

codex alimentarius commission



FOOD AND AGRICULTURE
ORGANIZATION
OF THE UNITED NATIONS

WORLD
HEALTH
ORGANIZATION



E

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 5

CX/CF 08/2/5
February 2008

JOINT FAO/WHO FOOD STANDARDS PROGRAMME **CODEX COMMITTEE ON CONTAMINANTS IN FOODS**

Second Session

The Hague, the Netherlands, 31 March - 4 April 2008

PROPOSED DRAFT REVISION OF THE PREAMBLE OF THE CODEX GENERAL STANDARD FOR CONTAMINANTS AND TOXINS IN FOODS (GSCTF)

(At Step 3 of the Elaboration Procedure)

Governments and international organizations are invited to submit comments on the following subject matters no later than 24 March 2008, preferably in electronic format, for the attention of Ms. Tanja Åkesson, the Netherlands Secretariat of the Codex Committee on Contaminants in Foods, Fax No.:+31 70 3786141; E-mail:info@codexalimentarius.nl with a copy to the Secretary, Codex Alimentarius Commission, Joint FAO/WHO Food Standards Programme, Viale delle Terme di Caracalla, 00153 Rome, Italy (Fax +39.06.5705.4593; E-mail: mailto:Codex@fao.org).

1. This document incorporates a report of the electronic working group (led by the European Community) to prepare a proposed draft revision of the Preamble of the Codex General Standard for Contaminants and Toxins in Foods (GSCTF) (as presented in Attachment I), as agreed by the Codex Committee on Contaminants in Foods (CCCF) at its First Session¹. Australia, Belgium, Brazil, France, Japan, Malaysia, the Netherlands, Philippines, FAO, CIAA, IADSA, ICBA, ICD and IDF participated in the electronic working group. A list of participants is presented in Attachment II to this document.

2. The Terms of Reference of the electronic working group² is:

- to extract the procedural provisions from the preamble to GSCTF to include them in the Procedural Manual;
- to revise the “Complementary food categorisation system for the GSCTF”;
- to update the provisions on the Procedural Manual as regards the contaminants; and
- to align the language of the Preamble with the language contained in the Procedural Manual.

3. Due to time constraints, the electronic working group has not yet completed the work on the above second bullet point (Revision of the Complementary Food Categorisation System for the GSCTF). Therefore it should be noted that the current ANNEX IV-A (COMPLEMENTARY FOOD CATEGORIZATION SYSTEM FOR THE GSCTF) as presented in the proposed draft revision will be replaced with a text which is supposed to be produced as an addendum document when it becomes available.

¹ ALINORM 07/30/41 para. 43

² ALINORM 06/29/12 para.119 (3rd bullet point) and Appendix XIX

Attachment I

Report of the electronic working group to prepare the Proposed Draft Revision of the Preamble of the Codex General Standard for Contaminants and Toxins in Foods (GSCTF)**BACKGROUND**

1. The 38th Session of the Codex Committee on Food Additives and Contaminants (CCFAC), held in April 2006, agreed to forward to the Codex Alimentarius Commission (CAC) a project document for new work to revise the Preamble of the Codex General Standard for Contaminants and Toxins in Foods (GSCTF) to remove the procedural provisions; to include them in the Procedural Manual; to update the provisions in the Procedural Manual as regards to contaminants; to amend “the complementary food categorization system for the GSCTF”; to align the language of the Preamble with the definitions contained in the Procedural Manual; and to establish an electronic Working Group, led by the European Community, to undertake this work, pending the approval of the Commission.³

2. The Codex Committee on Contaminants in Foods (CCCF), at its First Session held in April 2007, discussed in detail the proposed amendments⁴. The Committee noted however that there were still a number of proposed changes to the Preamble of the GSCTF that had not been fully considered and discussed by the Committee and that the time for reflection had been too brief because of the late circulation of the working document. It was therefore agreed that the proposed draft Revision be sent back to Step 2 for redrafting by an electronic working group, led by the Delegation of the European Community, in light of the comments made at its First Session, with a view to circulation of the revised proposal for comments at Step 3 and consideration at Step 4 at the Second Session of the Committee⁵.

REVISION OF THE PREAMBLE OF THE GSCTF

The electronic working group noted below several documents adopted by the CAC as those were linked to how it proceeded with revising the Preamble of the GSCTF.

3. The Preamble of the GSCTF had been elaborated by the CCFAC and adopted by the CAC (July 2006), which preceded with the inclusion of the "*Working Principles for Risk Analysis for Application in the Framework of the Codex Alimentarius*" in section III of the Procedural Manual (Procedural Manual – 17th edition in English – p. 112 - 118) and the establishment of the "*Working Principles for Risk Analysis for Food Safety for Application by Government*" adopted by the CAC in 2007 (ALINORM 07/30/REP – paras 56-60) as forwarded by the Codex Committee on General Principles (CCGP) (ALINORM 07/30/33 para. 89 and Appendix VIII).

4. Also other relevant texts, based on the *Working Principles for Risk Analysis for Application in the Framework of the Codex Alimentarius*, were prepared by the CCFAC to clarify its interaction with JECFA and establish its policy for risk assessment and have been included in Section III of the Procedural Manual, namely:

- "*Risk Analysis Principles Applied by the Codex Committee on Food Additives (CCFA) and the Codex Committee on Contaminants in Food (CCCF)*" (Procedural Manual – 17th edition in English, p. 119-124);
- "*Policy of the Codex Committee on Contaminants in Foods for Exposure Assessment of Contaminants and Toxins in Foods or Food Groups*" (Procedural Manual – 17th edition in English, p.125-128).

5. Moreover, the CAC has adopted a revised version of the *Criteria for the Establishment of Work Priorities* (Procedural Manual – 17th Edition in English, p.68 – 69) and established the firm process for deciding upon undertaking new work (Procedural Manual – 17th edition in English – p.21-22: *Procedures for the Elaboration of Codex Standards and related texts, Part 2, Critical Review*).

The electronic working group agreed as follows:

6. The revision of the Preamble of the GSCTF should be conducted, keeping in mind that:

³ ALINORM 06/29/12 para. 119, 3rd bullet point and Appendix XIX

⁴ ALINORM 07/30/41 paras 38 -42

⁵ ALINORM 07/30/41 para. 43

- (a) The rationale for inserting texts/provisions into the Procedural Manual is that the texts/provisions are only relevant for the CAC and its subsidiary bodies and that texts/provisions primarily relevant for Codex members are published as part of the Codex Alimentarius i.e. in the case of contaminants in the GSCTF.
- (b) Some parts of the current Preamble have been superseded by general provisions in the texts adopted more recently by the CAC as guidance to the then CCFAC and published in the Procedural Manual (see para. 2 and 3 above). In order to avoid repetitions and improve consistency with the general policy of the CAC on risk analysis, all parts of the Preamble of a general nature which overlap with the content of these texts should be deleted; only, paragraphs explaining how the process is applied when dealing with contaminants in foodstuffs could be retained.
- (c) Only those parts that constitute recommendations to Codex members should remain in the Preamble as these parts are applied as guidance to the CCCF. However, as the Working Principles for Risk Analysis for Food Safety for Application by Governments were adopted by the CAC (July 2007), future review of these parts may be necessary.

7. Taking into account the recent splitting of CCFAC into CCFA and CCCF, several editorial changes to the Preamble of the GSCTF should be made appropriately.

The electronic working group completed the above work and agreed to submit the following two documents for consideration by the CCCF:

- The Proposed draft revision of the Preamble of the GSCTF (as presented in APPENDIX I). Note that the electronic working group is still in process to revise the Complementary Food Categorisation System (see ANNEX IV-A);
- A proposed draft ANNEX to "*Risk Analysis Principles Applied by the Codex Committee on Food Additives and the Codex Committee on Contaminants in Foods*" (Procedural Manual – 17th edition in English, p. 119-124), which incorporates parts of the Preamble to be transferred to the Procedural Manual are presented in APPENDIX II to this report.

Further, the electronic working group recommends that the Committee should draw attention to the following:

8. There were very much diverging views as regards the possible deletion from the Preamble of the GSCTF of texts which should be included in the Procedural Manual. Some members of the electronic working group advocated the deletion of these texts, while other members were in favour of keeping these texts in the Preamble in addition to taking up these texts in the Procedural Manual. Given these divergent views, the electronic working group agreed to keep the text proposed for transfer to the Procedural Manual or to maintain them in the GSCTF with the comment and leave the final decision as regards possible deletion to the Plenary of CCCF.

9. There were some substantial discussion on feed and how to better integrate feed aspects within the current GSCTF or eventually to explore the possibility to elaborate a specific GSCT Feed. While the scope of the GSCTF clearly refers to contaminants and toxins in foods and feed, the electronic working group referred to in paragraph 2 above, notes that the provisions and information provided for in this Preamble was mainly related to food and that feed was at several occasions not sufficiently addressed. As the matter on feed fell outside the mandate of the electronic working group, it was agreed not to propose any changes to the Preamble related to the feed issue. The CCCF at its Second Session might wish to consider how to address this issue appropriately.

10. Furthermore, when maximum levels are set for commodities which can be used for human consumption as well for animal feeding, it should be specified to what intended use the maximum level is related to. It might be appropriate to specify, in specific instances, the intended use of the commodities for which a maximum level or guideline level has already been established in Schedule I.

APPENDIX I

CODEX GENERAL STANDARD FOR CONTAMINANTS AND TOXINS IN FOODS

CODEX STAN 193-1995 (Rev.3-2007)

*Proposed modifications are marked and **comments to the modifications are in italics with yellow background***

1. PREAMBLE**1.1 SCOPE**

This Standard contains the main principles ~~and procedures~~ which are ~~used and~~ recommended by the Codex Alimentarius in dealing with contaminants and toxins in foods and feeds, and lists the maximum levels of contaminants and natural toxicants in foods and feeds which are recommended by the CAC to be applied to commodities moving in international trade.

1.2 DEFINITION OF TERMS**1.2.1 General**

The definitions for the purpose of the Codex Alimentarius, as mentioned in the Procedural Manual, are applicable to the General Standard for Contaminants and Toxins in Foods (GSCTF) and only the most important ones are repeated here. Some new definitions are introduced, where this seems warranted to obtain optimal clarity. When reference is made to foods, this also applies to animal feed, in those cases where this is appropriate.

