

# 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 3(a)**

**CX/RVDF 01/2  
November 2001**

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

### **CODEX COMMITTEE ON RESIDUES OF VETERINARY DRUGS IN FOODS**

#### **Thirteen Session**

**Charleston, South Carolina, 4 - 7 December 2001**

### **MATTERS REFERRED BY THE CODEX ALIMENTARIUS COMMISSION AND OTHER CODEX COMMITTEES**

#### **CONSIDERATION OF THE DRAFT STRATEGIC FRAMEWORK, PROPOSED DRAFT MEDIUM PLAN 2003- 2007 AND THE CHAIRPERSON'S ACTION PLAN**

1. In discussing the Chairperson's Action Plan, the 24<sup>th</sup> Session (July 2001) of the Codex Alimentarius Commission noted<sup>1</sup> that recent changes had led to the improved identification and selection of experts and temporary advisors for expert groups and consultations. The Commission welcomed these developments and a planning meeting in November 2001 which would examine, among other issues, increased coordination between the JECFA, JMPR, and the other groups devoted to microbiological contamination and biotechnology on matters including selection and establishment of a roster of experts for such bodies, including increased transparency in the process. The Commission requested FAO and WHO to convene a consultation to review the status and procedures of the expert bodies and to develop recommendations for consideration by the Directors-General on additional ways to improve the quality, quantity and timeliness of scientific advice to the Commission.
2. The Commission adopted<sup>2</sup> the draft Strategic Framework, including the Strategic Vision Statement. It agreed that the draft Medium-Term Plan should be revised by the Secretariat in the light of the Strategic Framework, the Commission's discussion and the written comments received, and should incorporate the elements of the Chairperson's Action Plan agreed to by the Commission. The Commission agreed that the activities envisaged in the Medium Term Plan should include cost estimates to determine whether the objectives could be achieved within available resources and that the revised draft Medium-Term-Plan be circulated for the inputs of the Codex Coordinating Committees, other Codex Committees, Member governments and international organizations for further consideration and finalization at the 25<sup>th</sup> Session of the Commission.
3. The 49<sup>th</sup> Session (September 2001) of the Executive Committee of the Codex Alimentarius Commission noted<sup>3</sup> that Circular Letter CL 2001/26-EXEC had been sent to Members of the Commission on 14 August 2001. Governments and interested international organizations had been being invited to comment on the revised Draft Medium-Term Plan and also to propose or suggest new activities. Following the deadline for comments (30 November 2001) the Revised Draft Medium-Term Plan will be up-dated and placed on the

<sup>1</sup> ALINORM 01/41, paras. 58-61.

<sup>2</sup> ALINORM 01/41, paras. 46-70 and Appendix II.

<sup>3</sup> ALINORM 03/3, paras. 37-41.

Codex Website. The Plan will be up-dated following each Codex Committee/Task Force session to include new proposals as they arise.

4. This Plan will then be submitted to the 50th Session of the Executive Committee (2002) for review and then to governments and interested international organizations for comments. Those Codex Committees (especially Regional Committees) that had not previously commented will also have to opportunity to contribute to the development of the Medium-Term Plan. The Revised Draft Medium-Term Plan together with the various proposals made by Codex Committees and other interested parties will be considered by the 51st Session of the Executive Committee and then submitted to the 25th Session of the Codex Alimentarius Commission for adoption.

#### **RISK ANALYSIS POLICIES OF THE CODEX ALIMENTARIUS COMMISSION**

5. The 24<sup>th</sup> Session of the Codex Alimentarius Commission confirmed<sup>4</sup> its initial mandate to the Committee on General Principles to complete the principles for risk analysis within Codex as a high priority, with a view to their adoption in 2003.

6. The Commission adopted the position, in regard to the consideration of precaution, that:

*“When there is evidence that a risk to human health exists but scientific data are insufficient or incomplete, the Commission should not proceed to elaborate a standard but should consider elaborating a related text, such as a code of practice, provided that such a text would be supported by the available scientific evidence.”*

7. The Commission also recommended that relevant Codex Committees should continue to develop and document the application of risk analysis in their work. It was agreed that the risk analysis policies developed by the Committees would be presented in a single document to the next session of the Commission.

