CODEX ALIMENTARIUS COMMISSION

Food and Agriculture Organization of the United Nations

World Health Organization

Viale delle Terme di Caracalla, 00153 Rome, Italy - Tel: (+39) 06 57051 - E-mail: codex@fao.org - www.codexalimentarius.org

Agenda Item 10 **MAS/38 CRD/16**

JOINT FAO/WHO FOOD STANDARDS PROGRAMME
CODEX COMMITTEE ON METHODS OF ANALYSIS SAMPLING

38th Session
Budapest, Hungary, 8 -12 May 2017

FINAL REPORT OF THE 29th MEETING OF INTERNATIONAL ORGANISATIONS WORKING IN THE FIELD OF METHODS OF ANALYSIS AND SAMPLING

(INTER-AGENCY MEETING; IAM-29)

14.00 – 18.00h, Saturday, 6th May 2017

Present

Anne Bridges	AACCI
Darryl Sullivan	AOACI
Erik Konings	AOACI
John Szpylka	AOACI
Wayne Wargo	AOACI
Richard Cantrill	AOCS (Chair)
Ralf Josephs	BIPM
Verna Carolissen	CAC
Marot Hibbey	CCMAS Chair
Duncan Arthur	CEN
Sheryl Tittlemier	ICC
Jaap Evers	IDF
Roger Kissling	IDF
David Hammond	IFU
Marie-Noelle Bourquin	ISO
Christoph von Holst	IUPAC
Nina Skall Nielsen	NMKL
Andrea Zentai	NFCSO
Gina Clapper	USP-FCC (Secretariat)

Kristie Laurvick USP-FCC (Secretariat)

Invited

Greg Noonan USFDA

1. **Chair's Welcome / Introduction**
The attendees were welcomed by Dr Cantrill who thanked Dr Hibbey and Dr Zentai for kindly hosting the meeting at the Hungarian National Food Chain Safety Office.

Dr Cantrill noted that Dr. Roger Wood would not be present at the current meeting and had also expressed a desire to retire as Chair for the group. Dr. Cantrill offered to Chair the group for the current meeting. He also asked if representatives from USP/FCC (Ms. Laurvick and Ms. Clapper) would serve as the Secretariat unless there were objections. There were no objections..

2. **Introduction of Attendees**
The Chair noted the presence of new delegates and also the absence of a number of familiar faces and asked for introductions.

3. **Adoption of Agenda**
The Agenda was adopted with the following changes:

3.1 The Chair moved the Website Update from Agenda Item 11.3 to Item 5.2.

3.2 Christoph von Holst requested an addition to the Agenda under Item 12 Other Business to address difficulties being encountered with meeting performance requirements when validating methods with multiple analytes and requested a discussion with other Members regarding this issue.

3.3 The Chair noted that Dr. Greg Noonan (USFDA and Co-chair of the Methods Endorsement Working Group) was visiting the group with the Codex Secretariat and that they would like to address the group at Agenda Item 8.1.

4. **Report of the Previous Meeting IAM-28, 2016**
There were no corrections to the report of the 28th meeting.

4.1 **Chair and Secretariat –** The Chair explained that IAM rules require yearly consideration of the positions of Chair and Secretary and that Drs. Wood and Cantrill had held the positions for many years. It was generally agreed that annual reassignments would not lend consistency to the meetings or the work of IAM, and multi-year appointments would be preferred. Dr Cantrill proposed to remain Chair for the immediate future, should Dr. Wood be unable to join future meetings, however, he invited members to submit any additional interest or suggestions. AOACI (Sullivan) indicated that they would be happy to serve in the Chair position following Dr. Cantrill's tenure at a date to be determined.

4.2 **Website Update -** The Chair noted that AOCS had removed IAM pages from its website in a recent update and that the MoniQA Association (Roland Poms) had agreed to host those pages on its website. The Chair will provide a web link to the group once he receives it from Dr. Poms.

5. **Matters arising from the Previous Meeting not otherwise on the Agenda**
None presented.

6. Method Validation/Statistical Update Issue

6.1 **AOAC Expert Review Panel Methods Progress – Use of Proficiency Test Data –** Dr. Sullivan indicated that there are ongoing studies, but no data to share with the group at this time. AOAC is still very interested in this topic and will hopefully have data to share at IAM-30.

