

codex alimentarius commission



FOOD AND AGRICULTURE
ORGANIZATION
OF THE UNITED NATIONS

WORLD
HEALTH
ORGANIZATION



JOINT OFFICE: Viale delle Terme di Caracalla 00100 ROME Tel: 39 06 57051 www.codexalimentarius.net Email: codex@fao.org Facsimile: 39 06 5705 4593

Agenda Item 2

CX/MPH 03/2 - Add. 1
February 2003

JOINT FAO/WHO FOOD STANDARDS PROGRAMME CODEX COMMITTEE ON MEAT AND POULTRY HYGIENE

Ninth Session

Wellington, New Zealand, 17-21 February 2003

MATTERS OF INTEREST ARISING FROM THE 35TH SESSION OF THE CODEX COMMITTEE ON FOOD HYGIENE

(Orlando, Florida, USA - 27 January to 1 February 2003)

DISCUSSION PAPER ON RISK MANAGEMENT STRATEGIES FOR *SALMONELLA* SPP. IN POULTRY

The 35th Session of the Codex Committee on Food Hygiene decided that the drafting group led by Sweden, with the assistance of Australia, Canada, China, Czech Republic, Denmark, France, Germany, Netherlands, New Zealand, Thailand, USA and the EC and ALA, would revise the Discussion Paper on Risk Management Strategies for *Salmonella* spp. in Poultry for consideration at its next Session. The Committee agreed that the risk management strategies proposed should consider a farm to table approach.

The Committee also agreed that the discussions (paras 42- 46), as well as document CX/FH 03/5-Add.1, would be forwarded to the CCMPH for information and possible consideration in their continued elaboration of the proposed draft Code of Hygienic Practice for Fresh Meat¹.

35th CCFH Discussion on Risk Management Strategy for *Salmonella* spp. in Poultry²

The 34th Session of the CCFH noted that there was currently no work underway on *Salmonella* spp. in poultry and therefore, agreed that a drafting group led by Sweden would develop a Discussion Paper on Risk Management Strategies for *Salmonella* spp. in Poultry for consideration at its current meeting with a view towards developing risk management strategies for *Salmonella* spp. in poultry.³

In presenting the document on *Salmonella* spp. in poultry, the delegation of Sweden noted that in view of the risk assessment provided by FAO and WHO (as summarised in CX/FH 03/5), a further risk profile might not be required. It was stated that in any case, it was the responsibility of the CCFH to determine whether existing Codex texts provided adequate guidance in this regard or alternatively, whether additional risk management activities were required.

Some delegations were of the opinion that the risk management strategies presented in the document should be revised to take account of the farm to table approach. It was further stated that although the proposed draft Code

¹ ALINORM 03/13 A - paras. 47-48

² ALINORM 03/13A, paras. 42-46

³ ALINORM 03/13, para. 73

of Hygienic Practice for Fresh Meat under development by the Codex Committee on Meat and Poultry Hygiene (CCMPH) did not contain specific provisions related to *Salmonella* spp. in poultry, the text under development by the CCFH should nonetheless be forwarded to the CCMPH for their use and in order to determine if modifications to the CCFH document were required.

Other delegations were of the opinion that in order to incorporate a farm to table approach, new data and information were required, and governments were encouraged to submit data in this regard. It was noted that in any case, such a step did not preclude further work on the discussion paper within the CCFH.

Various delegations recommended that the following questions should be considered by the Drafting Group:

- Refine and prioritize possible interventions throughout the food chain with potential for risk reduction, with a view of formulating questions to risk assessors to be dealt with in modeling risk;
- Encourage input from experts on aspects throughout the food chain and scientific expertise;
- Risk management/risk assessment should be further developed.

DISCUSSION PAPER ON RISK MANAGEMENT STRATEGIES FOR *CAMPYLOBACTER* SPP. IN POULTRY (BROILER CHICKEN)

The Committee decided that the drafting group led by the Netherlands, with the assistance of Australia, Belgium, Canada, China, Denmark, Finland, Japan, New Zealand, Norway, Philippines, Thailand, the United Kingdom, USA and the EC and ALA, would revise the Discussion Paper on Risk Management Strategies for *Campylobacter* spp. in broiler chickens for consideration at its next Session. The Committee agreed that the results of further FAO and WHO work on risk assessment (as summarised in CX/FH 03/5) should be taken into account, and that a decision on the possible elaboration of a code of practice would be deferred for the time being.

