



JOINT FAO/WHO FOOD STANDARDS PROGRAMME

CODEx COMMITTEE ON FOOD HYGIENE

44th Session, New Orleans, USA

12 – 16 November 2012

REPORT OF THE PHYSICAL WORKING GROUP ON CCFH WORK PRIORITIES (PROPOSALS FOR NEW WORK AND/OR REVISION OF EXISTING STANDARDS)

PREPARED BY THE UNITED STATES AS CHAIR OF THE WORKING GROUP

The Chairperson opened the meeting by noting the *Request for Proposals for New Work and/or Revision of Existing Standards*, CL 2012/12-FH and the receipt of three Papers in response to the CL, specifically:

- The proposal of the United States, Australia, Canada, and the United Kingdom to develop a Code of Hygienic Practice for Low Moisture Food (see *Discussion Paper on code of hygienic practice for low-moisture foods* (CX/FH 12/44/11) along with a Project Document developed by Canada; and,
- A *Discussion Paper on new work and periodic review/revision of codes of hygienic practice*, CL/FH 12/44/12, prepared by Australia with input from New Zealand, Canada, and the United States. The Paper reviewed prior discussions on new work and existing codes; considered the process for prioritizing new work proposals including criteria for evaluating new work; and the maintaining of a Workplan by CCFH to help ensure that decisions relating to new work and the review of existing codes are retained by the Committee.
- A *Discussion Paper on development of a code of practice for the storage of cereals* (CRD 9) prepared by India.

The Chairperson proposed that the Working Group: briefly review each of the proposals for new work providing general comments on each proposal, and other items relating to specific new work; then review and discuss in depth the Discussion Paper prepared on new work developed by Australia; then return to the new work proposals for further discussion and the making of recommendations on them for the Committee's consideration. The Working Group agreed to this approach.

Discussion Paper on code of hygienic practice for low-moisture foods

The United States, as the lead country for the development of the Discussion Paper for the *Code of Hygienic Practice for Low Moisture Foods*, summarized the history of the Discussion Paper on low moisture foods, including the public health issues related to such products, noting that the proposed scope of the new work would apply to control of microbiological hazards in foods having a water activity of 0.85 or less. The Code could include the revision to the *Recommended International Code of Practice for Spices and Dried Aromatic Plants* (CAC/RCP 42, 1995) (approved as new work by the 35th (2012) Session of the Codex Alimentarius Commission) as well as the possible inclusion of the following existing codes of hygienic practice:

Recommended International Code of Hygienic Practice for Dried Fruits (CAC/RCP 3, 1969);

Recommended International Code of Hygienic Practice for Desiccated Coconut (CAC/RCP 4, 1971);
Recommended International Code of Hygienic Practice for Dehydrated Fruits and Vegetables including Edible Fungi (CAC/RCP 5, 1971)
Recommended International Code of Hygienic Practice for Tree Nuts (CAC/RCP 6, 1972); and,
Recommended International Code of Hygienic Practice for Ground Nuts (Peanuts) (CAC/RCP 22, 1979).

Canada, as the lead for the Project Document reviewed the document for the new work, presented in CX/FH 12/44/11 Appendix 1.

The Working Group generally supported the proposed new work. One delegation questioned whether the limited number of outbreaks related to low moisture foods warranted the work; however other delegations noted the occurrence of Salmonella outbreaks traced to low moisture foods and the importance for a code. Another delegation indicated that the proposed scope was too broad and could extend into products such as dried fish that are adequately covered by existing Codex codes and that care was needed in defining the scope of the document.

Several delegations that supported the work on the proposed code suggested that it would be helpful for FAO/WHO, through the Joint Expert Meeting on Microbiological Risk Assessment (JEMRA), to provide guidance on the precise scope of the code, including the inclusion of the new work on spices and dried aromatic plants, and the inclusion of revision to other existing codes on low-moisture codes (see above). The Working Group agreed with the need for such guidance.

Discussion Paper on development of a code of hygienic practice for the storage of cereals (FH 44 CRD 9)

India introduced its *Discussion Paper on the development of a code of practice for the storage of cereals*, noting that the proposal, while intended as a general hygienic code relating to grains and cereals, was intended to focus on the storage aspects of these commodities.