1.2.2 Contaminant

Codex Alimentarius defines a contaminant as follows:

"Any substance not intentionally added to food, which is present in such food 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 and distribution or holding of such food or as a result of environmental contamination. The term does not include foreign bodies such as insect fragments, rodent hairs and other extraneous matter".

This standard applies to any substance that meets the terms of the Codex definition for a contaminant, including contaminants in feed for food-producing animals, except:

- 1) Contaminants having only food quality significance, but no public health significance, in the food(s).
- 2) Pesticide residues, as defined by the Codex definition that are within the terms of reference of the Codex Committee on Pesticide Residues (CCPR). ~~Pesticide residues arising from pesticide uses not associated with food production may be considered for inclusion in the GSCTF if not dealt with by the CCPR.~~

Comment: ALINORM 07/30/41 § 39

- 3) Residues of veterinary drugs, as defined by the Codex definition, that are within the terms of reference of the Codex Committee on Residues of Veterinary Drugs in Foods (CCRVDF).
- 4) Microbial toxins, such as botulinum toxin and staphylococcus enterotoxin, and microorganisms that are within the terms of reference of the Codex Committee on Food Hygiene (CCFH).
- 5) ~~Residues of P~~processing aids (processing aids are any substance or material, not including apparatus or utensils, and not consumed as a food ingredient by itself, intentionally used in the processing of raw materials, foods or its ingredients, to fulfil a certain technological purpose during treatment or processing and which may result in the non-intentional but unavoidable presence of residues or derivatives in the final product) ~~(that by definition are intentionally added to foods).~~

Comment: The wording for exclusion of processing aids from the scope of the GSCTF should be further studied (ALINORM 07/30/41 § 39)

1.2.3 Natural toxins included in this standard

The Codex definition of a contaminant implicitly includes naturally occurring toxicants including such as are produced as toxic metabolites of certain microfungi that are not intentionally added to food (mycotoxins).

Microbial toxins that are produced by algae and that may be accumulated in edible aquatic organisms such as shellfish (phycotoxins) are also included in this standard. Mycotoxins and phycotoxins are both subclasses of contaminants.

Inherent natural toxicants, such as e.g. solanine, that are implicit constituents of foods resulting from a genus, species or strain ordinarily producing hazardous levels of a toxic metabolite(s), i.e. phytotoxins are not generally considered within the scope of this standard. They are, however, within the terms of reference of the Codex Committee on Contaminants in Foods (CCCF) and will be dealt with on a case by case basis.

1.2.4 Maximum level and related terms

The *Codex maximum level (ML)* for a contaminant in a food or feed commodity is the maximum concentration of that substance recommended by the Codex Alimentarius Commission (CAC) to be legally permitted in that commodity.

Comment: this definition is included in the 17th edition of the Procedural Manual (ALINORM07/30/REP, § 35 and Appendix III p.93)

For the contaminants methylmercury, radionuclides, acrylonitrile and vinylchloride monomer a **Codex guideline level (GL)**⁶ has been established.

~~A **Codex guideline level (GL)** is the maximum level of a substance in a food or feed commodity which is recommended by the CAC to be acceptable for commodities moving in international trade. When the GL is exceeded, governments should decide whether and under what circumstances the food should be distributed within their territory or jurisdiction.~~⁷

Comment: at the 1st session of CCCF it was agreed to retain the definition of Codex guideline level in a footnote (ALINORM 07/30/41, § 40)

1.3 GENERAL PRINCIPLES REGARDING CONTAMINANTS IN FOODS

1.3.1 General

Foods and feeds can become contaminated by various causes and processes. Contamination generally has a negative impact on the quality of the food or feed and may imply a risk to human or animal health.

Contaminant levels in foods shall be as low as reasonably achievable. The following actions may serve to prevent or to reduce contamination of foods and feeds:

- preventing food contamination at the source, e.g. by reducing environmental pollution.
- applying appropriate technology control measure(s) in food production, handling, storage, processing and packaging.
- applying measures aimed at decontamination of contaminated food or feed and measures to prevent contaminated food or feed to be marketed for consumption.

To ensure that adequate action is taken to reduce contamination of food and feed a Code of Practice shall be elaborated comprising source related measures and Good Manufacturing Practice as well as Good Agricultural Practice in relation to the specific contamination problem.

⁶ *A **Codex guideline level (GL)** is the maximum level of a substance in a food or feed commodity which is recommended by the CAC to be acceptable for commodities moving in international trade. When the GL is exceeded, governments should decide whether and under what circumstances the food should be distributed within their territory or jurisdiction.*

⁷ ~~Because the CAC has decided that the preferred format of a Codex standard in food or feed is a maximum level, the present existing or proposed guideline levels shall be reviewed for their possible conversion to a maximum level.~~
~~Because the CAC has decided that the preferred format of a Codex standard in food or feed is a maximum level, the present existing or proposed guideline levels shall be reviewed for their possible conversion to a maximum level.~~

The degree of contamination of foods and feeds and the effect of actions to reduce contamination shall be assessed by monitoring, survey programs and more specialized research programs, where necessary.

When there are indications that health hazards may be involved with consumption of foods that are contaminated, it is necessary that a risk assessment is made. When health concerns can be substantiated, a risk management ~~measure policy~~ — must be applied, based on a thorough evaluation of the situation. Depending on the assessment of the problems and the possible solutions, it may be necessary to establish maximum levels or other measures governing the contamination of foods. In special cases, it may also have to be considered to complement specific advice as regards give dietary recommendations, when other measures are not sufficiently adequate to exclude the possibility of hazards to health.

National measures regarding food contamination should avoid the creation of unnecessary barriers to international trade in food or feed commodities. The purpose of the GCSCTF is to provide guidance about ~~the possible approaches to eliminate~~ —of the contamination problem and to promote international harmonization through recommendations which in turn may ~~help to avoid the creation of prevent~~ trade barriers and disputes.

For all contaminants, which may be present in more than one food or feed item, a broad approach shall be applied, taking into account all relevant information that is available, for the assessment of risks and for the development of recommendations and measures, including the setting of maximum levels.

1.3.2 Principles for establishing maximum levels in foods and feeds

Maximum levels shall only be set for those foods in which the contaminant may be found in amounts that are significant for the total exposure of the consumer, —taking into consideration the CCCF Policy for Exposure Assessment of Contaminants and Toxins in Foods or Food Groups (Section III of the Procedural Manual)

The maximum levels shall be set in such a way that the consumer is adequately protected. At the same time the other legitimate factors need to be considered. technological possibilities to comply with maximum levels shall be taken into account. This will be performed in accordance with the "Working principles for Risk Analysis for Food safety for Application by Governments" taking into consideration the "Risk Analysis Principles Applied by the Codex Committee on Food Additives and the Codex Committee on Contaminants in Foods" (Section III of the Procedural Manual) in particular para 12 and 20.

—The principles of Good Manufacturing Practice, Good Veterinary Practice and Good Agricultural Practice as defined by Codex shall be used. Maximum levels shall be based on sound scientific principles leading to levels which are acceptable worldwide, so that there is no unjustified barrier to international trade in these foods is facilitated. Maximum levels shall be clearly defined with respect to status and intended use.

1.3.3 Specific criteria

The following criteria ~~may shall~~ (not preventing the use of other relevant criteria) be considered when developing ~~recommendations— maximum levels and/or other measures and making decisions~~ in connection with the Codex General Standard for Contaminants and Toxins in Food: (Further details about these criteria are given in Annex I).

Toxicological information

- identification of the toxic substance(s);
- metabolism by humans and animals, as appropriate;
- toxicokinetics and toxicodynamics including information on possible carry-over of the toxic substance from feed to edible animal tissue/products;
- information about acute and long term toxicity and other relevant toxicity data; and
- integrated toxicological expert advice regarding the acceptability and safety of intake levels of contaminants, including information on any population groups which are specially vulnerable.

Analytical data

- validated qualitative and quantitative data on representative samples; and
- appropriate sampling procedures.

Intake data

- presence in foods of dietary significance for the contaminant intake;
- presence in foods that are widely consumed;
- food intake data for average and most exposed/high consumer groups;
- results from total diet studies;
- calculated contaminant intake data from food consumption models; and —
- data on intake by susceptible groups.

Fair trade considerations

- existing or potential problems in international trade;
- commodities concerned moving in international trade; and
- information about national regulations, in particular on the data and considerations on which these regulations are based.

Technological considerations

- information about contamination processes, technological possibilities, production and manufacturing practices and economic aspects related to contaminant level management and control.

Risk assessment and risk management considerations (cf. "Working Principles for Risk Analysis for Food Safety for Application by Governments" and "Risk Analysis Principles Applied by the Codex Committee on Food Additives and the Codex Committee on Contaminants in Foods" (Section III of the Procedural Manual))

- risk assessment;
- risk management options and considerations;
- consideration of possible maximum levels in foods based on the criteria mentioned above; and
- consideration of alternative solutions.

1.4 CODEX PROCEDURE FOR ESTABLISHING STANDARDS FOR CONTAMINANTS AND TOXINS IN FOODS

Comment: This section could be considered to be superseded by more recent text in the Procedural Manual "Risk Analysis Principles Applied by the Codex Committee on Food Additives and the Codex Committee on Contaminants in Foods" (Procedural Manual, 17th edition and might therefore be deleted from the Preamble. However during the discussion at the 1st session of the CCCF several delegations were of the opinion that the texts contained in the sections 1.4.2. and 1.4.3. should be retained in the Preamble (ALINORM 07/30/41, § 41). Therefore the text is currently retained but deletion remains an option to consider.

For this section reference is made to "Risk Analysis Principles Applied by the Codex Committee on Food Additives and the Codex Committee on Contaminants in Foods" (Procedural Manual, 17th edition, p. 119)

1.4.1 General

The Procedure for the elaboration of Codex Standards, as contained in the Procedural Manual, is applicable. Further details are mentioned here regarding the procedure to be followed and the criteria for decision making, in order to clarify and to facilitate the process of the elaboration of Codex Standards for Contaminants and Toxins in Foods.

