and Switzerland, which were not included in the Annex to ALINORM 08/31/9D, are presented in the Annex to this document.

### II. MATTERS FOR INFORMATION TO THE COMMISSION

#### STRATEGIC PLAN 2008-2013 OF THE CODEX ALIMENTARIUS COMMISSION

2. Several Committees have reviewed the Strategic Plan 2008-2013 adopted by the 30<sup>th</sup> Session of the Commission, in particular the relevant Activities in Part II "Programme Areas and Planned Activities 2008-2013", and provided comments and/or observations as follows.

##### *The Second Session of the Codex Committee on Contaminants in Foods (CCCF)<sup>2</sup>*

3. The Committee noted the Activities 1.1, 2.2, 2.3, 2.5, 3.3, 4.1, 5.5 of the Strategic Plan 2008-2013, and in particular noted that the assignments given in relation to the implementation of the Strategic Plan were ongoing work in the Committee and that committee-specific decision making and priority setting criteria had been developed and were currently being implemented by the Committee.

<sup>1</sup> ALINORM 06/29/41, paras 170-174

<sup>2</sup> ALINORM 08/31/41, para. 17

***The 40<sup>th</sup> Session of the Codex Committee on Pesticide Residues (CCPR)***<sup>3</sup>

4. The Committee noted that activities such as 1.1, 2.2, 2.3, 2.5, 3.3 listed in Part II of the Codex Alimentarius Strategic Plan 2008-2013 were related to the ongoing work of the Committee or had already been addressed in recently completed documents and had been included in the Codex Procedural Manual.

***The 40<sup>th</sup> Session of the Codex Committee on Food Additives (CCFA)***<sup>4</sup>

5. The Committee noted that Activities 1.1, 2.2, 2.3, 2.5, 3.3, 4.1, 5.5 and 5.6 of the Strategic Plan 2008-2013 identified the CCFA as one of the responsible parties for implementation.

***The 36<sup>th</sup> Session of the Codex Committee on Food Labelling (CCFL)***<sup>5</sup>

6. With regard to Activity 3.3 (Develop committee-specific decision-making and priority-setting criteria), the Committee agreed that the Delegation of the European Community in cooperation with Canada would prepare a discussion document on the establishment of criteria for priority setting for consideration at the next session.

***The 14<sup>th</sup> Session of the Codex Committee on Fresh Fruits and Vegetables (CCFFV)***<sup>6</sup>

7. The Committee noted that Activities 1.2 (Review and develop Codex standards and related texts for food quality) and 4.1 (Track the activities of other international standard-setting bodies) were of particular relevance to its work and that they were part of its ongoing activities and did not require any specific action by the Committee. As regards Activity 3.3 (Develop committee-specific decision-making and priority-setting criteria), the Delegation of New Zealand, in view of the number of proposals for new work made, suggested that it would be worthwhile to consider screening of proposals in a working group before discussion in the plenary and developing criteria specifically applicable to this Committee.

**REVIEW OF CODEX COMMITTEE STRUCTURE AND MANDATES OF CODEX COMMITTEES AND TASK FORCES**

8. The 30<sup>th</sup> Session of the Commission considered 11 Proposals as contained in Circular Letter CL 2006/29-CAC. The Commission:

- agreed to invite Codex committees to consider adopting a longer inter-session interval with the understanding that a structured, effective inter-session working mechanism should then be put in place in accordance with the Guidelines on Physical Working Groups and on Electronic Working Groups (*Proposal 3* (interval of meetings))<sup>7</sup>; and
- agreed that the duration of a Codex session should be kept within seven days, including the pre-session meetings of working groups, if any, in order to keep its proceedings well focused, ensure transparency, and facilitate effective participation of the members, with the understanding that a certain margin of flexibility should be allowed, depending on the workload of each subsidiary bodies (*Proposal 4* (duration of meetings))<sup>8</sup>.

9. Several committees considered these decisions of the Commission as follows.

---

<sup>3</sup> ALINORM 08/31/24, para. 9

<sup>4</sup> ALINORM 08/31/12, para. 11

<sup>5</sup> ALINORM 08/31/22, para. 8

<sup>6</sup> ALINORM 08/31/35, paras 8 and 105

<sup>7</sup> ALINORM 07/30/REP, paras 151-154

<sup>8</sup> ALINORM 07/30/REP, para. 155

***The Second Session of the CCCF<sup>9</sup>***

10. The Committee agreed that the current duration and interval of meetings of the Committee were appropriate, especially given the fact that this was a new committee and concerns were raised that matters would not be finalized as quickly as they should be if a longer interval was applied. The Committee suggested that inter-session working groups should work in an effective way to ensure that all working documents be provided in principle two months in advance to each plenary session as required in the Rule XI of the Rule of Procedure.

***The 40<sup>th</sup> Session of the CCPR<sup>10</sup>***

11. The Committee noted that its work depended on the schedule and outcome of JMPR meetings/evaluations and agreed to inform the Commission that the current one year interval and six day duration of the Committee's meetings were appropriate and necessary in order to accomplish its work.

***The 40<sup>th</sup> Session of the CCFA<sup>11</sup>***

12. With regard to Proposal 3 (interval of meetings) and Proposal 4 (duration of meetings), the Committee was of the view that the current interval and duration of the meeting were appropriate considering the current workload. It was further noted that efforts had been made to reduce the number of pre- and in-session physical working groups.

***The 36<sup>th</sup> Session of the CCFL<sup>12</sup>***

13. Taking into account the proposals for new work put forward at the present session, the Committee confirmed that the current interval between meetings should be maintained.