6.2 **International Guidelines for the Validation of Qualitative Methods -** Dr. Holst indicated that there was no update since the last meeting. AOAC published POD determinations and Dr. Shillito (USA) is the project leader working to vote POD qualitative determination information into ISO and is receiving significant challenges from some countries. They should have a version to circulate through ISO/TC 34/SC 16 again shortly.

6.3 **Revision of ISO 5725 Update -** The Chair indicated that the notes from Steve Ellison shared in 2016 still apply. There are parts being re-written. Indications are the statistical approach should not be changing.

6.4 **USP/FCC Approach on Non-Targeted Analysis and Validation -** Ms. Laurvick shared with the group that USP had issued a draft guidance document on the validation of non-targeted methods of analysis for detecting adulteration. It generally addresses terminology and important validation criteria for non-targeted methods (largely spectroscopic) and does not provide specific requirements. Comments received during the public review of the proposal were currently undergoing review prior to an upcoming ballot. The final document should be published in September 2017. She welcomed members to review the draft document and submit additional comments to USP for future revision. This is an area of continued interest to USP and additional work will likely be performed with publications resulting from Expert Panel work.

6.5 Dr. Szpylka identified the need for validation guidelines or minimum requirements for handheld analytical devices and related consumer-oriented devices aimed at determining the authenticity of foods and drugs. The calibration of such devices appears unclear and mostly proprietary. USP and AOACI expressed interested in developing guidance in this area.

7. CCMAS

7.1 **Codex Secretariat Discussion on Enhancing the Role of IAM at CCMAS Meetings –** The Codex Secretariat indicated that Codex would like to receive a report of relevant information from IAM members which could be added to the CCMAS agenda instead of solely being supplied as a CRD. This report could include updates on the activities of different SDOs that might be of interest to member countries. The Codex Secretariat indicated that they are not requesting the IAM report, but suggested that IAM members may find it a helpful way to inform the member countries and find potential collaborators to help support harmonization efforts. Members discussed the idea and the Chair noted that the group generally agreed that it could be helpful to produce such a report, but it was unclear how IAM would accomplish this. The group would consider how to produce such a report and ensure that it is represented to CCMAS as a product of IAM and its SDOs rather than a general update from individual standards bodies.

PWG on Endorsement of Methods of Analysis and Sampling Plan Provisions in Codex Standards – Dr. Noonan addressed the group stating that, in many cases, Codex Committees are forwarding methods that delegates might not have access to or expertise in – currently this is dealt with through a physical working group on the day of the meeting. He would prefer to ask SDOs for feedback on methods prior to the meeting so that he could take the feedback to the PWG. The group discussed the issue and the lead time necessary to provide information, which will depend on the specific request. Suggestions from 2 to 6 weeks lead time were made, with the Chair noting that 4 weeks seems reasonable. This would require receiving information earlier than usual – Dr. Noonan indicated that he could send out Endorsement requests in multiple emails instead of waiting to send a single request.

Updating Method References in Codex Stan 234 – Dr. Noonan commented that there is often a similar problem when addressing workable packages received (lack of access to methods and inability to compare methods). There was general discussion about the importance of this work but agreement that the scope is large and some SDOs have little time to devote to it. The Chair noted that each organization should be responsible for ensuring that references and harmonization information are correct. An EWG for updating the references was discussed along with division of the work and creating an understanding that this work will likely take longer than one year.

7.2 **Matters Referred to the Committee by the Codex Alimentarius Commission and Other Subsidiary Bodies CX/MAS 17/38/2 -** Chair asked if any members have anything to bring to the group's attention relevant to this agenda item/document. Dr. Evers asked the Codex Secretariat if CCNFSDU is looking for a single method for *trans*-fatty acids. The position paper from Canada provided a table listing 3 methods and the Chair noted that these cannot be combined into a single method. Dr. Noonan provided a table listing more details from the 3 methods (product types/ranges/food types) to indicate in which matrices each method has been validated, as a more practical approach to finding an answer for CCNFSDU.

7.3 **Endorsement of Methods of Analysis Provisions and Sampling Plans in Codex Standards CX/MAS 17/38/3 –** The Chair indicated that AOCS would have methods to submit for Shea butter. The Chair further indicated that the proposed method for determining the acid value of Frozen French Fried Potatoes and Laver products was not suitable for that application unless a validated extraction method were available.