Several delegations noted that a primary problem with grain storage was the issue of mycotoxin contamination and that Codex maintained substantial existing guidance relating to mycotoxin control and prevention in cereal/grain products. Delegations also noted that the general hygiene guidance existing in the *Codex Recommended International Code of Practice: General Principles of Food Hygiene* covered many areas of importance relating to the storage of grain and questioned the need for the new work.

Delegations raised the question as to whether the scope of this code could be incorporated into the work being proposed for low moisture foods.

In general, most delegations believed that further review and study of this proposal was needed prior to making a decision on the new work.

Discussion Paper on new work and periodic review/revision of codes of hygienic practice

The Delegation of Australia presented the *Discussion Paper on new work and periodic review/revision of codes of hygienic practice*, CL/FH 12/44/12. The Delegation noted that CCFH had previously considered the processes and procedures for undertaking new work and reviewing/revising existing codes, had developed a process for this area and had developed a listing of codes for review. Australia further noted that a process had been put into place and is now utilized and that many of the codes on the original list had been revised, but noted that further consideration of the process was needed, that previously established criteria for new work needed review, and that there was a need for a workplan to ensure that CCFH did not lose track of the status of codex and their priority for review.

Australia, in Appendix 1 of its Discussion Paper, summarized CCFH's consideration of new work proposals since 2006. Additionally, the Discussion Paper presented a set of criteria for considering new work and, in Appendix 2 of the Discussion Paper, presented a listing of Forward Work Proposals for the Committee's consideration, based on previous new work proposals that had not been taken forward by the Committee, the proposals submitted for this Session of CCFH, and older CCFH-developed codes not previously considered for revision.

The criteria for considering new work, as presented in the Discussion Paper, along with their proposed weighting value, were the following.

Criteria	Weighting Value
Public health risk—such as a foodborne risk to public health	Actual 10
	Potential 8
Impact of trade on the public health	Global impact 10
	Regional Impact 8
Currency of information- New data/technologies that influences need to review existing code	5
Duplication of, or inconsistency with, existing codes	5
More than 5 years since implementation, last review and/or last consideration by the Committee	3

The Discussion Paper also proposed the development of a forward looking Workplan that would provide a listing of work intended to be undertaken by CCFH. The Forward Workplan would be maintained and updated at each Session of the Committee based on new work decisions agreed to by CCFH.

There was general acceptance of the Paper. Several delegations noted that a more systematic procedure was necessary for the CCFH to consider the area of new work in order to improve transparency. Delegations noted the need to maintain a list of new work items and indicated general acceptance of maintaining a Forward Workplan

In the context of the Forward Workplan, a discussion occurred on whether a definition of new work should be developed. Within this discussion was a consideration of whether annexes to codes of hygienic practice should or should not be considered new work. Mixed views on this area were presented. In general, the Working Group agreed that it would be unwise to develop a definition for new work, that care was needed to not be too prescriptive in what specifically required a Project Document, and that the merits of whether or not an annex was or was not new work depended on the specifics of the proposal and should be considered on a case-by-case basis.

The Working Group reviewed the criteria for considering new work and the weighting values. The Working Group agreed with the first three criteria (public health risk, impact of trade on public health, currency of new information). Mixed views were expressed regarding the last two criteria (duplication or inconsistency with existing codes, time since last revision). The Working Group agreed to delete the last two criteria (along with their weight values) but incorporate their provisions into a chapeau paragraph appearing in a revised document on the process by which CCFH will undertake its work (see below).

The Working Group also discussed the weighting values. Mixed views were expressed regarding the precise weighting values to use. However, the Working Group agreed that, rather than to change the weighting values at this time, it was better to employ the criteria, along with their weighting values and, based on experience, modify them in the future as may be necessary.

The Working Group considered a proposed revision (CRD 10) to the *Process by which the Codex Committee on Food Hygiene (CCFH) will undertake its work* (Appendix VI of the Report of the 43rd Session of CCFH, REP 12/FH) prepared by the United States. The revision reordered some portions of Appendix VI for logic flow, added the criteria presented in Discussion Paper developed by Australia, added a paragraph relating to maintaining a Workplan, and made a few other editorial changes for clarity. The Working Group agreed with the proposed revision, noting the adjustment to delete the last two criteria but to include the content in the chapeau paragraph to the criteria; the chapeau paragraph as revised would read as follows (addition shown in bold).