1.4.2 Procedure for preliminary discussion ~~about contaminants~~ in the CCCF

Suggestions for new contaminants or new contaminant/commodity combinations to be discussed in CCCF and to be included in the GSCTF may be raised by Codex members or by delegates or by the Codex secretariat. An initial discussion may be held based on oral contributions, but preferably on the basis of a written request ~~note~~ containing relevant and adequate information, that should be provided to CCCF members in advance of next session. For a satisfactory preliminary review the following information is essential:

- 1) Identification of the contaminant and concise information about the background of the problem.
- 2) Indications about the availability of toxicological information and analytical and intake data, including references.
- 3) Indications about (potential) health problems.
- 4) Indications about existing and expected barriers to international trade.
- 5) Information about technological possibilities and economic aspects related to the management of the contaminant problem in food.
- 6) Preferably a proposal for action by the CCCF.

When a ~~Codex memberdelegation~~ wishes that the CCCF shall consider a request for action concerning a specific contaminant this ~~Codex memberdelegation~~ shall, as far as possible, supply information as stated above to serve as the basis for a preliminary review and request the ~~Codex~~ Secretariat to include the matter on the agenda of the next meeting of the Committee.

1.4.3 Procedure for risk management decisions in the CCCF ~~regarding contaminants~~

An evaluation by JECFA of the toxicological and of other aspects of a contaminant (~~relevant to the conduct of an appropriate risk assessment~~) and subsequent recommendations ~~regarding the acceptable intake and regarding maximum levels in foods~~ shall be the main basis for decisions to be discussed by the CCCF. In the absence of recommendations by JECFA, decisions may be taken by CCCF when sufficient information from other sources is available to the Committee and the matter is considered urgent.

The CCCF procedure for risk management decisions is further described in Annex II.

1.5 FORMAT OF THE STANDARD FOR CONTAMINANTS IN FOODS

The General Standard for Contaminants and Toxins in Foods contains two types of presentation for the Standards: Schedule I in which the standards are listed per contaminant in the various food categories, and Schedule II (to be developed at a later stage) in which the contaminant standards are presented per food (category).

The format of the presentation is according to the provisions described in the Procedural Manual, in so far they are applicable. In order to obtain maximal clarity, explanatory notes shall be added where appropriate. The format contains all elements necessary for full understanding of the meaning, background, application and scope of the standards and contains references to the relevant documents and ~~discussion~~ reports on which the standard is based.

A full description of the format is given in Annex III.

~~For each session of the CCCF, a working document shall be prepared in which the complete list of Codex Standards for contaminants in foods (both proposed and agreed) is presented in the form of Schedule I.~~

~~The list of Codex contaminant standards for individual foods or food categories shall be presented according to a~~ An agreed food categorization system for expressing MLs is given in. ~~See Annex IV. The food category descriptors are not intended to be legal product designations.~~

1.6 REVIEW AND REVISION OF THE STANDARD

The contaminant provisions ~~in Schedule I for this Standard~~ shall be reviewed on a regular basis by the CCCF and revised as necessary taking into account the most recent in the light of revisions of toxicological advice by JECFA or of changed risk management views, ~~residue management~~ possibilities for prevention and reduction of contamination, mitigation possibilities, scientific knowledge or other important relevant developments.

Specific attention shall be given to the review of existing Maximum Levels as well as ~~and to the possible conversion of~~ Guideline Levels ~~and to their possible conversion in~~ to Maximum Levels.

ANNEX I

CRITERIA FOR THE ESTABLISHMENT OF MAXIMUM LEVELS IN FOODS

Introduction

In this Annex criteria are mentioned regarding information which is considered necessary for evaluating contaminant problems in foods and for the establishment of maximum levels. It is therefore important that these criteria are taken into account when information is supplied to JECFA and/or to the CCCF.

The criteria mentioned here are elaborated in more detail than in section 1.3.3. of the Preamble. Only those aspects are mentioned that need further clarification, so criteria or aspects that are not mentioned here should not be ruled out in the evaluation process.

Toxicological information

Integrated toxicological expert advice regarding a safe/tolerable intake level of a contaminant is essential when decisions about maximum levels in foods are considered. A recommendation from JECFA regarding the maximum allowable or tolerable intake, based on a full evaluation of an adequate toxicological data base, ~~should shall~~ be the main basis for decisions by ~~CCCF~~ Codex members. In urgent cases, it may be possible to rely on less developed evaluations from JECFA or on toxicological expert advice from other international or national bodies.

When toxicological information is presented in relation to proposals for maximum levels for contaminants in foods, indications are desirable about the following aspects:

- identification of the toxic substance(s);
- metabolism in humans and animals, as appropriate;
- toxicokinetics and toxicodynamics including information on possible carry-over of the toxic substance from feed to edible animal tissue/products;
- information about acute and long term toxicity in animals and humans, including epidemiological data on humans and other relevant toxicity data;
- conclusions and advice of toxicological expert(s) (groups), with references, including information on specially vulnerable population groups or animals.

Analytical data

Validated qualitative and quantitative analytical data on representative samples should be supplied. Information on the analytical and sampling methods used and on the validation of the results is desirable. A statement on the representativeness of the samples for the contamination of the product in general (e.g. on a national basis) should be added. The portion of the commodity that was analyzed and to which the contaminant content is related should be clearly stated and preferably should be equivalent to the definition of the commodity for this purpose or to existing related contaminant residue regulation.

Information on appropriate sampling procedures should be supplied. Special attention to this aspect is necessary in the case of contaminants that may be unequally distributed in the product (e.g. mycotoxins in some commodities).

Intake data

It is desirable to have information about the contaminant concentrations in those foods or food groups that (together) are responsible for at least half and preferably 80% or more of the total dietary intake of the contaminant, both for ~~average~~ consumers with average and high consumption patterns and ~~for high consumers~~.

Information about the *presence of the contaminant in foods that are widely consumed* (staple foods) is desirable in order to be able to make a satisfactory assessment of the contaminant intake and of risks associated with food trade.

Food consumption data for average, most exposed (high consumers) and susceptible consumer groups are desirable for evaluations of (potential) intake of contaminants. This problem, however, has to be addressed differently on a national and on an international scale. It is therefore important to have information about both average and high consumption patterns regarding a wide scale of foodstuffs, so that for every contaminant the most exposed consumer groups may be identified. Detailed information about high consumption patterns is desirable, both regarding group identification criteria (e.g. age or sex differences, vegetarian or regional dietary customs, etc.) and statistical aspects.

Dietary intake of contaminants: Reference is made to the Guidelines for the study of dietary intake of chemical contaminants (WHO). It is important to supply all relevant details, such as the type of study (duplicate diet, total diet or market basket study, selective study), and statistical details. Calculated contaminant intake data from food consumption models may also be useful. When results about food groups and about effects of preparation and cooking etc. are available, these should also be supplied.

Fair trade considerations

Existing, expected or potential problems in international trade: In order to assess the urgency of a problem ~~to be discussed by CCCF~~ it is important to have information about the magnitude of existing or expected problems, both regarding the amount and the source of the food or feed that is at stake and the concerned parties and economic aspects involved. Potential problems should also be indicated.

Foods concerned moving in international trade: The main exporting and importing countries for commodities which are involved in the issue should be identified and it is essential that information is available about contaminant concentrations in the commodities originating from the main exporting countries.

Information about national regulations: It is desirable that details are made available by countries (especially the main exporting and importing countries) about their national regulations regarding the contaminant in question, in particular on the data and the considerations on which these regulations are based. For a good evaluation of the problem it is essential that not only the data base is clear, but also the risk assessment and risk management policy which is used for making decisions regarding maximum levels in foods.

Technological considerations

Information about the source of the contaminant and the way in which the food is contaminated, possibly including information, if it is available, about contamination being present in parts only of the product, is essential for assessing the possibilities to control the contamination process and to be able to guarantee a desired product quality. Where possible *Source-related measures* should be proposed. ***Good Manufacturing Practice (GMP)*** and/or ***Good Agricultural Practice (GAP)*** should also be formulated to control a contamination problem. When this is possible, maximum levels may be based on GMP or GAP considerations and may thus be established at a level as low as reasonably achievable. Considerations regarding the technological possibilities to control a contamination problem, e.g. by cleaning, should also be taken into account when a primary risk assessment model (theoretical maximum daily intake) shows possible intakes exceeding the toxicological reference value. ~~toxicological maximum intake recommendation~~. In such a case the possibilities of lower contamination levels need further careful examination. Then a detailed study about all the aspects involved is necessary, so that decisions about maximum limits can be based on a thorough evaluation of both the public health arguments and the possibilities and problems to comply with the proposed standard.

Risk assessment and risk management considerations

Risk assessment and risk management are conducted in accordance with the "Working Principles for Risk Analysis for Food Safety for application by Governments" taking into consideration "Working Principles for Risk Analysis for Application in the Framework of the Codex Alimentarius (section III of the Procedural Manuel), the "Risk Analysis Principles Applied by the Codex Committee on Food Additives and the Codex Committee on Contaminants in Foods" (Section III of the Procedural Manual,) and the CCCF Policy for Exposure Assessment of Contaminants and Toxins in Foods or Food groups (Section III of the Procedural Manual).