The Committee also agreed that the above discussions, as well as document CX/FH 03/5-Add.2, would be forwarded to the CCMPH for information and possible consideration in their continued elaboration of the proposed draft Code of Hygienic Practice for Fresh Meat asking specific questions to be answered.⁴

35th CCFH Discussion on Risk Management Strategy for *Campylobacter* spp. in Poultry (Broiler Chicken)⁵

The 34th Session of the CCFH agreed that a drafting group led by the Netherlands would develop a Discussion Paper on Risk Management Strategies for *Campylobacter* spp. in broiler chickens for consideration at its current meeting and in order to provide further guidance to FAO and WHO in their risk assessment of *Campylobacter* spp. in broiler chickens.⁶

In presenting the document on *Campylobacter* spp. in broiler chickens, the delegation of the Netherlands noted that the drafting group had followed the instructions of the 34th Session of the CCFH and had formulated specific questions for the risk assessors as well as elaborating a format for the risk profile. The delegation noted that although the document recommended the development of a code of practice, such a step should take account of the feasibility and cost effectiveness of initiating such a proposal.

The Committee was informed that several questions presented in the discussion paper had been adequately responded to by the risk assessors but that others could not be answered and would require further consideration. In view of this information, it was noted that the elaboration of a code of practice might be premature, especially in consideration that additional data would need to be submitted in order to perform a complete risk assessment.

Various delegations recommended that the following questions should be considered by the Drafting Group:

- Refine and prioritize possible interventions throughout the food chain with potential for risk reduction, with a view of formulating questions to risk assessors to be dealt with in modeling risk;

⁴ ALINORM 03/13A, paras. 53-54

⁵ ALINORM 03/13A, paras. 49-52

⁶ ALINORM 03/13A, para. 79

- Encourage input from experts on aspects throughout the food chain and scientific expertise;
- Risk management/risk assessment should be further developed.

PROPOSED DRAFT PRINCIPLES AND GUIDELINES FOR THE CONDUCT OF MICROBIOLOGICAL RISK MANAGEMENT

The Committee's discussion on proposed concepts and definitions for Food Safety Objective (FSO) and Appropriate Level Of Protection (ALOP) was as follows:

General Discussion⁷

It was suggested that further work was required in the Scope and other sections of the document to clearly differentiate between specific recommendations applying to Codex and those applying to national governments. For instance, it was noted that the definition for ALOP, which was already established under the SPS Agreement, should be clearly designated as a responsibility of national governments. In this regard, it was suggested that the document should focus on the application of risk management as opposed to an evaluation of hazards.

It was also noted that the concept, connotation and definition of FSOs, including its application and the designation of performance criteria at points within or at the end of the food chain (i.e., at the point of consumption), needed to be discussed further. It was noted that the consideration of ongoing work in other Codex committees related to the determination of FSOs, including in the Codex Committee on Meat and Poultry Hygiene (CCMPH), should be taken into account. The role of the CCFH and the CCMPH in the elaboration of the definition and concepts related to FSOs was also discussed and it was noted that CCFH had a leadership role.

The relationship between risk assessment and risk management was also felt to be an important aspect of the Principles requiring further attention. In regard to the consideration of precaution, it was noted that the Commission had already reached a compromise position on a definition that needed to be taken into account. It was further noted by one delegation that non-safety related issues should not be considered in carrying out risk management decisions.

It was noted that the current document overlapped in many areas with the proposed draft Process paper previously discussed under agenda item 5(e) and that inconsistencies between the documents should be avoided wherever possible.

Definition of FSO⁸

In discussing the current proposed definition for an FSO and its application at the point of consumption, various opinions were expressed. A simplified definition of "A performance parameter at the point of consumption" was also proposed. It was also suggested that the example of an FSO under the proposed definition was misleading and could lead to an erroneous conclusion and therefore, should be deleted.

Some delegations were of the opinion that the FSO should be applied at the point of consumption and that performance criteria or parameters at various points along the food chain would ensure that the FSO was met. In any case, the Committee agreed that the definition needed to be considered further by the drafting group.

Definition of ALOP⁹

In regard to the term ALOP, the Committee reaffirmed that the definition was clearly established under the SPS Agreement and therefore, changes to the definition were not within the mandate of Codex. However, it was noted that the application of the term within the remainder of the text was under the responsibility of the CCFH.

⁷ ALINORM 03/13A, para. 82-85

⁸ ALINORM 03/13A, paras. 88-89

⁹ ALINORM 03/13A, para. 90