In addition to the provisions applying to the proposals for new work contained in the Codex *Procedural Manual*, the following criteria and associated weighting factors will be used in evaluating new work priorities to assist in determining the priority for new work to be undertaken by CCFH. **Standards older than five years or those with duplication or inconsistency with existing codes should also be assessed by the criteria below to determine their need for revision.**

The revision of the *Process by which the Codex Committee on Food Hygiene (CCFH) will undertake its work* is given in Appendix 1 of this Report.

Other New Work Proposals

Revision of the *Code of Hygienic Practice for Fresh Fruits and Vegetables*

The Working Group discussed the need to revise the existing *Code of Hygienic Practice for Fresh Fruits and Vegetables* (CAC/RCP-53/2003). The Working Group noted that there were redundancies between the main code and the annexes that had arisen over the years as the various annexes were developed. One delegation also noted that provisions relating to packing houses were missing from the main code and should be added. It was agreed that a Discussion Paper should be developed to consider revision to the code to remove duplication and redundancies and to consider the addition of new provisions.

Development of additional guidance relating to parasites in food

During the discussion of Australia's paper on new work, the need for possible new work on parasites in food was brought forward. FAO presented their in-depth study relating to parasites in food (*Multicriteria-Based Ranking for Risk Management of Foodborne Parasites, Preliminary Report, 24 Oct., 2012*). FAO noted the regional differences that existed in terms of Foodborne parasites, which presented a challenge to global ranking and therefore developed and applied a systematic ranking approach which could be used by countries to identify their own priorities and could be part of any risk management guidance. In addition, the FAO meeting provided some guidance on control measures for the top ranked parasites as well as information on their food attribution, the primary commodities of concern and their relevance in international trade to support risk management decisions on Foodborne parasites. The Working Group generally agreed that it was important to consider how CCFH should address the occurrence and control of parasites in food, how best to deal with this issue with respect to pertinent commodities, and to develop guidance on the control of parasites in food that could be used to address priorities that exist in this area at the national or regional level.

Other

The Delegation of the United States noted that it was beginning consideration of whether it would submit a proposal to CCFH to undertake new work on developing guidance on the control of Salmonella in meat products (products other than poultry). The Delegation asked that other countries who may be interested in, and supportive of, such work contact the United States in order to discuss the project.

Recommendations

The Working Group provides the following recommendations to the 44th Session of the CCFH for their consideration.

1. The Working Group recommends that CCFH proceed with new work on the development of a *Code of Hygienic Practice for Low Moisture Foods* as presented in the Project Document contained in the *Discussion Paper a code of hygienic practice for low-moisture foods (CX/FH 12/44/11)*. Further, that in order to proceed with certain aspects of the new work, CCFH requests FAO/WHO to undertake work to provide the Committee with scientific advice on the following.

- a. Identify, according to a defined set of criteria, the low moisture foods which should be considered as the highest priorities for the Committee and the associated microbiological hazards. The ranking process should include, but is not limited to, dried fruits and dehydrated fruits and vegetables, peanut butter, cereals, dry protein products (e.g. dried dairy products), confections (cocoa and chocolate), snacks (e.g. spiced chips), tree nuts, desiccated coconut, seeds for consumption, spices and dried aromatic plants. To help provide information for the identification, FAO/WHO should issue a call for data on microbiological and other hazards associated with low moisture foods, report illness associated with low moisture foods and the role of various agricultural and manufacturing practices in enhancing or mitigating these hazards and any other data relevant to prioritizing low moisture foods and managing the associated risks.

- b. Provide the Committee with information relevant to the risk management of the microbiological hazards associated with the identified range of low moisture foods, with particular attention to the role of agricultural and handling/manufacturing practices in the introduction and control of hazards and the identification of the critical points for mitigation of the risks associated with low moisture foods.

The Working Group noted that Canada agreed to lead the work. The United States agreed to serve as the co-lead country.