~~A tiered approach, involving risk assessment and risk management procedures, is recommended for developing a consistent policy regarding public health risks related to contaminants in foods.~~

~~**Risk assessment** is defined as the scientific evaluation of the probability of occurrence of known or potential adverse health effects resulting from human exposure to foodborne hazards. The process consists of the following steps: **hazard identification, hazard characterization, exposure assessment and risk characterization.** (The definition includes quantitative risk assessment, which emphasizes reliance on numerical expressions of risk, and also qualitative expressions of risk, as well as an indication of the attendant uncertainties).~~

~~The first steps are **hazard identification** and **hazard characterization.** **Hazard identification** is the identification of known or potential health effects in humans, produced by a contaminant which may be present in a particular food or group of foods. **Hazard characterization** is the qualitative and, if possible, quantitative evaluation of the nature of the adverse effects associated with the food contaminant, including a dose/response assessment and, when possible, the establishment of a safety standard (ADI, TDI or comparable toxicological recommendation) for the intake of the contaminant. The **exposure assessment** is the qualitative and, when possible, quantitative evaluation of the likely intake of the contaminant via food, as well as exposure from other sources if relevant. In the **risk characterization** step, the hazard identification, hazard characterization and exposure assessment are combined into an estimation of the severity and occurrence of known or potential health effects likely to occur in a given population, including attendant uncertainties.~~

~~Potential public health risks can be considered to exist when there is evidence that the contaminant intake of (groups of) consumers may exceed (on a long term basis for long term recommendations) the toxicological recommendation about the maximum acceptable or tolerable intake level. More specific estimation and description of the risks will be necessary to deal adequately with cases when intakes exceeding the toxicological standard occur in practice and cannot easily be reduced. This also applies when it has not been possible to establish a safe dose level of the contaminant.~~

~~**Risk management** is defined as the process of weighing policy alternatives in the light of the risk assessment and, if required, to select and implement appropriate control options, including the establishment and enforcement of maximum levels of contaminants in foods. It is based on adequate risk assessment and on information about policy options and strategies to deal with contamination problems and involves **risk communication.**~~

~~**Risk communication** is the interactive exchange of information and opinions concerning risk among risk assessors, risk managers and other interested parties. Responsible risk management is based on consistent application of an appropriate policy regarding the protection of public health, but also involves taking into account other relevant criteria, such as the available analytical data, the technological possibilities to control the contamination of products, economic factors and fair trade criteria.~~

~~In short, the risk assessment shall establish how many consumers possibly exceed the toxicological standard, and for how long time and how much, and what this implies as real health risks. Risk management involves, in a consistent way, deciding what is acceptable in this respect and what is not, to what extent other factors can be taken into account, and decisions and actions to achieve sufficient public health protection and control of the contamination.~~

~~Risk management decisions may lead to maximum levels for foods. In the process leading to such a decision, the consequences, costs and benefits should be presented and evaluated in relation to other policy options.~~

Establishment of maximum levels ~~for contaminants~~

In case it is decided that, on the basis of the outcome of the risk assessment, there is no need to establish a maximum level to protect public health as the level of hazard/risk does not pose a public health problem, this should be communicated in a transparent and accessible manner.

The *establishment of maximum levels of contaminants in foods* involves several principles, some of which have already been mentioned in this Preamble. Briefly stated, the following criteria will help in maintaining a consistent policy in this matter:

Comment: as it is part of the Preamble, it contains advice also to Codex members. Therefore it is appropriate to use in this section the term "should" instead of "shall"

- MLs ~~should~~ be set only for those contaminants that present both a significant risk to public health and a known or expected problem in international trade.
- MLs ~~should~~ be set only for those foods that are significant for the total exposure of the consumer to the contaminant. When identifying the significance of certain foods in the total exposure to the contaminant, the criteria contained in the CCCFAC Policy for Exposure Assessment of Contaminants and Toxins in Foods or Food Groups should be consulted (see para. 11 of the “CCCFAC Policy for Exposure Assessment of Contaminants and Toxins in Foods” in the Codex Alimentarius Commission Procedural Manual).
- MLs ~~should~~ be set as low as reasonably achievable. Providing it is acceptable from the toxicological point of view, MLs ~~should~~ be set at a level which is (slightly) higher than the normal range of variation in levels in foods that are produced with current adequate technological methods, in order to avoid undue disruptions of food production and trade. Where possible, MLs ~~should~~ be based on GMP and/or GAP considerations in which the health concerns have been incorporated as a guiding principle to achieve contaminant levels as low as reasonably achievable. Foods that are evidently contaminated by local situations or processing conditions that can be avoided by reasonably achievable means shall be excluded in this evaluation, unless a higher ML can be shown to be acceptable from a public health point of view and appreciable economic aspects are at stake.
- Proposals for MLs in products ~~should~~ be based on data from ~~at least~~ various countries and sources, encompassing the main production areas/processes of those products, as far as they are engaged in international trade. When there is evidence that contamination patterns are sufficiently understood and will be comparable on a global scale, more limited data may be enough.
- MLs may be set for product groups when sufficient information is available about the contamination pattern for the whole group, or when there are other arguments that extrapolation is appropriate.
- Numerical values for MLs ~~should~~ preferably be regular figures in a geometric scale (0.01, 0.02, 0.05, 0.1, 0.2, 0.5, 1, 2, 5 etc.), unless this may pose problems in the acceptability of the MLs.
- MLs ~~should~~ apply to representative samples per lot. If necessary, appropriate methods of sampling ~~shall~~ be specified.
- MLs should not be lower than a level which can be analyzed with methods of analysis that can ~~be~~ readily be set up and applied in ~~normal food -product~~ control laboratories, unless public health considerations necessitate a lower ~~ML detection limit~~ which can only be controlled by means of a more elaborate and sensitive method of analysis with an adequate lower detection limit. In all cases, however, a validated method of analysis should be available with which a ML can be controlled.

- The contaminant as it should be analyzed and to which the ML applies should be clearly defined. The definition may include important metabolites when this is appropriate from an analytical or toxicological point of view. It may also be aimed at indicator substances which are chosen from a group of related contaminants.
- The product as it should be analyzed and to which the ML applies, should be clearly defined. In general, MLs are set on primary products. MLs ~~should~~ in general preferably be expressed as a level of the contaminant related to the product as it is, on a fresh weight basis. In some cases, however, there may be valid arguments to prefer expression on a dry weight basis. Preferably the product ~~should~~ be defined as it moves in trade, with provisions where necessary for the removal of inedible parts that might disturb the preparation of the sample and the analysis. The product definitions used by the CCPR and contained in the Classification of foods and feeds may serve as guidance on this subject; other product definitions should only be used for specified reasons. For contaminant purposes, however, analysis and consequently MLs ~~should~~ preferably be on the basis of the edible part of the product.

For fat soluble contaminants which may accumulate in animal products, provisions should be applied regarding the application of the ML to products with various fat content (comparable to the provisions for fat soluble pesticides).

- Guidance is desirable regarding the possible application of MLs established for primary products to processed products and multi-ingredient products. When products are concentrated, dried or diluted, use of the concentration or dilution factor is generally appropriate in order to be able to obtain a primary judgement of the contaminant levels in these processed products. The maximum contaminant concentration in a multi-ingredient food can likewise be calculated from the composition of the food. Information regarding the behaviour of the contaminant during processing (e.g. washing, peeling, extraction, cooking, drying etc.) is however desirable to give more adequate guidance here. When contaminant levels are consistently different in processed products related to the primary products from which they are derived, and sufficient information is available about the contamination pattern, it may be appropriate to establish separate maximum levels for these processed products. This also applies when contamination may occur during processing. In general however, maximum levels should preferably be set for primary agricultural products and may be applied to processed, derived and multi-ingredient foods by using appropriate factors. When these factors are sufficiently known, they should be added to the data base about the contaminant and mentioned in connection to the maximum level in a product.
- MLs ~~should~~ preferably not be set higher than is acceptable in a primary (theoretical maximum intake and risk estimation) approach of their acceptability from a public health point of view. When this poses problems in relation to other criteria for establishing MLs, further evaluations are necessary regarding the possibilities to reduce the contaminant levels, e.g. by improving GAP and/or GMP conditions. When this does not bring a satisfactory solution, further refined risk assessment and contaminant risk management evaluations will have to be made in order to try to reach agreement about an acceptable ML.

Procedure for risk assessment in relation to (proposed) MLs ~~for contaminants~~

It will be evident that in the case of contaminants, it is more difficult to control food contamination problems than in the case of food additives and pesticide residues. Proposed MLs will inevitably be influenced by this situation. In order to promote acceptance of Codex contaminant MLs, it is therefore important that assessments of the acceptability of those MLs are done in a consistent and realistic way. The procedure involves assessment of the dietary intake in relation to the proposed or existing MLs and the toxicological reference value. ~~maximally acceptable intake from the toxicological point of view.~~

~~For pesticide residues, Guidelines (WHO, 1989, revised 1995) have been prepared for predicting the dietary intake, involving a two tiered approach with increasingly realistic predictions of intake. In the crude estimate phase, hypothetical global and cultural diets are used to calculate the theoretical maximum daily intake (TMDI) (based on proposed or existing MRLs). The best estimate of dietary intake involves the national dietary pattern and corrections for concentration residue changes losses during transport, storage, food preparation, for known residue levels in foods as consumed, etc. It is recommended to be cautious in using other than average food consumption values, although it is considered appropriate to use relevant average food consumption data for identifiable subgroups of the population. The procedure is used to assess the acceptability of proposed MRLs and to promote international acceptance of Codex MRLs.~~

For contaminants and natural toxins in food, essentially the abovementioned same procedure is used. Food consumption patterns with a higher intake of critical foods may be used in the intake calculations when this is part of an accepted national or international health protection and risk management policy. A harmonized approach using an appropriate intake estimation model that is as realistic as possible is recommended. Calculated data should where possible always be compared with measured intake data. Proposals for ~~Codex~~ MRLs should be accompanied by intake calculations and risk assessment conclusions regarding their acceptability and use. The intake calculations should follow the methodology described in the CCCF Policy for Exposure Assessment and, if appropriate, be accompanied by the generation of distribution curves for the concentration in specific foods/food groups (see paras 5-8 and 12-14 of the CCCF Policy for Exposure Assessment of Contaminants and Toxins in Foods in the Codex Alimentarius Commission Procedural Manual). Statements from Governments about the (non-acceptance of (proposed) Codex MLs should refer to specified intake calculations and risk management conclusions which support this position.

ANNEX II

Comment: Related with the possible deletion of the text of I.4 in the Preamble. Also largely superseded by relevant texts in the Procedural Manual and therefore deletion of the Annex II from the Preamble could be considered. However, during the discussions at the 1st session of CCCF a delegation proposed the retention of the risk management decision scheme, because this was not recorded in the Risk Analysis Principles section of the procedural Manual. It was agreed to further consider this issue recognizing that updates to the scheme might be necessary (ALINORM 07/30/41, § 42)

PROCEDURE FOR RISK MANAGEMENT DECISIONS**Introduction**

The recommended procedure for risk management decisions in the CCCF is presented here as a simple decision scheme based on the main criteria, mentioned in the Preamble, I.4.2. Criterion (1), basic information about the contaminant (problem) is not further mentioned, because it is considered a prerequisite, without which no sensible discussion can take place. ~~hazard identification and characterization.~~ Criterion (5), technological and economic aspects, is an essential tool for making recommendations about the risk management of the contaminant problem and for developing MLs, and when this information is not adequate, further data shall be requested. ~~Bearing this in mind, it need not be further mentioned in the decision scheme, which is shown below.~~ Decisions can be based on the availability of information (- or + or ?) on the following criteria:

- (2a) Tox toxicological information;
- (3) PHP potential health problems; ;
- (2b) A/In analytical and intake data; ;
- (4) TP international trade problems.