#### **CONSIDERATION OF PROPOSED AMENDMENTS TO THE PROCEDURAL MANUAL OF THE CODEX ALIMENTARIUS COMMISSION – STATEMENTS OF PRINCIPLE ON THE ROLE OF SCIENCE IN THE CODEX DECISION MAKING PROCESS AND THE EXTENT TO WHICH OTHER FACTORS ARE TAKEN INTO ACCOUNT: CRITERIA**

8. The 24<sup>th</sup> Session of the Codex Alimentarius Commission amended and adopted<sup>5</sup> *Criteria for the Consideration of Other Factors Referred to in the Second Statement of Principle* in the Statements of Principle Concerning the Role of Science in the Codex Decision Making Process and the Extent to Which Other Factors are Taken into Account (Codex Alimentarius Procedural Manual, Eleventh Edition).

#### **CONSIDERATION OF NEW WORK PROPOSALS**

9. The 47<sup>th</sup> Session (June 2000) of the Executive Committee approved<sup>6</sup> new work proposed under the Priority List of Veterinary Drugs<sup>7</sup> and for the Amendment to the Glossary of Terms and Definitions (definitions for muscle, fat, milk and egg) under the accelerated procedure.

#### **CONSIDERATION OF PROPOSED DRAFT STANDARDS AND RELATED TEXTS**

10. The 47<sup>th</sup> Session (June 2000) of the Executive Committee adopted<sup>8</sup> the proposed draft maximum residue limits for clenbuterol, neomycin, phoxim, porcine somatotropin and thiamphenicol as proposed<sup>9</sup>. The Executive Committee noted that further advancement of the draft MRL for Porcine Somatotropin would

---

<sup>4</sup> ALINORM 01/41, paras. 71-85.

<sup>5</sup> ALINORM 01/41, paras. 93-98 and Appendix III.

<sup>6</sup> ALINORM 01/3, Appendix III.

<sup>7</sup> ALINORM 01/31, Appendix VIII.

<sup>8</sup> ALINORM 01/3, Appendix IV.

<sup>9</sup> ALINORM 01/31, Appendix V.

depend on the outcome of the discussion of “other legitimate factors” by the Codex Committee on General Principles.

11. At the 49<sup>th</sup> Session (September 2001) of the Executive Committee, the Committee noted<sup>10</sup> the comments of the Representative of the South-West Pacific that the proposed draft Guidelines for Food Import Control Systems<sup>11</sup> no longer referred to situations where a zero-tolerance for pesticide limits had been taken by the importing country for reasons other than protection of consumers’ health. The Representative suggested that this matter should be taken up by the relevant Committees dealing with pesticide and veterinary drug residues.

#### **CONSIDERATION OF DRAFT STANDARDS AND RELATED TEXTS**

12. The 24<sup>th</sup> Session of the Codex Alimentarius Commission adopted<sup>12</sup> the draft maximum residue limits for danofloxacin, gentamicin, imidocarb and sarafloxacin as proposed<sup>13</sup>. In response to concerns expressed concerning the approval and use of danofloxacin and sarafloxacin with respect to antimicrobial resistance, the Commission was informed that the general issue of antimicrobial resistance and the use of antimicrobials in animal production was currently under consideration in the Committee.

13. The Commission also adopted<sup>14</sup> the proposed draft and proposed draft revised maximum residue limits at Steps 5 and 8 with the omission of Steps 6 and 7 for dihydrostreptomycin/streptomycin and doramectin<sup>15</sup>.

#### **DESIGNATION OF HOST GOVERNMENTS COMMITTEES AND *AD HOC* TASK FORCES**

14. The 24<sup>th</sup> Session of the Codex Alimentarius Commission decided<sup>16</sup> to reactivate the Codex Committee on Meat Hygiene and agreed that the mandate of the Committee should be extended to include poultry. It agreed to amend the Committee’s terms of reference accordingly, and renamed the Committee the Codex Committee on Meat and Poultry Hygiene. The Commission confirmed that the New Zealand would be the host Government of this Committee.