2. The Working Group recommends that a Discussion Paper be prepared on the occurrence and control of parasites in food, taking into account the findings of the FAO/WHO *Report on Multicriteria-Based Ranking for Risk Management of Foodborne Parasites*, and work on parasites currently in-progress by CCFH. The Discussion Paper should: 1) address whether control of parasites should be addressed in a general code of practice or addressed within existing commodity codes; 2) address whether additional guidance on criteria for prioritization of parasites for use by governments should be developed; and, 3) include a Project Document as appropriate. The Working Group noted the agreement of Australia to prepare the Discussion Paper, for presentation at the next (45th) Session of CCFH.
3. The Working Group recommends that a Discussion Paper be prepared on the need to revise the existing *Code of Hygienic Practice for Fresh Fruits and Vegetables (CAC/RCP-53/2003)*, including its annexes, specifically in regards to eliminating duplication and redundancies in the Code and in regards to identifying provisions that may be missing from the Code. The Working Group noted the

agreement of Brazil to prepare the Discussion Paper to be presented at the next (45th) Session of CCFH.

4. The Working Group recommends that no action be taken on the proposal for new work on a *Code of Hygienic Practice for the Storage of Cereals* but that this proposal be added to the CCFH Workplan (see recommendation 5) and that this commodity be considered in relationship to the development of a *Code of Hygienic Practice for Low Moisture Foods* (see recommendation 1).
5. The Working Group recommends that the *Process by which the Codex Committee on Food Hygiene (CCFH) will undertake its work* (Appendix VI of the Report of the 43rd Session of CCFH, REP 12/FH) be revised as contained in Appendix 1 of this Report. The revisions establish preliminary criteria to be applied on an experimental basis to the consideration of new work proposals and weighting values for the criteria, the establishment of a Forward Workplan (see recommendation 6), and some reordering and other editorial changes for clarity. The criteria will be applied on a trial basis for the 45th Session of CCFH and a decision made as to the future use and value of this approach.
6. The Working Group recommends the establishment of a provisional Forward Workplan to identify, in priority order, potential future work for CCFH. Additionally, that the Workplan be updated annually based on decisions for new work made by the Committee. A draft of a current proposed Forward Workplan is contained in Appendix 2.

APPENDIX 1

**PROPOSED DRAFT REVISION TO THE CCFH
PROCESS BY WHICH THE CODEX COMMITTEE ON FOOD HYGIENE (CCFH) WILL
UNDERTAKE ITS WORK¹**

Prepared by the United States of America

Note: Newly added text is shown in **underline/bold font**, text that has been moved is shown in **bold font**, and text proposed for deletion is shown in ~~strike through font~~.

Purpose

1. The following guidelines are established to assist the CCFH to:
 - Identify, prioritize and efficiently carry out its work; and
 - Interact with FAO/WHO and their scientific bodies as the need arises.

Scope

2. These guidelines apply to all work undertaken by the CCFH and encompass: guidelines and procedures for proposing new work (**including the revision of existing codes of hygienic practice**); criteria and procedures for considering the priorities for proposed and existing work; procedures for implementing new work; and a process by which CCFH will obtain scientific advice from FAO/WHO.

Proposals for New Work

3. Proposals for new work to be undertaken by CCFH should follow the process outline below. In addition to the provisions applying to proposals for new work in the Procedural Manual, the proposals for new work should include a Risk Profile², as appropriate. The proposals for new work should indicate the specific nature or outcome of the new work being proposed (e.g., new or revised code of hygienic practice, risk management guidance document).

4. The proposals for new work will typically address a food hygiene issue of public health significance. It should describe in as much detail as possible, the scope and impact of the issue and the extent to which it impacts on international trade.

5. The proposal for new work may also:

- address an issue that affects progress within CCFH or by other committees, provided it is consistent with the mandate of CCFH;
- facilitate risk analysis activities; or
- establish or revise general principles or guidance. The need to revise existing CCFH texts may be to reflect current knowledge and/or improve consistency with the *General Principles of Food Hygiene* (CAC/RCP 1-1969).

Criteria for Evaluating and Prioritizing New Work

6. In addition to the provisions applying to the proposals for new work contained in the Codex Procedural Manual, the following criteria and associated weighting factors will be used in

¹ Original contained in Appendix VI of REP 12/FH, Report of the 43rd Session of the Codex Committee on Food Hygiene.

² Definition of a risk profile is “the description of the food safety problem and its context” (Codex Alimentarius Commission, *Procedural Manual*,). The elements of a risk profile are provided in the *Principles and Guidelines for the Conduct of Microbiological Risk Management* (CAC/GL 63-2007).

evaluating new work priorities to assist in determining the priority for new work to be undertaken by CCFH. Standards older than five years or those with duplication or inconsistency with existing codes should also be assessed by the criteria below to determine their need for revision.