The question mark ? is used in the column PHP, to indicate that only toxicological information is sufficiently available, or only intake data, so that there is no sufficient basis to decide whether there are potential health problems. Obviously, in practice there will be many situations which are not so clear cut as it is presented in the scheme. Information may be considered sufficient by some, and inadequate by others. Decisions will have to be taken on a case by case basis, considering the criteria mentioned in Annex I. Further quantification of the criteria for the necessary data base for making decisions may become inevitable when serious problems are encountered in practice regarding this aspect.

Risk management decision scheme for CCCF

Case	Criterion				CCCF Action
	(2a) Tox	(2b) A/In	(3) PHP	(4) TP	
1.	-	+	?	-	Request Tox data/evaluation by JECFA
2.	-	+	?	+	Request Tox data/evaluation by JECFA, national risk assessment. In urgent cases, CCCF statement
3.	+	-	?	-	Request analytical/intake data
4.	+	+	-	-	No further action, <u>the justification for no action has to be widely communicated</u>
5.	+	+	-	+	Request national risk assessment. After evaluation (in urgent cases, after a preliminary assessment) a CCCF statement
6.	+	+	+	-	Development of MLs by CCCF
7.	+	+	+	+	Development of MLs by CCCF, with priority (in urgent cases, if necessary, temporary MLs)

(-) insufficient information

(+) ~~available~~ information available

(?) only toxicological information is sufficiently available, or only intake data, so that there is no sufficient basis to decide whether there are potential health problems.

ANNEX III**FORMAT OF THE GSCTF****Introduction**

The format for Schedule I shall contain the following elements:

Comment: *the format of Schedule I was discussed at the 1st session of CCCF under Agenda item 5 b. Several suggestions for modifications were made to the format but none were agreed. It was agreed by the Committee that the issue of the format of Schedule I would be discussed at the next session of the Committee (ALINORM 07/30/41, p. 47-48)*

- **Name of the contaminant:** symbols, synonyms, abbreviations, scientific descriptions ~~and identification codes that are commonly used~~ shall be mentioned, ~~too~~.

- ~~Codex number of the contaminant:~~ number according to the list described in Schedule I.

Comment: *CCFAC agreed at 38th Session to stop using codex numbers for contaminants*

- **Reference to JECFA meetings** (in which the contaminant was discussed).
- **ADI, TDI, PTWI or similar toxicological reference value intake recommendation:** when the situation is complex a short statement and further references may be necessary here.
- **Contaminant Residue definition:** definition of the contaminant as it shall be analyzed and to which the maximum level applies.

- ~~Reference to a source-directed measure or a code of practice for the contaminant, if appropriate.~~

- ~~List of Codex standards for contaminants in that food commodity/category;~~ this list shall be composed of the following elements, in columns:

~~Name of the contaminant;~~

~~Numerical value of maximum level;~~

- ~~References, remarks and notes (shorter than in Schedule I).~~

- ~~Reference to a Code of practice for the food, if appropriate.~~

- ~~Name of food commodity/category;~~

- ~~Classification number of food commodity or food category;~~

Comment: *It is unclear at which stage the abovementioned modifications were agreed to be included in Revision 3 – 2007 of the CODEX STAN 193-2007 as it is not correct. Probably a mix of the composition of the list in Schedule I and Schedule II has happened. CCFAC agreed at 38th Session to stop using codex numbers for contaminants. The proposal here below is based mainly on what was foreseen in the Revision 2 – 2005 of the CODEX STAN 193-1995.*

- ~~List of Codex maximum levels for that contaminant;~~ this list shall be composed of the following elements, in columns:

~~Classification number of food commodity or food category;~~

~~Name of food commodity/category;~~

~~Numerical value of maximum level;~~

~~Suffix accompanying a ML to specify the application of the ML;~~

~~References to documents, or adoption year~~

~~References to standard criteria for methods of analysis and sampling;~~

~~Notes/remarks.~~

The format of Schedule II shall contain the following elements:

- *Name of food commodity/category;*
- *Classification number of food commodity or food category;*
- *List of Codex maximum levels standards for contaminants in that food commodity/category;* ~~This~~ list shall be composed of the following elements, in columns:
 - Name of the contaminant;
 - Numerical value of maximum level;
 - ~~- Step in Codex procedure (only in CCCF working documents);~~
 - References or adoption year, remarks and notes (shorter than in Schedule I).
 - ~~—~~ Reference to a Code of practice for the food, if appropriate.

When appropriate, instead of a maximum level a (note referring to a) statement regarding the contaminant in the mentioned food (category) may be inserted.

ANNEX IV

FOOD CATEGORIZATION SYSTEM (GSCTF)

Introduction

The food categorization system of the GSCTF is constructed to perform the following functions:

It has a logical structure which enables a clear and systematic presentation of the (proposed) MLs. It contains (references to) product definitions and definitions of the part of the product which is analyzed and to which the ML refers. It contains codes for the food categories and the individual foods, so that data can be stored and retrieved in a convenient way.

To achieve as much harmonization as possible, an existing agreed categorization system is used.

The GSCTF uses the system which is developed in the framework of the CCPR as it is also suitable for contaminants. It is adopted for characterizing the various food and feed groups and the individual commodities. This system is especially elaborated regarding primary agricultural commodities, but needs further extension regarding processed products. Where necessary, new (sub)group codes or commodity codes are therefore introduced. These are described in Annex IV-A Annex IV-A ~~will~~ also contains product descriptions as far as they are different from those contained in the existing system described by the CCPR.

Where appropriate and possible, the descriptive texts accompanying the food categories do or should also contain indications about the concentration or dilution factor in the processed commodities mentioned, in relation to the primary product(s) involved. In that way a first estimate can be made of the possible carry-over of contaminants from primary products to the various processed products. It has to be borne in mind however that the specific distribution of a contaminant in the primary product and the behaviour during processing is a complicating factor here. Further advice may be necessary in those cases. See also the general indications in Annex I and possible specific information mentioned in relation to the contaminant.

Description of the food categorization system of the GSCTF

The first part contains the categorization system as developed and maintained by the CCPR. It consists of 5 classes, covering primary food commodities of plant, resp. animal origin, primary feed commodities and processed commodities of plant, resp. animal origin. The classes are subdivided in 19 types and 93 groups, which are identified by code numbers and letters.

Annex IV-A is the other part of the food categorization system for the GSCTF. It is developed and maintained by the CCCF, and is complementary to the system described in the first part. It is therefore called "Complementary Food Categorization System for GSCTF". It is mainly directed to processed, derived and multi-ingredient foods and encompasses all those types and groups and commodity descriptions that are necessary to assign food categorization codes to existing ~~or planned~~ Codex MLs for contaminants or those under elaboration.

ANNEX IV-A**COMPLEMENTARY FOOD CATEGORIZATION SYSTEM FOR THE GSCTF**

Comment: *At the 1st session of CCCF, the delegation of Japan, noting that the ongoing revision of the Codex Classification of Foods and Animal Feeds by the Committee on Pesticide Residues was focused on inclusion of specialty crops, proposed that the Committee take the lead in including, in the supplementary list of the food categorization system, some products of relevance to the GSCTF, such as fish and fish products. The Committee noted that this work would fall within the terms of reference of the electronic working group on the revision of the Preamble of the GSCTF and invited interested Members to actively contribute to the work of the working group regarding the possible revision of the food category system.(ALINORM 07/30/41, § 136)*

It should be noted that the current ANNEX IV-A as presented in the proposed draft revision will be replaced with a text which is supposed to be produced as an addendum document in a later stage

Introduction

The additions to the food categorization system described in this Annex will serve the need of assigning a food code number to commodities that are not covered by this Annex. The commodities involved are mainly processed, derived and multi-ingredient foods.

The system has been designed as a comprehensive list (on a general level), in order to be able to accommodate possible future needs.

In this phase no individual product definitions and codes are given. It seems sufficient to go no further than a type or group level in judging the acceptability of the system. The classification can be developed in further detail as the need arises.

The system used in the Codex General Standard for Food Additives (GSFA) for food classification has been utilized as far as it is compatible with the existing Codex classification system described in this Annex.

See the following -list of proposed new food categories. Some explanations (as shown in the list) and some existing related food categories, for a better insight in the proposed system.

Commodity descriptions can often be derived from existing Codex Standards.

Information regarding concentration and dilution factors, in relation to contaminant carry-over from primary products, will be added where appropriate and available.

Definitions for the part of the product that shall be analyzed and to which the ML of a contaminant will apply, that are different from existing definitions in this Annex ; may also be mentioned in this Annex will also be added.