7.4 **Guidance on the Criteria Approach for Methods Which Use a "Sum of Components" CX/MAS 17/38/4 –** The Chair indicated that the UK paper was circulated recently and asked the group if any members had anything to bring to the group's attention relevant to this agenda item/document. No comments were received.

7.5 **Criteria for endorsement of biological methods used to detect chemicals of concern CX/MAS 17/38/5 –** The Chair asked if any members had anything to bring to the group's attention relevant to this agenda item/document? Dr. Noonan offered a point of suggestion about re-typing the mouse biological assay from type 4 to type 2 or 3. He indicated that it is a type 4 method because it has not met the current validation criteria. To make this a type 1 we would have to remove the other type 2 method in the standard and likely this will not achieve consensus. No further comments were offered.

7.6 **Review and Update of Methods in CODEX STAN 234-1999 (replies to CL 2017/4-MAS) CX/MAS 17/38/6 –** The Chair asked if any members had anything to bring to the group's attention relevant to this agenda item/document. This topic was discussed earlier. Dr. Noonan noted that Section 2 calls for performance criteria for the methods, also in Section 4 a description of the method is required – this seems like a lot of information? Chair indicated this information is largely, freely available and addresses the scope of the methods (section 4) but that performance data may not be available or may be proprietary (the proprietary nature is AOCS' opinion).

7.7 **Information document on Practical Examples on the Selection of Appropriate Sampling Plans (Replies to CL 2017/5-MAS) CX/MAS 17/38/7 –** The Chair asked if any members had anything to bring to the group's attention relevant to this agenda item/document. No comments were received.

7.8 **Proposal to amend the Guidelines on Measurement Uncertainty (CAC/GL 54-2004) CX/MAS 17/38/8 –** The Chair asked if any members had anything to bring to the group's attention relevant to this agenda item/document. IDF indicated its comments were provided in CRD 11. The key points are that a revision of the Guidelines is supported and that the revised Guidelines must clearly describe the

purpose of, and differences between, conformity assessment and of sampling inspection.

7.9 **Proposal to amend the General Guidelines on sampling (CAC/GL 50-2004) CX/MAS 17/38/9 –** The Chair asked if any members had anything to bring to the group's attention relevant to this agenda item/document. No comments were received.

8. Update on CEN Report on Information to and Procedures for CEN TC 275 Working Groups to Consider When Specific Standards are Being Developed and Adopted by the TC and Its Working Groups

The document was discussed last year with a request for comments. Dr. Wood was to put comments into a final document which would be provided as a revised version – action item for Dr. Wood.

CEN WG 0 Document.docx

9. General Comments – The Chair noted that we were pleased to receive some endorsement document earlier than in previous years.

10. IAM Housekeeping/Standing Items

10.1 **Exchange of Reports and Information/Concerns of Members -** Lack of collaborators, proprietary data requested by Codex, and handheld analytical devices were mentioned as issues of general interest to the group. AOAC remarked that collaborators in China struggled to receive collaborative study samples, however, this could be alleviated if the partner were with a government lab. Thus shipment to the government lab and further distribution in-country was possible. AOAC offered to exchange information on shipping to such countries. Other common issues – proprietary information; handheld devices of unknown origin and functionality being applied to commodities (guidelines on performance or expectations necessary).

10.2 **Incorporation of change of methods/method corrections in the Codex Alimentarius Commission –** The Chair asked if there were additional comments. Recap of previous comments from 8.1. The Chair reiterated the proposal for each individual SDO to be responsible for these updates.

11. Any Other Business –

11.1 Dr.von Holst mentioned issues arising from validating methods for multiple analytes. How other groups are confronting this issue. How do you deal with analytes in a mixture where certain analytes do meet the criteria? Is there a need for a practical guideline on how to perform these validation studies? Can specific analytes be defined as "more important" or critical than others in these mixtures/tests? He indicates this is not straight-forward. Participants were invited to share ideas and experiences at the next meeting

11.2 Dr. Josephs informed the meeting of a training program implemented to synthesize mycotoxin reference materials in places where they are difficult to source or too expensive to obtain. In the future there is a possibility this training would be available to third-party laboratories.

12. Provisional Date and Place of Next Meeting

Tentatively set for February, 2018, but Codex Secretariat needs to confirm with Hungarian Delegation.

13. The meeting was adjourned by a toast thanking the hosts and participants enjoyed a small reception.