

codex alimentarius commission E



FOOD AND AGRICULTURE
ORGANIZATION
OF THE UNITED NATIONS

WORLD
HEALTH
ORGANIZATION



JOINT OFFICE: Viale delle Terme di Caracalla 00153 ROME Tel: 39 06 57051 www.codexalimentarius.net Email: codex@fao.org Facsimile: 39 06 5705 4593

ALINORM 09/32/31
May 2009

JOINT FAO/WHO FOOD STANDARDS PROGRAMME

CODEX ALIMENTARIUS COMMISSION

Thirty second Session

Rome, Italy, 29 June - 4 July 2009

REPORT OF THE EIGHTEENTH SESSION OF THE

CODEX COMMITTEE ON RESIDUES OF VETERINARY DRUGS IN FOODS

Natal, Brazil

11-15 May 2009

NOTE: This report contains Codex Circular Letter CL 2009/17-RVDF

codex alimentarius commission E



FOOD AND AGRICULTURE
ORGANIZATION
OF THE UNITED NATIONS

WORLD
HEALTH
ORGANIZATION



JOINT OFFICE: Viale delle Terme di Caracalla 00153 ROME Tel: 39 06 57051 www.codexalimentarius.net Email: codex@fao.org Facsimile: 39 06 5705 4593

CX 4/60.2

**CL 2009/17-RVDF
May 2009**

TO: - Codex Contact Points
- Interested International Organizations

FROM: Secretary, Codex Alimentarius Commission
Joint FAO/WHO Food Standards Programme,
Viale delle Terme di Caracalla
00153 Rome, Italy

SUBJECT DISTRIBUTION OF THE REPORT OF THE 18TH SESSION OF THE CODEX COMMITTEE ON RESIDUES OF VETERINARY DRUGS IN FOODS (ALINORM 09/32/31)

The report of the Eighteenth Session of the Codex Committee on Residues of Veterinary Drugs in Foods will be considered by the 32nd Session of the Codex Alimentarius Commission (Rome, Italy, 29 June-4 July 2009).

MATTERS FOR ADOPTION BY THE 32ND SESSION OF THE CODEX ALIMENTARIUS COMMISSION

- 1. Draft and proposed draft Maximum Residues Limits (MRLs) for Veterinary Drugs, at Step 8 and 5/8 of the Procedure, respectively (para. 80 and Appendices II and III)**
- 2. Draft Guidelines for the Design and Implementation of National Regulatory Food Safety Assurance Programmes Associated with the Use of Veterinary Drugs in Food Producing Animals at Step 8 of the Procedure (para. 109 and Appendix V)**
- 3. Proposed draft Maximum Residues Limits (MRLs) for Veterinary Drugs, at Step 5 of the Procedure (para. 80 and Appendix IV)**

Governments and international organizations wishing to submit comments on the above texts should do so in writing, preferably by e-mail, to the Secretary, Codex Alimentarius Commission, Joint FAO/WHO Food Standards Programme, FAO, Viale delle Terme di Caracalla, 00153 Rome, Italy (Email: codex@fao.org, telefax : +39 06 57054593) **before 15 June 2009.**