15. At the 49<sup>th</sup> Session of the Executive Committee, the Representative of the South-West Pacific noted that the proposed work of the Codex Committee on Meat and Poultry Hygiene envisaged a broad definition of “meat” that would encompass poultry and other meats. On this basis, the decision of the Commission to make a separate reference to poultry meat may be prejudicial to this approach. The Executive Committee invited the Committee to discuss its Name and Terms of Reference at its next session and make appropriate proposals to the Commission.<sup>17</sup>

#### **ANTIBIOTICS USED ON AGRICULTURAL COMMODITIES AND ANTIMICROBIAL RESISTANT BACTERIA IN FOOD**

16. The 48<sup>th</sup> Session (June 2001) of the Executive Committee noted<sup>18</sup> that the first of these matters had been raised by the Committee on Pesticide Residues<sup>19</sup> and the second by the Committee on Food Hygiene<sup>20</sup>. In relation to the first matter, the Executive Committee was of the opinion that the use of antimicrobials on agricultural commodities should be subject to evaluation within a risk analysis framework; the question was whether the normal process used for the evaluation of pesticides was the appropriate one. In the second case, the Executive Committee agreed that consideration should be given to the consideration of antimicrobial

---

<sup>10</sup> ALINORM 03/3, para. 17.

<sup>11</sup> ALINORM 01/30A, Appendix IV.

<sup>12</sup> ALINORM 01/41, paras. 141.

<sup>13</sup> ALINORM 01/31, Appendix II.

<sup>14</sup> ALINORM 01/41, para. 142.

<sup>15</sup> ALINORM 01/31, Appendix III

<sup>16</sup> ALINORM 01/41, paras. 9 and 215.

<sup>17</sup> ALINORM 03/3, paras. 44.

<sup>18</sup> ALINORM 01/4 paras. 36-37.

<sup>19</sup> ALINORM 01/24A, para. 222

<sup>20</sup> ALINORM 01/13A, paras 132-142

resistant micro-organisms in food within a risk analysis framework on a case-by-case basis as micro-organism/food combinations were being assessed.

17. The Executive Committee agreed however that the issues raised by these Committees required a more general and multidisciplinary and multi-agency response. It noted the on-going work of the Committee on Residues of Veterinary Drugs in Foods and the Task Force on Animal Feeding. Moreover, it was aware of the recommendations contained in the WHO Global Principles for the Containment of Antimicrobial Resistance in Animals Intended for Food<sup>21</sup> and the work of the OIE. It noted that in the past, attempts to coordinate work between Codex Committees with diverse mandates had not always been successful and that the establishment of new task forces to deal with these specific issues had helped to resolve the issues at hand. Without prejudice to the possibility of establishing a new Task Force, it recommended that FAO and WHO should give consideration to convening as soon as possible a multidisciplinary expert consultation in cooperation with OIE and if required the IPPC, to advise the Commission on possible directions to be taken including the establishment of a new task force if necessary. The consultation should consider all uses of antimicrobials in agriculture and veterinary use (including aquaculture) and take into account the role played by antimicrobials as essential human and veterinary medicines. It noted that the convening of an additional expert consultation in the forthcoming biennium would be subject to the availability of funds.

### **CODEX AD-HOC INTERGOVERNMENTAL TASK FORCE ON ANIMAL FEEDING<sup>22</sup>**

18. At the 24<sup>th</sup> Session of the Codex Alimentarius Commission, the Delegation of Denmark presented<sup>23</sup> the Interim Report<sup>24</sup> of the Ad Hoc Intergovernmental Task Force on Animal Feeding, as required under the Task Force's Terms of Reference. The Commission was informed that a final Draft Code of Practice on Good Animal Feeding would be proposed for adoption at its next session. The Commission was also informed that the Task Force noted that other Codex bodies with a mandate for the establishment of maximum residues levels for contaminants, pesticides, veterinary drugs and microbiological limits did not always use a terminology which was common in a feed context and therefore, the Task Force recognised the need to establish the necessary links.

---

<sup>21</sup> WHO document WHO/CDS/CSR/APH/2000.4

<sup>22</sup> Reports of the 1<sup>st</sup> (ALINORM 01/38) and 2<sup>nd</sup> (ALINORM 01/38A) Sessions of the Codex *Ad Hoc* Intergovernmental Task Force on Animal Feeding

<sup>23</sup> ALINORM 01/41, paras. 210-211

<sup>24</sup> CAC/LIM 14 (Interim Report of the Ad Hoc Task Force on Animal Feeding).