

# 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 5 (a)

CX/MPH 03/05 Add 1  
January 2003

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

Ninth Session

Wellington, New Zealand, 17-21 February 2003

### APPENDICES AND ADDITIONAL PROVISIONS TO THE PROPOSED DRAFT CODE OF HYGIENIC PRACTICE FOR FRESH MEAT

#### PRINCIPLES AND GUIDELINES FOR ESTABLISHING RISK-BASED ANTE- AND POST-MORTEM INSPECTION SYSTEMS FOR PARTICULAR SLAUGHTER POPULATIONS, INCLUDING EXAMPLES

#### Government Comments

Comments from: Egypt, European Community

#### EGYPT

EOS supports the draft proposal under item 5.5. (Risk Management Decisions) as in Table 1 (page 6) and Table 2 (page 7) with special reference to the column of Codex example.

#### EUROPEAN COMMUNITY

The European Community (EC) would like to thank New Zealand for the work involved in developing this document. The EC would like to make the following comments.

#### General

The European Community supports the development of an Annex II to the proposed draft Code of Hygienic Practice for Fresh Meat, on Risk-based post-mortem inspection procedures for fresh meat. However, the proposed document is not very clear as regards structure and content.

#### Title

The issue of 'ante-mortem inspection' is not dealt with in the document. The title should therefore not mention 'ante-mortem inspection'.

The terminology of the title should be put in line with the terminology of the Code. For instance, the Code proposes the use of the words 'ante-mortem *examination*'.

#### Paragraph 3

The second sentence is not clear. It would appear that the aspect of *suitability* is not covered by the Annex. However, the European Community is of the opinion that post-mortem inspection procedures should in principle detect gross abnormalities irrespective of whether or not a public health hazard is involved.

---

#### Paragraph 4

The introductory sentence of the paragraph speaks about *development* of post-mortem inspection procedures. However, paragraph 4 seems to deal more with the evaluation of post-mortem procedures and not with the development (this latter aspect is tackled in the subsequent paragraphs).

#### Paragraph 9

It is not clear why the hazard identification process should be only *empirical*. It might be appropriate to carry out specific scientific studies. In addition, the relation with paragraph 13 is unclear.

#### Paragraph 10

Field trials should not be carried out to give a reliable estimate of the true prevalence of gross abnormalities but rather to give an estimate of the detection rate of gross abnormalities achieved by specific post-mortem inspection procedures.

#### Paragraph 14

This should be Sub-Chapter 5.3 instead of 5.4.

#### Paragraphs 15 and 16

The definitions of the words *sensitivity* and *specificity* are confusing, especially the relation with 'public health hazards'. Considering the fact that post-mortem inspection procedures should detect gross abnormalities irrespective of whether or not a public health hazard is involved, these definitions seem inappropriate.

#### Paragraph 19

It is not clear what *alternative inspection procedures* and *traditional procedures* are. These terms should be clarified and defined.

#### Examples

The examples are not well presented and therefore not easy to understand. Their relevance for this exercise can be questioned.