Contents

SUMMARY AND CONCLUSIONS	page iii
LIST OF ABBREVIATIONS	page v
REPORT OF THE 18 TH SESSION OF THE CODEX COMMITTEE ON RESIDUES OF VETERINARY DRUGS IN FOODS	page 1
SUMMARY STATUS OF WORK	page 19
	Paragraph
INTRODUCTION	1 - 5
ADOPTION OF THE AGENDA (Agenda Item 1)	6 - 9
MATTERS REFERRED BY THE CODEX ALIMENTARIUS COMMISSION AND OTHER CODEX COMMITTEES AND TASK FORCES (Agenda Item 2)	10 - 22
MATTERS OF INTEREST ARISING FROM FAO AND WHO AND FROM THE 70 TH MEETING OF JOINT FAO/WHO EXPERT COMMITTEE ON FOOD ADDITIVES (JECFA) (Agenda Item 3) ...	23 - 41
REPORT OF OIE ACTIVITIES, INCLUDING THE HARMONIZATION OF TECHNICAL REQUIREMENTS FOR THE REGISTRATION OF VETERINARY MEDICINAL PRODUCTS (VICH) (Agenda Item 4)	42 - 49
CONSIDERATION OF MAXIMUM RESIDUES LIMITS (MRLS) FOR VETERINARY DRUGS (Agenda Item 5)	
DRAFT MRLS FOR VETERINARY DRUGS (AT STEP 7) (Agenda Item 5a)	50 - 54
PROPOSED DRAFT MRLS FOR VETERINARY DRUGS (AT STEP 3) (Agenda Item 5b)	55 - 80
DRAFT GUIDELINES FOR THE DESIGN AND IMPLEMENTATION OF NATIONAL REGULATORY FOOD SAFETY ASSURANCE PROGRAMMES ASSOCIATED WITH THE USE OF VETERINARY DRUG RESIDUES IN FOODS (Agenda Item 6)	81 - 106
DISCUSSION PAPER ON CONSIDERATION OF METHODS OF ANALYSIS IN CCRVDF (REPORT OF THE ELECTRONIC WORKING GROUP ON METHODS OF ANALYSIS AND SAMPLING) (Agenda Item 7)	107 - 121
DRAFT PRIORITY LIST OF VETERINARY DRUGS REQUIRING EVALUATION OR RE-EVALUATION BY JECFA ABD WORKING DOCUMENT LISTING VETERINARY DRUGS OF POTENTIAL INTEREST (REPORT OF THE ELECTRONIC WORKING GROUP ON PRIORITY LIST OF VETERINARY DRUGS REQUIRING EVALUATION OR RE-EVALUATION (Agenda Item 8)	122 - 142
DISCUSSION PAPER ON CURRENT PRACTICES AND NEEDS FOR FURTHER WORK BY THE COMMITTEE (REPORT OF THE ELECTRONIC WORKING GROUP ON RISK MANAGEMENT TOPICS AND OPTIONS) (Agenda Item 9)	143 - 167
OTHER BUSINESS AND FUTURE WORK (Agenda Item 10)	168 - 179
DATE AND PLACE OF NEXT SESSION (Agenda Item 11)	180
Appendix I : List of Participants	page 20
Appendix II : Draft Maximum Residue Limit for veterinary drugs (at Step 8 of the Elaboration Procedure)	page 35
Appendix III : Proposed draft Maximum Residue Limit for veterinary drugs (at Step 5/8 of the Elaboration Procedure)	page 36
Appendix IV : Proposed draft Maximum Residue Limit for veterinary drugs (at Step 5 of the Elaboration Procedure)	page 39
Appendix V : Draft Guidelines for the design and implementation of national regulatory food safety assurance programmes associated with the use of veterinary drug residues in foods (at Step 8 of the Elaboration Procedure)	page 40
Appendix VI : Priority list of veterinary drugs for evaluation or re-evaluation by JECFA ...	page 78

SUMMARY AND CONCLUSIONS

The Eighteenth Session of the Codex Committee on Residues of Veterinary Drugs in Foods reached the following conclusions:

MATTERS FOR ADOPTION/CONSIDERATION BY THE 32ND SESSION OF THE CODEX ALIMENTARIUS COMMISSION

Draft and proposed draft Standards and Related Texts for adoption at Step 8 and 5/8 of the Procedure

- Draft MRLs for melengestrol acetate for adoption at Step 8 and proposed draft MRLs for avilamycin, dexamethasone, monensin, narasin, triclabendazol and tylosin for adoption at Step 5/8 (para. 80 and Appendices II and III);
- Draft Guidelines for the Design and Implementation of National Regulatory Food Safety Assurance Programmes Associated with the Use of Veterinary Drugs in Food Producing Animals (para. 106 and Appendix V).

