

# codex alimentarius commission



FOOD AND AGRICULTURE  
ORGANIZATION  
OF THE UNITED NATIONS

WORLD  
HEALTH  
ORGANIZATION



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

**Agenda Item 6**

**CX/FH 08/40/6 – Add.1  
November 2008**

## **JOINT FAO/WHO FOOD STANDARDS PROGRAMME**

### **CODEX COMMITTEE ON FOOD HYGIENE**

**Fortieth Session  
Guatemala City, Guatemala  
1-5 December 2008**

#### **PROPOSED DRAFT GUIDELINES FOR CONTROL OF *CAMPYLOBACTER* AND *SALMONELLA* SPP. IN CHICKEN MEAT**

**Comments submitted by:  
Australia, Kenya, Philippines, United States<sup>1</sup>**

#### **GENERAL COMMENTS**

##### **AUSTRALIA**

Australia acknowledges the substantial work undertaken by New Zealand and Sweden to progress the draft Guidelines for the Control of *Campylobacter* and *Salmonella* spp. in Chicken Meat. Although a lack of data has resulted in very few hazard-based or risk-based control measures being identified, significant guidance is provided on GHP-based control measures.

Australia agrees with the recommendation that the document be returned to Step 2 for further input from the Working Group and Member countries. We support the further elaboration of hazard-based and risk-based control measures and encourage Member countries to submit relevant data.

As noted in the Agenda Paper, several elements of the draft Guideline document are not complete and further input by the WG and Member countries is required. The following comments relate to some specific issues identified in the draft Guidelines. Further detailed comments will be provided prior to the next meeting of the WG.

##### **PHILIPPINES**

The Philippines reiterates its support to the continued progression of the document, “Proposed Draft Guidelines for Control of *Campylobacter* and *Salmonella* spp. In Chicken Meat”.

##### **UNITED STATES**

The U.S. is pleased with the progress made to date and supports the continued development of these guidelines. The U.S recognizes that in order for the working group to meet the overarching goal of drafting guidelines rooted in robust science, the draft may need to be returned to Step 2 so that there may be additional input provided by the work group as well as by Member countries. In particular, the U.S. supports the proposal of returning the proposed draft guidelines to Step 2 in order that additional quantitative

---

<sup>1</sup> Comments submitted in Spanish and French are being translated and would be distributed at a later stage.

information on interventions identified from production to consumption may be gathered and so there is sufficient time for the development of the web-based risk management decision tool.

The U.S. supports the recommendation for further calls for information on: measures based on hazard control, selection and validation of CCPs, measures based on risk assessment, monitoring and review systems in Recommendation 4. However, members should carefully review the need for additional information and the expansion of the scope to include development of annexes regarding other production processes. The U.S. believes there is a lack of information regarding free range, organic primary production and halal slaughter systems that would unnecessarily delay development of the guidelines.

## 1. Introduction

### AUSTRALIA

It is suggested that additional text be included in the introduction to elaborate on the qualifying criteria used to identify proposed control measures. It is believed this would assist in providing a rationale for the inclusion of specific control measures

### 3.1. Scope

#### Second Paragraph

### AUSTRALIA

Last sentence: This may significantly limit the applicability of the on-farm control measures in Australia as it is estimated only 5% of poultry shedding is of the controlled-environment type. Poultry in Australia are generally housed in open-sided or tunnel-ventilated sheds.

It is suggested that control measures specific to controlled-environment housing be clearly identified in the relevant sections of the draft Guidelines.

### 3.2. Use

#### Second Paragraph

### AUSTRALIA

Australia suggests that relevant OIE guidelines be listed.

## 4. Definitions

### Flock

### KENYA

Remove square brackets

### 8.1.1 Measures based on GHP

#### First Paragraph

### AUSTRALIA

For *Salmonella*

**First Sentence:** Delete the sentence and substitute the following text; “The breeder flock should be kept free from infection with *Salmonella* to minimise the spread of infection to subsequent stages of the production chain.”

**Rationale:** It is not clear if this is to prevent true vertical (trans-ovarian) transmission or spread of *Salmonella* spp. from breeder flocks to eggs/ hatcheries/chicks via other means such as faecal contamination etc.

### 8.3.1 Measures based on GHP

For *Salmonella*

### AUSTRALIA

First sentence: Australia suggests deleting the sentence.

**Rationale:** This could be considered inconsistent with the first paragraph (“*Where the use of eggs from flocks...*”). Other methods can be used to minimise potential *Salmonella* transmission from positive flocks eg litter and nest box management, nest prills, egg fumigation, increased egg collection frequency (cf OIE Hygiene and Biosecurity Procedures During Poultry Production).

### 8.9.1 Measures based on GHP

#### First Paragraph

#### AUSTRALIA

Breeder flocks are managed under high levels of biosecurity control, therefore not all measures will be applicable to the management of broilers. To avoid doubt, it is suggested that relevant control measures are repeated in this section.

### 8.11.1 Measures based on GHP

#### First Paragraph and First Two Bullets

#### KENYA

Kenya proposes that there is need for Competent Authority to validate this measure in the national setting before advocating its use

For *Salmonella*

#### First Sentence

#### AUSTRALIA

Based on limited laboratory / commercial data, Australia suggests moving this to the Annex.

#### KENYA

Kenya proposes that there is need for Competent Authority to validate this measure in the national setting before advocating its use

### 9.7.1.2 Immersion Chilling

For *Salmonella*

#### AUSTRALIA

Reported reductions in *Salmonella* in prevalence following immersion chilling in the presence of antimicrobial/sanitising agents are highly variable. It is dependant on a number of factors such as the type and concentration of chemical agent, contact time, pH, organic load/turbidity, rate of water replacement, initial levels of carcass contamination etc.

Suggest further information on this measure be included (if available) and it be moved to “measures based on hazard control”.