Criteria	Weighting Value
<u>Public health risk* - such as foodborne risk to public health</u>	Actual 10
	Potential 8
<u>Impact of trade on the public health risk</u>	Global impact 10
	Regional impact 8
<u>Currency of information- new data/technologies that has arisen or that influences need to review existing codes or take up new work</u>	5

***Risk³ is defined as a function of the probability of an adverse health effect and the severity of that effect, consequential to a hazard in food. The hazard may be a biological, chemical or physical agent in, or condition of, food that has the potential to cause an adverse health effect. The public health risk should be based on documented convincing or probable scientific evidence of adverse health effects or potential adverse health effects including morbidity and/or mortality due to a biological, chemical or physical agent in, or condition of the food. The *Working Principles for Risk Analysis for Application in the Framework of the Codex Alimentarius*³ should be referenced when determining the public health risk.**

Process for Considering Proposals for New Work

7. To facilitate the process of managing the work of the Committee, CCFH may establish an *ad hoc* Working Group for the Establishment of CCFH Work Priorities (“*ad hoc* Working Group”) at each Session, in accordance with the Guidelines on Physical Working Groups.

8. The Codex Committee on Food Hygiene will, normally, employ the following process for undertaking new work.

- i. A request for proposals for new work and/or revision of an existing standard will be issued in the form of a Codex Circular Letter, if required.
- ii. Proposals for new work received in response to the Codex Circular Letter will be transmitted to the Host of the *ad hoc* Working Group as well as the CCFH Host government and Codex Secretariats.
- iii. The Host of the *ad hoc* Working Group will collate the proposals for new work in a document that will be distributed by the Codex Secretariat to Codex members and observers for review and comment within a specified time frame.
- iv. The *ad hoc* Working Group will meet as decided by the Committee, normally on the day prior to the plenary session of CCFH to develop recommendations for consideration by the Committee during the CCFH session. The *ad hoc* Working Group will review the proposals for new work along with comments submitted. It will verify the completeness and compliance with the prioritization criteria of the proposals for new work and make recommendations to the Committee on whether the proposals for new work should be accepted, denied, or returned for additional information.

³ *Codex Procedural Manual*

v. If accepted, a recommendation will be provided on the priority of the proposal for new work compared to pre-established priorities. The priority of the proposals for new work will be established using the guidelines **presented above**, ~~outlined below, taking into account the “Criteria for the Establishment of Work Priorities”⁴~~. Proposals for new work of lower priority may be delayed if resources are limiting. Proposals for new work of lower priority not recommended may be reconsidered at the next CCFH session. If the *ad hoc* Working Group recommends that a proposal for new work be “denied” or “returned for revision,” a justification for this recommendation will be provided.

vi. At the CCFH session, the *ad hoc* Working Group Chair will introduce the recommendations of the *ad hoc* Working Group to the Committee. The CCFH will decide whether a proposal for new work and/or revision of an existing standard is accepted, returned for revision, or denied. If accepted, a project document⁵, which may include amendments agreed upon by the Committee, will be prepared by the CCFH and submitted to the Codex Alimentarius Commission (CAC) with a request for approval of the proposed new work.

vii. The CCFH Workplan (see below) will be updated at each meeting of the *ad hoc* Working Group in order to maintain continuity and a historical record of CCFH’s consideration of new work.

Proposals for New Work

~~5. In addition to the provisions applying to proposals for new work in the Procedural Manual, the proposals for new work should include a Risk Profile⁶, as appropriate. The proposals for new work should indicate the specific nature or outcome of the new work being proposed (e.g., new or revised code of hygienic practice, risk management guidance document).~~

~~6. The proposals for new work will typically address a food hygiene issue of public health significance. It should describe in as much detail as possible, the scope and impact of the issue and the extent to which it impacts on international trade.~~

~~7. The proposal for new work may also:~~

- ~~• address an issue that affects progress within CCFH or by other committees, provided it is consistent with the mandate of CCFH;~~
- ~~• facilitate risk analysis activities; or~~
- ~~• establish or revise general principles or guidance. The need to revise existing CCFH texts may be to reflect current knowledge and/or improve consistency with the *General Principles of Food Hygiene* (CAC/RCP 1-1969).~~

CCFH Workplan

9. CCFH will maintain a forward-looking Workplan that will include new work proposals and, for the purpose of review, existing codes. The Workplan will list work in priority order based upon decisions made by CCFH and using the criteria for evaluating and prioritizing work (see above).