Proposed draft Standards and Related Texts at Step 5 of the Procedure

- Proposed draft MRLs for narasin and tilmicosin for adoption at Step 5 (para. 80 and Appendix IV).

Codex standards and related texts for revocation

- *Temporary MRL for tilmicosin in sheep milk* (para. 72);
- *Guidelines for the Establishment of a Regulatory Programme for Control of Veterinary Drug Residues in Foods* (CAC/GL 16-1993) (para. 106); and
- *Code of Practice for Control of the Use of Veterinary Drugs* (CAC/RCP 38-1993) (para. 106).

Proposals for the Elaboration of New Standards and Related Texts

- Priority list of veterinary drugs for evaluation or re-evaluation by JECFA (para. 138 and Appendix VI).

Discontinuation of Work

- MRLs for triclabendazole in goat tissues (para. 74);

Matters for information by the 32nd Session of the Codex Alimentarius Commission

The Committee:

- Concluded that there was no significant new data available that would justify the inclusion of ractopamine in the Priority List for complete re-evaluation by JECFA (para. 21);
- Agreed to request FAO/WHO to convene an Expert consultation on dietary exposure assessment as it relates to veterinary drug residues in food (para. 150).

OTHER MATTERS

The Committee agreed:

- To request the Codex Secretariat to issue a Circular Letter requesting information on veterinary drugs registered for honey production and bee health (para. 28);
- To establish an electronic working group, led by the United Kingdom, to review: (i) the information on veterinary drugs registered for honey production and bee health submitted in response to the Circular Letter; and (ii) the guidelines on good veterinary practice with respect to honey (para. 29);

- To establish an electronic working group, led by the United States of America, to prepare revised table on guidance on sample type and quantity for residue control for aquatic animal products and derived edible products of aquatic origin, including minimum quantity required for laboratory sample and instruction for collection, for future inclusion in the Guidelines for the Design and Implementation of National Regulatory Food Safety Assurance Programmes Associated with the Use of Veterinary Drugs in Food Producing Animals (para. 103);
- To establish an electronic working group, led by the United Kingdom, to prepare a discussion paper containing proposals for the evaluation of analytical methods provided by JECFA and guidance on the development of performance characteristics for multi-residue analysis (para. 118 and 120);
- To request the Codex Secretariat to issue a Circular Letter requesting: (i) comments and information on the priority list of veterinary drugs for evaluation or re-evaluation by JECFA; and (ii) developing countries to indicate those priority compounds for which this assistance would be required and provide other relevant information (paras 139 and 142);
- To establish: (i) an electronic working group, led by Australia, to prepare a proposal for a Priority List of veterinary drugs for evaluation or re-evaluation by JECFA; and (ii) a physical working group, which would meet immediately before its next session, under the chairmanship of Australia, to consider the report of the electronic working group and comments submitted (para. 140-141);
- To establish: (i) an electronic Working Group, led by France, to prepare a discussion paper which would review all the factors taken into account in connection with establishing the ADI and the current process of recommending MRLs; and (ii) a physical working group, which would meet immediately before its next session, under the chairmanship of France, to consider the report of the electronic working group and comments submitted (paras 148-149);
- To state that malachite green and chloramphenicol should not be used for food producing animals (para. 163).
- To establish an electronic working group, led by the United States of America, to (i) define the scope for the new work addressing risk management recommendations for veterinary drugs for which no ADI and MRL has been recommended by JECFA due to specific human health concerns or lack of information needed to resolve existing human health concerns; (ii) develop a process by which the Committee will promulgate risk management recommendations; (iii) make proposals on how to address veterinary drugs for which JECFA clearly identified human health concerns; and (iv) propose procedures for conveying these risk management recommendations in the Codex standard setting process (para. 165).