Class	Type	Group	Letter code	Product group description
D				PROCESSED FOODS OF PLANT ORIGIN <i>(existing)</i>
D	01			Secondary commodities of plant origin <i>(5 existing groups)</i>
D	01	06	TF	Treated fruit products (peeled, cut, frozen etc.) <i>(New proposed group; commodity codes can be derived from existing fruit codes)</i>
D	01	07	TV	Treated vegetable products (cleaned, cut, frozen etc.) <i>(New proposed group; commodity codes can be derived from existing vegetable codes)</i>
D	02			Derived products of plant origin <i>(7 existing groups)</i>
D	02	08	JV	Vegetable juices and purees <i>(New proposed group; commodity codes can be derived from the</i>

Class	Type	Group	Letter code	Product group description
				<i>existing vegetable codes)</i>
D	02	09	SH	Sugars, syrups and honey <i>(is this to be classified with products of plant origin?)</i> <i>(New proposed group; commodity codes to be developed)</i>
D	03			Manufactured foods of plant origin (multi-ingredient) <i>(1 existing group)</i>
D	03	01	CP	Manufactured multi-ingredient cereal products (e.g. bread and other cooked cereal products) <i>(existing group)</i>
D	03	02	CB	Beverages derived from cereals (e.g. beer) <i>(New proposed group; commodity codes to be developed when the necessity arises)</i>
D	03	03	NF	Fruit nectars <i>(New proposed group; commodity codes can be derived from the existing fruit codes)</i>
D	03	04	FF	Fermented fruit beverages (wine, cider) <i>(New proposed group; commodity codes can be derived from the existing fruit concerned)</i>
D	03	05	DA	Distilled alcoholic beverages <i>(New proposed group; commodity codes to be developed when the need arises)</i>
D	03	06	FJ	Fruit jams, jellies, marmalades etc. <i>(New proposed group; commodity codes to be derived from the existing fruit codes)</i>
D	03	07	SF	Fruit chutneys and comparable preparations <i>(New proposed group; commodity codes to be derived from the existing fruit codes)</i>
D	03	08	SV	Vegetable chutneys and comparable preparations <i>(New proposed group; commodity codes to be derived from the existing vegetable codes)</i>
D	03	09	PS	Preparations from nuts, oil seeds and other seeds <i>(New proposed group; commodity codes to be derived from the existing product codes)</i>
D	03	10	PP	Other manufactured plant products <i>(New proposed group; commodity codes to be developed when the need arises)</i>
E				PROCESSED FOODS OF ANIMAL ORIGIN <i>(existing class)</i>
E	01			Secondary commodities of animal origin <i>(2 existing groups)</i>
E	01	03	MS	Secondary meat products (e.g. cooked meat) <i>(New proposed group; commodity codes to be derived from the existing meat codes)</i>
E	01	04	ES	Secondary egg products (e.g. egg powder) <i>(New proposed group; commodity codes to be derived from the existing egg codes)</i>

Class	Type	Group	Letter code	Product group description
E	01	05	WS	Secondary fishery products (e.g., smoked fish) <i>(New proposed group; commodity codes to be derived from the existing fish codes)</i>
E	02			Derived animal products of animal origin <i>(4 existing groups)</i>
E	02	05	MC	Derived meat products (e.g. meat extract) <i>(New proposed group; commodity codes to be derived from existing meat codes)</i>
E	02	06	ED	Derived egg products (e.g. egg white, yolk) <i>(New proposed group; commodity codes to be derived from existing egg codes)</i>
E	02	07	WD	Derived fishery products <i>(New proposed group; commodity codes to be derived from the existing fish codes)</i>
E	03			Manufactured food (single ingredient), animal origin <i>(1 existing group)</i>
E	03	01	LI	Manufactured milk products (single ingredient) <i>(existing group)</i>
E	03	02	MT	Manufactured meat products (e.g. cured meat) <i>(New proposed group; commodity codes to be derived from existing meat codes)</i>
E	03	03	EM	Manufactured egg products (e.g. egg white powder) <i>(New proposed group; commodity codes to be derived from existing egg codes)</i>
E	03	04	WP	Manufactured fishery products <i>(New proposed group; commodity codes to be derived from existing fish codes)</i>
E	04			Manufactured food (multi-ingredient) of animal origin <i>(1 existing group)</i>
E	04	01	LM	Manufactured milk products (multi-ingredient) <i>(existing group)</i>
E	04	02	MP	Manufactured meat products (multi-ingredient) (e.g. sausage) <i>(New proposed group; commodity codes to be developed in relation to commodity description)</i>
E	04	03	EP	Manufactured egg products (multi-ingredient) <i>(New proposed groups; commodity codes to be developed in relation to commodity description)</i>
E	04	04	WI	Manufactured fishery products (multi-ingredient) <i>(New proposed group; commodity codes to be derived from existing fish codes)</i>
F				MULTI-INGREDIENT MANUFACTURED FOODS <i>(New proposed class)</i>
F	01			Beverages (multi-ingredient) <i>(New proposed type)</i>

Class	Type	Group	Letter code	Product group description
F	01	01	BS	Beverages (soft drinks end comparable preparations) <i>(New proposed group; commodity codes to be developed when the necessity arises)</i>
F	01	02	BA	Alcoholic multi-ingredient beverages <i>(New proposed group; commodity codes to be developed when the necessity arises)</i>
F	02			Sauces, salad dressings, soups, bouillons etc. <i>(New proposed type)</i>
F	02	01	SP	Seasonings and condiments <i>(New proposed group; commodity codes to be developed when the necessity arises)</i>
F	02	02	PV	Vinegars (multi-ingredient) <i>(New proposed group; commodity codes to be developed when the necessity arises)</i>
F	02	03	PM	Mustards <i>(New proposed group; commodity codes to be developed when the necessity arises)</i>
F	02	04	BS	Soups and broths <i>(New proposed group; commodity codes to be developed when the necessity arises)</i>
F	02	05	ME	Sauces and comparable products <i>(New proposed group; commodity codes to be developed when the necessity arises)</i>
F	02	06	BC	Salads and sandwich spreads <i>(New proposed group; commodity codes to be developed when the necessity arises)</i>
F	03			Chocolate & other confectionery <i>(New proposed type)</i>
F	03	01	CC	Chocolate products <i>(New proposed group; commodity codes to be developed when the necessity arises)</i>
F	03	02	CS	Sugar confectionery, including nut based and comparable multi-ingredient confectionery <i>(New proposed group; commodity codes to be developed when the necessity arises)</i>
F	03	03	CG	Chewing gum <i>(New proposed group; commodity codes to be developed when the necessity arises)</i>
F	04			Margarines & other multi-ingredient fatty foods <i>(New proposed type)</i>
F	04	01	HF	Margarines > 80 % fat <i>(New proposed group; commodity codes to be developed when the necessity arises)</i>
F	04	02	LF	Margarines < 80 % fat <i>(New proposed group; commodity codes to be developed when the necessity arises)</i>

Class	Type	Group	Letter code	Product group description
F	04	03	OF	Other products based on fat emulsions <i>(New proposed group; commodity codes to be developed when the necessity arises)</i>
F	05			Multi-ingredient bakery wares <i>(New proposed type)</i>
F	05	01	BF	Fine bakery wares <i>(New proposed group; commodity codes to be developed when the necessity arises)</i>
F	05	02	BS	Savoury snacks (potato, cereal or starch base) <i>(New proposed group; commodity codes to be developed when the necessity arises)</i>
F	05	03	NS	Savoury coated nuts, other nut snacks, nut mixtures <i>(New proposed group; commodity codes to be developed when the necessity arises)</i>
F	06			Multi-ingredient foods for special dietary uses <i>(New proposed type)</i>
F	06	01	ID	Infant and follow-on formulae <i>(New proposed group; commodity codes to be developed when the necessity arises)</i>
F	06	02	CD	Weaning foods <i>(New proposed group; commodity codes to be developed when the necessity arises)</i>
F	06	03	HD	Dietetic foods intended for special medical purposes <i>(New proposed group; commodity codes to be developed when the necessity arises)</i>
F	06	04	TD	Dietetic formulae for slimming purposes and weight reduction <i>(New proposed group; commodity codes to be developed when the necessity arises)</i>
F	06	05	SD	Supplementary foods for dietetic uses <i>(New proposed group; commodity codes to be developed when the necessity arises)</i>
F	06	06	AD	Food supplements <i>(New proposed group; commodity codes to be developed when the necessity arises)</i>
G				OTHER EDIBLE PRODUCTS <i>(New proposed class)</i>
G	01			Water, minerals and organic compounds <i>(New proposed type)</i>
G	01	01	DW	Drinking water, mineral water, table waters <i>(New proposed group, commodity codes to be developed when the necessity arises)</i>
G	01	02	SW	Salt, salt substitutes, mineral preparations <i>(New proposed group; commodity codes to be developed when the necessity arises)</i>

APPENDIX II

Proposed draft ANNEX to the “Risk Analysis Principles Applied by the Codex Committee on Food Additives and the Codex Committee on Contaminants in Foods” (Procedural Manual – 17th edition in English, p. 119-124)

Comment; if this part is accepted for inclusion in the Procedural Manual, as Annex to text on risk analysis principles, it might be possible that some of the references to texts in the procedural Manual are superfluous and can be deleted.

LIST OF RISK MANAGEMENT POLICIES USED BY CCCF

1. This part of the document addresses the risk management policies that are used by Codex Committee on Contaminants in Foods (CCCF) when discussing risk assessment policy, risk assessment results, establishment of Maximum Levels and other risk management decisions such as Codes of Practice.

CODEX PROCEDURE FOR ESTABLISHING STANDARDS FOR CONTAMINANTS AND TOXINS IN FOODS

2. The Procedure for the elaboration of Codex Standards, as contained in other parts of the Procedural Manual, is applicable. Further details are mentioned in this part of the Procedural manual regarding the procedure to be followed and the criteria for decision making, in order to clarify and to facilitate the process of the elaboration of Codex Standards for Contaminants and Toxins in Foods.

3. The terms of the Codex definition for a contaminant include contaminants in feed for food-producing animals, except:

- Contaminants having only food quality significance, but no public health significance, in the food(s).
- Pesticide residues, as defined by the Codex definition that are within the terms of reference of the Codex Committee on Pesticide Residues (CCPR).
- Residues of veterinary drugs, as defined by the Codex definition, that are within the terms of reference of the Codex Committee on Residues of Veterinary Drugs in Foods (CCRVDF).
- Microbial toxins, such as botulinum toxin and staphylococcus enterotoxin, and micro-organisms that are within the terms of reference of the Codex Committee on Food Hygiene (CCFH).
- Residues of processing aids (processing aids are any substance or material, not including apparatus or utensils, and not consumed as a food ingredient by itself, intentionally used in the processing of raw materials, foods or its ingredients, to fulfil a certain technological purpose during treatment or processing and which may result in the non-intentional but unavoidable presence of residues or derivatives in the final product).

4. The Codex definition of a contaminant implicitly includes naturally occurring toxicants such as are produced as toxic metabolites of certain microfungi that are not intentionally added to food (mycotoxins). Microbial toxins that are produced by algae and that may be accumulated in edible aquatic organisms such as shellfish (phycotoxins) are also included in this standard. Mycotoxins and phycotoxins are both subclasses of contaminants. Inherent natural toxicants that are implicit constituents of foods resulting from a genus, species or strain ordinarily producing hazardous levels of a toxic metabolite(s), i.e. phytotoxins are not generally considered within the scope of this standard. They are, however, within the terms of reference of the Codex Committee on Contaminants in Foods (CCCF) and will be dealt with on a case by case basis.