⁴~~Codex Alimentarius Commission, *Procedural Manual*.~~

⁵ The elements of a project document are described in the Codex Alimentarius Commission, *Procedural Manual*.

⁶ Definition of a risk profile is “the description of the food safety problem and its context” (Codex Alimentarius Commission, *Procedural Manual*,). The elements of a risk profile are provided in the *Principles and Guidelines for the Conduct of Microbiological Risk Management* (CAC/GL 63-2007).

The Workplan will be reviewed by the *ad-hoc* Working Group at each Session of CCFH when prioritizing proposals for new work. CCFH will progressively work down the prioritized list of items contained in the Workplan. CCFH may reassess the priority of each item on the Workplan; where new data or other information is available relating to an item on the workplan, such data may be submitted for consideration and the priority for the work item reconsidered. It is intended for the Workplan to continue from Session to Session, updated and revised as appropriate based on CCFH’s criteria for undertaking new work. If items are moved forward as new work, each item will require a Project Document and a clear indication of how the work is to be progressed (e.g., nominated delegation to lead work, use of a working group process).

Prioritization of Proposals for New Work

8. The Committee will prioritize its proposals for new work at each CCFH meeting, if required. This will be carried out by the Committee after consideration of the recommendations from the *ad hoc* Working Group. The *ad hoc* Working Group will consider the priority of proposals for new work taking into account the current workload of the Committee, and in accordance with the “Criteria for the Establishment of Work Priorities” and if necessary, additional criteria to be prepared by the Committee. If CCFH resources are limited, proposals for new work or existing work may need to be delayed in order to advance higher priority work. A higher priority should be given to proposals for new work needed to control an urgent public health problem.

Obtaining Scientific Advice

10. There are instances where progress on the work of the Committee will require an international risk assessment or other expert scientific advice. This advice will be typically be sought through FAO/WHO (e.g., through JEMRA, *ad hoc* expert consultations), though in certain instances such advice may be requested from other specialized international scientific bodies. When undertaking such work, the Committee should follow the structured approach given in the *Principles and Guidelines for the Conduct of Microbiological Risk Management* (CAC/GL 63-2007) and the *Working Principles for Risk Analysis for Application in the Framework of the Codex Alimentarius*.⁷

11. In seeking an international risk assessment to be conducted by FAO/WHO (e.g., through JEMRA), CCFH should consider and seek advice on whether:

- i. Sufficient scientific knowledge and data to conduct the needed risk assessment are available or obtainable in a timely manner. (An initial evaluation of available knowledge and data will typically be provided within the Risk Profile.)
- ii. There is a reasonable expectation that a risk assessment will provide results that can assist in reaching risk management decisions related to control of the microbiological hazard without unduly delaying the adoption of the needed microbiological risk management guidance.
- iii. Risk assessments performed at the regional, national and multinational levels that can facilitate the conduct of an international risk assessment are available.

12. If the Committee decides to request that a microbiological risk assessment or other scientific advice be developed, the Committee will forward a specific request to FAO/WHO, the risk profile document (**where available**), a clear statement of the purpose and scope of the work to be undertaken, any time constraints facing the Committee that could impact the work, and in the case of a risk assessment, the specific risk management questions to be addressed by the risk assessors. The Committee will, as appropriate, also provide FAO/WHO with information relating to the risk assessment policy for the

⁷ Codex Alimentarius Commission, *Procedural Manual*.

specific risk assessment work to be undertaken. FAO/WHO will evaluate the request according to their criteria and subsequently inform the Committee of its

decision on whether or not to carry out such work together with a scope of work to be undertaken. If FAO/WHO responds favourably, the Committee will encourage its members to submit their relevant scientific data. If a decision is made by FAO/WHO not to perform the requested risk assessment, FAO/WHO will inform the Committee of this fact and the reasons for not undertaking the work (e.g., lack of data, lack of financial resources).

13. The Committee recognizes that an iterative process between risk managers and risk assessors is essential throughout the process described above and for the adequate undertaking of any microbiological risk assessment and the development of any microbiological risk management guidance document or other CCFH document(s).