***The 14<sup>th</sup> Session of the CCFV<sup>13</sup>***

14. The Committee considered proposal 3 (interval between meetings) and proposal 4 (duration of meetings) and agreed that the current interval of 18 months and a duration of 5 days were appropriate taking into account the need for sufficient time to prepare and consider documents and that working groups had been established that would work between sessions as well as immediately prior to the next Session of the Committee to facilitate the work of the Committee.

---

<sup>9</sup> ALINORM 08/31/41, para. 18

<sup>10</sup> ALINORM 08/31/24, para. 10

<sup>11</sup> ALINORM 08/31/12, para. 12

<sup>12</sup> ALINORM 08/31/22, para. 130

<sup>13</sup> ALINORM 08/31/35, para. 110

ANNEX**Comments Received in Response to CL 2007/19-CAC:****“Request for Proposals for Future Work by Codex on Animal Feeding and Information on the National experience in the Implementation of the *Codex Code of Practice in Good Animal Feeding* (CAC/RCP 58-2004)”**AUSTRALIA

Australia is pleased to submit the following comments in response to CL 2007/19-CAC with relation to proposals for future work by Codex on Animal Feeding.

Many of the elements covered in the Codex Code of Practice on Good Animal Feeding are already covered by existing Australian legislation. Australia is currently drafting a new National Animal Feed Controls Standard to ensure greater consistency in the application of existing Australian legislation by states and territories. The National Standard is based on the Codex Code of Practice on Good Animal Feeding, with some additional measures to take account of Australian requirements.

In relation to future work by Codex on animal feeding, Australia notes the Report of the FAO/WHO Expert Meeting on Animal Feed Impact on Food Safety. Australia supports the re-establishment of the *ad hoc* Task Force on Animal Feeding to consider this report and identify possible areas that the Task Force may need to address.

PERU

Peru welcomes the opportunity to express its opinion and respond to the Circular Letter.

In response to the request for proposals for future work by Codex on animal feeding and information on national experience in the implementation of the Codex Code of Practice in Good Animal Feeding (CAC/RCP 58-2004), we wish to mention the following:

With regard to national experience in the implementation of the document in question, Peru has initiated a process of promotion of food safety at different levels, through a draft Framework Act on Food Safety involving the National Plant and Animal Health Service (SENASA), the General Directorate of Environmental Health (DIGESA) of the Ministry of Health and the Fisheries Technology Institute (ITP) of the Ministry of Production – authorities with responsibilities in food safety.

Since 1998, Supreme Decree N° 015-98-AG has regulated the registration, control and trade of animal feed, covering its production, storage, formulation, labelling, microbiological analysis and quality. This now applies to all food imported or manufactured in the country.

Supreme Decree N° 008-2005-AG of 2005 established the SENASA Food Safety Division to help protect consumer health and agricultural competitiveness by improving and ensuring the safety of crop and livestock production.

As regards product traceability and registration of feed and feed ingredients, most manufacturers registered with the SENASA keep records of the production and distribution of their feed and feed ingredients, but not their utilization. Nor are there records of operator notification of potential food hazards. In this regard, there is a plan to implement a system that will enable the official authority to learn in real time of any problem detected in the food industry that could represent a consumer risk.

As regards inspection and control procedures, some operators have a system of self-regulation or auto-control to ensure compliance with production, storage and transport standards because they maintain the quality certificates (ISO standards) that guarantee the product they produce and market.

In relation to food-borne risks to consumer health, the SENASA regulates levels of undesirable substances on the basis of the Codex Maximum Residue Limits (MRLs).

As regards the production and use of feed and feed ingredients on farms or establishments, very little is done on the application of good agricultural practices for fodder and forage crops for animals destined for human consumption. In this connection, a series of activities have been programmed (training, informal discussions, field visits, etc.) to promote the application of good practices throughout the food production chain.

## **SWITZERLAND**

We thank you for the opportunity to make proposals and comments on future work by Codex on animal feeding. Below is a list of proposals we would like to see given priority.

### **Description of proposed Codex work on animal feeding**

Swiss legislation on feed hygiene now equates with that of the European Union. The principles of Codex on feed have been integrated.

#### **1. General objectives**

##### 1.1 Formulation of international rules of feed hygiene

Higher global demand for food and the availability of new by-products, increasingly associated with the production of bioenergy, require coordination between all States to establish and maintain rules on feed that will ensure safety of animal products.

##### 1.2. Safety in the trade of raw materials and feed

Greater international trade of raw materials and feed require the establishment and control of common rules on quality of the traded products. Because of its universal scope, Codex is ideally suited to act as such an instrument. Global food safety can only be obtained by fully controlling all the links of the food chain, including feed.

#### **2. Specific objectives**

##### 2.1. Control of contaminants

In order to ensure the effective safety of the food chain, we believe that the *ad hoc* Intergovernmental Task Force on Animal Feeding should include the control of contaminants in raw materials used for feed. The scandals relating to feed in recent years have clearly demonstrated the need to identify potential risks from contaminants and to put more effective prevention measures in place.

##### 2.2. Exchange of information on the safety of feed

A global system of rapid exchange of information on feed safety is urgently needed to warn national feed control bodies of potential hazards. We wish to play an active role in devising and establishing such a network.

##### 2.3. Quality control of feed production

The application of quality control systems based on risk assessment, determination of critical control points and implementation of corrective measures, along the lines of HACCP, has produced good results. The *ad hoc* Intergovernmental Task Force on Animal Feeding could widely disseminate this effective expertise in food safety.

##### 2.4. Coordination between international organizations

The activities of the *ad hoc* Intergovernmental Task Force on Animal Feeding should dovetail with those of other Codex committees and international organizations such as FAO, WHO, OIE and IPPC.

We should like to thank you for your consideration of these comments.