LIST OF ABBREVIATIONS USED IN THIS REPORT

ADI	Acceptable Daily Intake
AGISAR	Advisory Group on Integrated Surveillance of Antimicrobial Resistance (WHO)
bw	body weight
CAC	Codex Alimentarius Commission
CAC/GL	Codex Alimentarius Commission / Guidelines
CCMAS	Codex Committee on Methods of Analysis and Sampling
CCPR	Codex Committee on Pesticide Residues
CCRVDF	Codex Committee on Residues of Veterinary Drugs in Foods
CL	Circular Letter
CRD	Conference Room Document
EC	European Community
EDI	Estimated Daily Intake
EFSA	European Food Safety Authority
EMEA	European Agency for the Evaluation of Medicinal Products
FAO	Food and Agriculture Organization of the United Nations
GIFSA	Global Initiative for Food-Related Scientific Advice
IAEA	International Atomic Energy Administration
IFAH	International Federation for Animal Health
INFOSAN	International Food Safety Authorities Network
JECFA	Joint FAO/WHO Expert Committee on Food Additives
JMPR	Joint FAO/WHO Meeting on Pesticide Residues
LMG	Leucomalachite green
MRL	Maximum Residue Limit
MRLVD	Maximum Residue Limit for Veterinary Drug
OIE	World Organization for Animal Health
PVS	Performance, Vision and Strategy
TDI	Tolerable Daily Intake
TMDI	Theoretical Maximum Daily Intake
TTC	Threshold of Toxicological Concern
TRS	Technical Report Series
USA	United States of America
VICH	International Cooperation on Harmonisation of Technical Requirements for Registration of Veterinary Medicinal Products
WGAPFS	Working Group on Animal Production Food Safety (OIE)
WHO	World Health Organization

INTRODUCTION

1. The Codex Committee on Residues of Veterinary Drugs in Foods (CCRVDF) held its Eighteenth Session in Natal, Brazil from 11 to 15 May 2009, at the kind invitation of the Governments of Brazil and the United States of America. The Session was chaired by Dr Bernadette Dunham, Director, Center for Veterinary Medicine, United States Food and Drug Administration and co-chaired by Dr Ricardo Pamplona, Veterinary Official Inspector, Ministry of Agriculture, Livestock and Food Supply of Brazil. The Session was attended by delegates from 53 Member countries and one Member organization, Observers from 3 international organizations and FAO and WHO. A list of participants, including the Secretariat, is given in Appendix I to this report.

2. Dr Celio Brovino Porto, Secretary of Agribusiness International Relations from Ministry of Agriculture, Livestock and Food Supply of Brazil, opened the session. In welcoming the participants, Dr Celio Brovino Porto indicated that the high level of participation in this Session of the CCRVDF showed the importance of international trade of animals and products of animal origin. He encouraged the Committee to make sound recommendations which would ensure food safety and promote fair trade practices. Dr Celio Brovino Porto highlighted Brazil's commitment to use Codex recommendations and ensured that Brazil would comply with the most rigorous safety measures for the benefit of its consumers and trade partners.

3. Ms Karen Stuck, Manager Codex Office, United States Department of Agriculture, welcomed the participants on behalf of the Government of the United States of America. She thanked the Brazilian Government for co-hosting this meeting and wished all the best for the delegates in their deliberations. She also noted the passing away of Ms Edith Kennard, US Codex officer, who devotedly worked for the Committee for many years.

4. On behalf of the Food and Agriculture Organization of the United Nations (FAO) and the World Health Organization (WHO), Dr Annika Wennberg, FAO Joint Secretary to JECFA, welcomed the participants and thanked the Government of Brazil for hosting this meeting.

Division of Competence

5. The Committee noted the division of competence between the European Community and its Member States, according to paragraph 5, Rule II of the Rules of Procedure of the Codex Alimentarius Commission, as presented in CRD1.