14. The FAO/WHO will provide the results of the microbiological risk assessment(s) **or other expert scientific advice** to the Committee in a format and fashion to be determined jointly by the Committee and FAO/WHO. As needed, the FAO/WHO will provide scientific expertise to the Committee, as feasible, to provide guidance on the appropriate interpretation of the risk assessment.

15. Microbiological risk assessments carried out by FAO/WHO (JEMRA) will operate under the framework contained in the *Principles and Guidelines for the Conduct of Microbiological Risk Assessment* (CAC/RCP 30-1999).

APPENDIX 2

CCFH PROVISIONAL FORWARD WORKPLAN

Note: Additions to the Forward Workplan as a result of the Working Group meeting held on 11 November, 2012 are shown in **bold**.

<i>Title of work</i> (Date revised)	Total			
	Public health	New information	Trade impact	
<i>Code of Hygienic Practice on the Control of Parasites in Food</i>				
<i>Code of Hygienic Practice for the Storage of Cereals</i>				
CAC/RCP 53-2003 Code of Hygienic Practice for Fresh Fruits and Vegetables (The annex for fresh leafy greens was completed in 2010, however the code is greater than ten years old and a review would also examine why additional annexes need to be developed).	10		10	20

<p><i>Development of a code of hygienic practice for low-moisture foods</i></p> <p><i>The following may be within scope:</i></p> <p><i>CAC/RCP 3 – Recommended International Code of Hygienic Practice for Dried Fruits (1969)</i></p> <p><i>CAC/RCP 4 – Recommended International Code of Hygienic Practice for Desiccated Coconut (1971)</i></p> <p><i>CAC/RCP 5 – Recommended International Code of Hygienic Practice for Dehydrated Fruits and Vegetables Including Edible Fungi (1971)</i></p> <p><i>CAC/RCP 42 – Code of Hygienic Practice for Spices and Dried Aromatic Plants</i></p> <p><i>CAC/RCP 6 - Recommended International Code of Hygienic Practice for Tree Nuts (1972)</i></p> <p><i>CAC/RCP 22 – Recommended International Code of Hygienic Practice for Ground Nuts (Peanuts) (1979)</i></p>	<p>10 – still evidence of systems failures e.g. spices /nuts; illness with these foods</p>	<p>5</p>	<p>10</p>	<p>25</p>
<p><i>Development of an annex on tomatoes for the code of hygienic practice for fresh fruit and vegetables</i></p>	<p>10</p>	<p></p>	<p>8</p>	<p>18</p>
<p><i>Development of an annex on carrots for the code of hygienic practice for fresh fruit and vegetables</i></p>	<p>10</p>	<p></p>	<p>8</p>	<p>18</p>

CAC/RCP 48 - Code of Hygienic Practice for Bottled/Packaged Drinking Waters (other than natural mineral waters) (2001)	8		10	18
CAC/RCP 2 – Code of Hygienic Practice for Precooked and Cooked Foods in Mass Catering (1993)	10	5		15
<p><i>CAC/RCP 23 – Recommended International Codes of Hygienic Practice for Low-acid and Acidified Low-acid Canned Foods (1993)</i></p> <p><i>CAC/RCP 40 – Code of Hygienic Practice for Aseptically Processed and Packaged Low-acid Foods (1993)</i></p> <p><i>CAC/GL 17 – Guideline Procedures for the Visual Inspection of Lots of Canned Foods for Unacceptable Defects (1993)</i></p> <p><i>CAC/RCP 2 – Recommended International Code of Hygienic Practice for Canned Fruit and Vegetable Products (1969)</i></p>		5		5
CAC/RCP 47 - Code of Hygienic Practice for the Transport of Food in Bulk and Semi-Packed Food (2001)			10	10
CAC/RCP 30 – Recommended International Code of Hygienic Practice for the Processing of Frog Legs. (1983)			8	8
<p><i>CAC/RCP 1 – Recommended International Code of Practice – General Principles of Food Hygiene</i></p> <p><i>Annex: Guidelines for the Application of HACCP systems</i></p> <p>(2003)</p>				

CAC/RCP – Code of Hygienic Practice for Refrigerated Packaged foods with Extended Shelf Life (1999)		5		5
CAC/RCP 57 - Code of Hygienic Practice for Milk and Milk Products (2009)				
CAC/RCP15 – Code of Hygienic Practice for Egg and Egg Products (2007)				
CAC/RCP 58 – Code of Hygienic Practice for Meat (2005)				