5. Suggestions for new contaminants or new contaminant/commodity combinations to be discussed in the Codex Committee on Contaminants in Foods (CCCF) and to be included in the GSCTF may be raised by Codex members or by the Codex Secretariat. An initial discussion may be held based on oral contributions, but preferably on the basis of a discussion paper containing relevant and adequate information. For a satisfactory preliminary review the following information is essential:

- 1) Identification of the contaminant and concise information about the background of the problem.
- 2) Indications about the availability of toxicological information and analytical and intake data, including references.
- 3) Indications about (potential) health problems.

- 4) Indications about existing and expected barriers to international trade.
- 5) Information about technological possibilities and economic aspects related to the management of the contaminant problem in food.
- 6) Preferably a proposal for action by the CCCF.

6. When a Codex member wishes that the CCCF shall consider a request for action concerning a specific contaminant this Codex member shall, as far as possible, supply information as stated above to serve as the basis for a preliminary review and request the Codex Secretariat to include the matter on the agenda of the next meeting of the Committee.

7. An evaluation by JECFA of the toxicological and of other aspects of a contaminant and subsequent recommendations regarding the acceptable intake and regarding maximum levels in foods shall be the main basis for decisions to be discussed by the CCCF. In the absence of recommendations by JECFA, decisions may be taken by CCCF when sufficient information from other sources is available to the Committee and the matter is considered urgent.

CRITERIA FOR THE ESTABLISHMENT OF MAXIMUM LEVELS IN FOODS

8. These criteria are mentioned regarding information which is considered necessary for evaluating contaminant problems in foods and for the establishment of maximum levels in the CCCF. It is therefore important that these criteria are taken into account when information is supplied to JECFA and/or to the CCCF.

9. The criteria or aspects mentioned here are not exhaustive and other criteria could be considered appropriate to take into account.

Toxicological information

10. *Integrated toxicological expert advice regarding a safe/tolerable intake level* of a contaminant is essential when decisions about maximum levels in foods are considered. A recommendation from JECFA regarding the maximum allowable or tolerable intake, based on a full evaluation of an adequate toxicological data base, shall be the main basis for decisions by CCCF. In urgent cases, it may be possible to rely on less developed evaluations from JECFA or on toxicological expert advice from other international or national bodies.

11. When toxicological information is presented in relation to proposals for maximum levels for contaminants in foods, indications are desirable about the following aspects:

- identification of the toxic substance(s);
- metabolism in humans and animals, as appropriate;
- toxicokinetics and toxicodynamics including information on possible carry-over of the toxic substances from feed to edible animal tissue/products;
- information about acute and long term toxicity in animals and humans, including epidemiological data on humans and other relevant toxicity data;
- conclusions and advice of toxicological expert(s) (groups), with references, including information on specially vulnerable population groups or animals.

Analytical data

12. *Validated qualitative and quantitative analytical data on representative samples* should be supplied. Information on the analytical and sampling methods used and on the validation of the results is desirable. A statement on the representativeness of the samples for the contamination of the product in general (e.g. on a national basis) should be added. The portion of the commodity that was analyzed and to which the contaminant content is related should be clearly stated and preferably should be equivalent to the definition of the commodity for this purpose or to existing related contaminant regulation.

13. *Information on appropriate sampling procedures* should be supplied. Special attention to this aspect is necessary in the case of contaminants that may be unequally distributed in the product (e.g. mycotoxins in some commodities).

Intake data

14. It is desirable to have information about the contaminant concentrations in those foods or food groups that (together) are responsible for at least half and preferably 80% or more of the total dietary intake of the contaminant, both for consumers with average and high consumption patterns .

15. Information about the *presence of the contaminant in foods that are widely consumed* (staple foods) is desirable in order to be able to make a satisfactory assessment of the contaminant intake and of risks associated with food trade.

16. *Food consumption data for average, most exposed (high consumers) and susceptible consumer groups* are desirable for evaluations of (potential) intake of contaminants. This problem, however, has to be addressed differently on a national and on an international scale. It is therefore important to have information about both average and high consumption patterns regarding a wide scale of foodstuffs, so that for every contaminant the most exposed consumer groups may be identified. Detailed information about high consumption patterns is desirable, both regarding group identification criteria (e.g. age or sex differences, vegetarian or regional dietary customs, etc.) and statistical aspects.

17. *Dietary intake of contaminants:* Reference is made to the Guidelines for the study of dietary intake of chemical contaminants (WHO). It is important to supply all relevant details, such as the type of study (duplicate diet, total diet or market basket study, selective study), and statistical details. Calculated contaminant intake data from food consumption models may also be useful. When results about food groups and about effects of preparation and cooking etc. are available, these should also be supplied.

Fair trade considerations

18. *Existing, expected or potential problems in international trade:* In order to assess the urgency of a problem to be discussed by CCCF it is important to have information about the magnitude of existing or expected problems, both regarding the amount and the source of the food or feed that is at stake and the concerned parties and economic aspects involved. Potential problems should also be indicated.

19. *Foods concerned moving in international trade:* The main exporting and importing countries for commodities which are involved in the issue should be identified and it is essential that information is available about contaminant concentrations in the commodities originating from the main exporting countries.

20. *Information about national regulations:* It is desirable that details are made available by countries (especially the main exporting and importing countries) about their national regulations regarding the contaminant in question, in particular on the data and the considerations on which these regulations are based. For a good evaluation of the problem it is essential that not only the data base is clear, but also the risk assessment and risk management policy which is used for making decisions regarding maximum levels in foods.

Technological considerations

21. Information about the source of the contaminant and the way in which the food is contaminated, possibly including information, if it is available, about contamination being present in parts only of the product, is essential for assessing the possibilities to control the contamination process and to be able to guarantee a desired product quality. Where possible *Source-related measures* should be proposed. *Good Manufacturing Practice (GMP)* and/or *Good Agricultural Practice (GAP)* should also be formulated to control a contamination problem. When this is possible, maximum levels may be based on GMP or GAP considerations and may thus be established at a level as low as reasonably achievable. Considerations regarding the technological possibilities to control a contamination problem, e.g. by cleaning, should also be taken into account when a primary risk assessment model (theoretical maximum daily intake) shows possible intakes exceeding the toxicological reference value. In such a case the possibilities of lower contamination levels need further careful examination. Then a detailed study about all the aspects involved is necessary, so that decisions about maximum limits can be based on a thorough evaluation of both the public health arguments and the possibilities and problems to comply with the proposed standard.

Establishment of maximum levels

22. In case it is decided that, on the basis of the outcome of the risk assessment, there is no need to establish a maximum level to protect public health as the level of hazard/risk does not pose a public health problem, this should be communicated in a transparent and accessible manner.

The *establishment of maximum levels of contaminants in foods* involves several principles, some of which have already been mentioned in these criteria or in the relevant texts in the Procedural Manual. Briefly stated, the following criteria will help in maintaining a consistent policy in this matter:

Comment: *If the inclusion in the Procedural Manual is agreed, then the reference to "shall" remains as it contains the criteria for setting maximum levels within Codex.*

- MLs shall be set only for those contaminants that present both a significant risk to public health and a known or expected problem in international trade.
- MLs shall be set only for those foods that are significant for the total exposure of the consumer to the contaminant. When identifying the significance of certain foods in the total exposure to the contaminant, the criteria contained in the CCCF Policy for Exposure Assessment of Contaminants and Toxins in Foods or Food Groups should be consulted (see para. 11 of the "CCCF Policy for Exposure Assessment of Contaminants and Toxins in Foods" in the Codex Alimentarius Commission Procedural Manual).
- MLs shall be set as low as reasonably achievable. Providing it is acceptable from the toxicological point of view, MLs shall be set at a level which is (slightly) higher than the normal range of variation in levels in foods that are produced with current adequate technological methods, in order to avoid undue disruptions of food production and trade. Where possible, MLs shall be based on GMP and/or GAP considerations in which the health concerns have been incorporated as a guiding principle to achieve contaminant levels as low as reasonably achievable. Foods that are evidently contaminated by local situations or processing conditions that can be avoided by reasonably achievable means shall be excluded in this evaluation, unless a higher ML can be shown to be acceptable from a public health point of view and appreciable economic aspects are at stake.
- Proposals for MLs in products shall be based on data from various countries and sources, encompassing the main production areas/processes of those products, as far as they are engaged in international trade. When there is evidence that contamination patterns are sufficiently understood and will be comparable on a global scale, more limited data may be enough.
- MLs may be set for product groups when sufficient information is available about the contamination pattern for the whole group, or when there are other arguments that extrapolation is appropriate.
- Numerical values for MLs shall preferably be regular figures in a geometric scale (0.01, 0.02, 0.05, 0.1, 0.2, 0.5, 1, 2, 5 etc.), unless this may pose problems in the acceptability of the MLs.
- MLs shall apply to representative samples per lot. If necessary, appropriate methods of sampling shall be specified.
- MLs shall not be lower than a level which can be analyzed with methods of analysis that can readily be set up and applied in food control laboratories, unless public health considerations necessitate a lower ML which can only be controlled by means of a more elaborate and sensitive method of analysis with an adequate lower detection limit. In all cases, however, a validated method of analysis shall be available with which a ML can be controlled.
- The contaminant as it should be analyzed and to which the ML applies shall be clearly defined. The definition may include important metabolites when this is appropriate from an analytical or toxicological point of view. It may also be aimed at indicator substances which are chosen from a group of related contaminants.

- The product as it should be analyzed and to which the ML applies, shall be clearly defined. In general, MLs are set on primary products. MLs shall in general preferably be expressed as a level of the contaminant related to the product as it is, on a fresh weight basis. In some cases, however, there may be valid arguments to prefer expression on a dry weight basis. Preferably the product shall be defined as it moves in trade, with provisions where necessary for the removal of inedible parts that might disturb the preparation of the sample and the analysis. The product definitions used by the CCPR and contained in the Classification of foods and feeds may serve as guidance on this subject; other product definitions should only be used for specified reasons. For contaminant purposes, however, analysis and consequently MLs will preferably be on the basis of the edible part of the product.

For fat soluble contaminants which may accumulate in animal products, provisions shall be applied regarding the application of the ML to products with various fat content (comparable to the provisions for fat soluble pesticides).

- Guidance is desirable regarding the possible application of MLs established for primary products to processed products and multi-ingredient products. When products are concentrated, dried or diluted, use of the concentration or dilution factor is generally appropriate in order to be able to obtain a primary judgement of the contaminant levels in these processed products. The maximum contaminant concentration in a multi-ingredient food can likewise be calculated from the composition of the food. Information regarding the behaviour of the contaminant during processing (e.g. washing, peeling, extraction, cooking, drying etc.) is however desirable to give more adequate guidance here. When contaminant levels are consistently different in processed products related to the primary products from which they are derived, and sufficient information is available about the contamination pattern, it may be appropriate to establish separate maximum levels for these processed products. This also applies when contamination may occur during processing. In general however, maximum levels should preferably be set for primary agricultural products and may be applied to processed, derived and multi-ingredient foods by using appropriate factors. When these factors are sufficiently known, they should be added to the data base about the contaminant and mentioned in connection to the maximum level in a product.
- MLs shall preferably not be set higher than is acceptable in a primary (theoretical maximum intake and risk estimation) approach of their acceptability from a public health point of view. When this poses problems in relation to other criteria for establishing MLs, further evaluations are necessary regarding the possibilities to reduce the contaminant levels, e.g. by improving GAP and/or GMP conditions. When this does not bring a satisfactory solution, further refined risk assessment and contaminant risk management evaluations will have to be made in order to try to reach agreement about an acceptable ML.

REVIEW AND REVISION OF THE STANDARD

23. The contaminant provisions in Schedule I shall be reviewed on a regular basis by the CCCF and revised as necessary taking into account the most recent toxicological advice by JECFA or of changed risk management views, possibilities for prevention and reduction of contamination, mitigation possibilities, scientific knowledge or other important relevant developments.

Specific attention shall be given to the review of existing Maximum Levels as well as to the possible conversion of Guideline Levels into Maximum Levels.

24. For each session of the CCCF, a working document shall be prepared in which the complete list of Codex Standards for contaminants in foods (both proposed and agreed) is presented in the form of Schedule I.

**LIST OF PARTICIPANTS
LISTE DES PARTICIPANTS
LISTA DE PARTICIPANTES
CHAIRPERSON/PRESIDENT/PRESIDENTE**

Mr Frans VERSTRAETE

Administrator
European Commission, Health and Consumer
Protection DG
Rue Froissart 101
1049 Brussels
BELGIUM
Tel.: +32 2 295.6359
Fax.: +32 2 299 1856
E-mail: frans.verstraete@ec.europa.eu

MEMBER COUNTRIES**AUSTRALIA - AUSTRALIE****Dr Glenn STANLEY**

Senior Risk Manager
Food Standards Australia New Zealand
PO Box 7186
CANBERRA BC ACT 2601
AUSTRALIA
Tel: +61 2 6271 2643
Fax: +61 2 6271 2278
Email: glenn.stanley@foodstandards.gov.au

Ms Rebecca LATHBURY

Executive Officer
Codex Australia, Product Safety and Integrity
Product Integrity Animal and Plant Health
Department of Agriculture, Fisheries and Forestry
Tel: (02) 6272 4542
Fax: (02) 6272 3103
Email: rebecca.lathbury@daff.gov.au

Mr Ed KLIM

Manager, Food Safety Systems and Support
Product Safety and Integrity
Australian Government Department of Agriculture,
Fisheries and Forestry
GPO Box 858
CANBERRA ACT 2601
AUSTRALIA
Ph: +61 2 6272 5507
Fax: +61 2 6272 5679
Email: ed.klim@daff.gov.au

BELGIUM - BELGIQUE - BÉLGICA**Ms Christine VINKX**

Expert additives and contaminants
Federal Public Service of Health,
Food Chain Safety and Environment
Place Victor Horta 40, Box 10
1060 Brussels
BELGIUM
Tel.: +32 2 524 7359
Fax.: +32 2 524 7399
E-mail: Christine.vinkx@health.fgov.be

BRAZIL - BRÉSIL - BRASIL**Ms Ligia SCHREINER**

Expert on Regulation
National Health Surveillance Agency
SEPN 511, BLOCO A, Edifício Bittar II
70750-541 Brasilia
BRAZIL
Tel.: +55 613 448 6292
Fax.: +55 613 448 6274
E-mail: ligia.schreiner@anvisa.gov.br

FRANCE - FRANCIA**Mr Pascal AUDEBERT**

Point de Contact du Codex alimentarius en France
Premier Ministre Secrétariat Général
des Affaires Européenne
2, Boulevard Diderot
75572 Paris Cedex 12
FRANCE
Tel.: +33 144 871 603
Fax.: +33 144 871 604
E-mail: pascal.audebert@sgae.gouv.fr

JAPAN - JAPON - JAPÓN**Dr Yukiko YAMADA**

Deputy Director –General
Food Safety and Consumer Affairs Bureau
Ministry of Agriculture, Forestry and Fisheries
1-2-1 Kasumigaseki, Chiyoda-ku
Tokyo 100 8950
JAPAN
Tel.: +81 3 3507 5716
Fax.: +81 3 3507 0389
E-mail: yukiko_yamada@nm.maff.gp.jp

Mr Masahiro SEGAWA

Deputy Director
Plant Products Safety Division
Ministry of Agriculture, Forestry and Fisheries
1-2-1 Kasumigaseki, Chiyoda-ku
100-8950 Tokyo
JAPAN
Tel.: +81 335 025 968
Fax.: +81 335 808 950
E-mail: masahiro_segawa@nm.maff.go.jp

MALAYSIA - MALAISIE - MALASIA**Ms Zaleenah ZAINUDDIN**

Senior Principal Assistant Director
 Ministry of Health Malaysia
 Federal Government Administration Centre
 Precint 1
 62590 Putrajaya
 MALAYSIA
 Tel.: +60 388 833 518
 Fax.: +60 388 893 815
 E-mail: zaleenahzain@yahoo.com

**NETHERLANDS - PAYS-BAS –
PAÍSES BAJOS****Mr Harrie STORMS**

Policy Advisor
 Ministry of Health, Welfare and Sport
 P.O. Box 20350
 2500 EJ The Hague
 NETHERLANDS
 Tel.: +31 70 340 6225
 Fax.: +31 70 340 5554
 E-mail: hf.storms@minvws.nl

Ms Astrid BULDER

Researcher Toxicology and Risk Assessment
 RIKILT Institute of Food Safety – Wageningen UR
 Cluster Databases, Risk Assessment & Supply Chain
 Management
 Bornsesteeg 45, 6708 PD Wageningen
 PO Box 230,
 6700 AE Wageningen
 NETHERLANDS
 Phone +31 (0)317 47 55 75 (new number per 7 March
 2008: (0)317 48 03 70)
 Fax +31 (0)317 41 77 17
 E-mail: Astrid.Bulder@wur.nl

Dr Martien C. SPANJER

Senior Analytical Chemist
 Food and Consumer Product Safety Authority
 Hoogte Kadijk 401
 1018 BK Amsterdam
 THE NETHERLANDS
 Tel.: +31 20 524 4703
 Fax.: +31 20 524 4700
 E-mail: martien.spanjer@vwa.nl

PHILIPPINES - FILIPINAS**Ms Alicia LUSTRE**

Director
 National Food Authority, Food Development Center
 FTI cor. DBP Avenue, FTI Complex
 Taguig City
 PHILIPPINES
 Tel.: +63 2 838 4715
 Fax.: +63 2 838 4692
 E-mail: lustre@pacific.net.ph

**INTERNATIONAL
 GOVERNMENTAL ORGANIZATIONS
 ORGANISATIONS GOUVERNEMENTALES
 INTERNATIONALES
 ORGANIZACIONES
 GUBERNAMENTALES INTERNACIONALES**

FAO**Ms Annika WENBERG**

Senior Officer
 FAO JECFA Secretary
 Food and Nutrition Division
 Food and Agriculture Organization
 of the United Nations
 Viale delle Terme di Caracalla
 Roma
 ITALY
 Tel.: +39 6 5705 3612
 Fax.: +39 6 5705 4593
 E-mail: annika.wennberg@fao.org

**INTERNATIONAL NON-GOVERNMENTAL
 ORGANIZATIONS
 ORGANISATIONS NON-
 GOUVERNEMENTALES INTERNATIONALES
 ORGANIZACIONES INTERNACIONALES NO
 GUBERNAMENTALES**

CIAA**Ms Clara THOMPSON**

Scientific & Technical Manager
 Avenue des Arts 43
 1040 Brussels
 BELGIUM
 Tel.: +32 4 9753 6179
 Fax.: +32 2 508 1021
 E-mail: c.thompson@ciaa.be

IADSA**Mr. David PINEDA ERENO**

Director, Regulatory Affairs
 50 Rue de l'Association
 1000 Brussels
 BELGIUM
 Tel: +32 22 09 11 55
 Fax: +32 22 23 30 64
 Email: davidpineda@iadsa.be

ICBA**Ms Paivi JULKUNEN**

Chair, ICBA Committee for Codex
 Boulevard St. Michel 79
 1040 Brussels
 BELGIUM
 Tel.: +32 2 7434050
 Fax.: +32 2 7325102
 E-mail: pjulkunen@na.ko.com

ICD

Ms Yasmine MOTARJEMI

Corporate Food Safety Manager
Quality Management, Nestlé
Industry Council for Development
74 West Hill, Wembley Park, HA9 9RS UK
tel +44 20 8908 6375, fax +44 20 8385 2656
e-mail: industrycouncil@btinternet.com

IDF

Ms. Helen DORNOM

Technical Issues Manager
FIL-IDF Australia c/o Dairy Australia
Locked Bag 104
Flinders Lane
Melbourne Vic 8006
Australia
Tel.: +61 3 9694 3897
Fax: +61 3 9694 3833
E-mail: hdornom@dairyaustralia.com.au

Ms. Aurélie DUBOIS

Assistant to the Technical Director
International Dairy Federation
Diamant Building
Boulevard Auguste Reyers, 80
1030 Brussels
Belgium
Tel.: +32 2 706 86 45
Fax: +32 2 733 04 13
E-mail: ADubois@fil-idf.org