ADOPTION OF THE AGENDA (Agenda Item 1)¹

6. The Committee, with a view to facilitating its discussion under Agenda Item 9 "Current Practices and Needs for Further Work by the Committee", agreed to establish an in-session working group led by France, that was open to all interested members and observers and working in English only, which would review relevant documents and written comments and prepare recommendations for consideration of the Committee. This working group was asked to make proposals on how to address food consumption data issues which are relevant to some countries or regions and also to consider proposals for new work.

7. The Committee agreed to discuss under Agenda Item 9 "Current Practices and Needs for Further Work by the Committee" the proposal for new work on "Risk Management Recommendations/Guidance for Veterinary Drugs for Which no ADI and MRL has been Recommended by JECFA due to Specific Human Health Concerns or Lack of Information Needed to Resolve Existing Human Health Concerns" that was referred back to the Committee by the 31st Session of the Commission (*see* CX/RVDF 09/18/2).

8. The Committee accepted the proposal of the Chairperson to discuss under Agenda Item 10 "Other Business and Future Work" problems that the CCRVDF is currently facing and solutions to those problems. It agreed to consider this Item after Agenda Item 5.

9. With this modification the Committee adopted the Provisional Agenda as its Agenda for the Session.

¹ CX/RVDF 09/18/1

MATTERS REFERRED BY THE CODEX ALIMENTARIUS COMMISSION AND OTHER CODEX COMMITTEES AND TASK FORCES (Agenda Item 2)²

10. The Committee noted that a number of matters referred by the 31st Session of the Commission were only for information purposes or would be discussed under relevant Agenda Items.

11. The Committee was informed that the 31st Session of the Commission had endorsed the recommendations of the 61st Session of the Executive Committee on the length and content of session reports³ and that the 25th Session of the Codex Committee on General Principles (CCGP) had agreed to confirm its objective of completing the review of risk analysis policies, elaborated by various Committees, by 2011 as initially scheduled⁴. The Committee was also updated on the status of work of the *ad hoc* Intergovernmental Task Force on Antimicrobial Resistance.

12. In particular, the Committee commented and/or made decisions as follows:

MRLs for Ractopamine

13. The Committee recalled that the 31st Session of the Commission had agreed to hold the Maximum Residue Limits (MRLs) for ractopamine at Step 8 for discussion at its 32nd Session and that it had requested Members to submit relevant information on the availability of scientific data to the 18th Session of the Committee in order to allow the Committee to decide on the inclusion of ractopamine in the priority list for re-evaluation by JECFA. The Commission further agreed that at its 32nd Session, it would decide on the adoption of the MRLs for ractopamine based on the report of the 18th Session of the CCRVDF⁵.

14. The European Community, referring to their written comments, as contained in CRD2, indicated that the European Food Safety Authority (EFSA) had conducted a review of the JECFA evaluation regarding the safety of ractopamine. EFSA's review pointed out a number of uncertainties and weaknesses in the data underlying the JECFA assessment. The European Community therefore requested to include ractopamine in the priority list of substances for re-evaluation by JECFA.

15. China, referring to their written comments, as contained in CRD3, described briefly the results of residue studies carried out in pigs in China and pointed to high residue levels at early time points after cessation of treatment and that significant levels of residues were also found in other tissues such as lung and intestine. The delegation expressed the view that the current MRLs for ractopamine would not be compatible with a zero withdrawal period, and that in China also other tissues than those included in the established food basket were regularly consumed. The delegation stated that they could not support the draft MRLs and requested JECFA to conduct a comprehensive re-evaluation of the substance.

16. The European Community and China positions were supported by some delegations.

17. Some other delegations did not support re-evaluation by JECFA because in their view no new data had been presented which would necessitate a re-evaluation of ractopamine by JECFA. It was noted that ractopamine has been used in many countries for a number of years and it was commented that the studies conducted by China would not affect the ADI established by JECFA.

18. The WHO JECFA Secretariat noted that EFSA did not perform a risk assessment but reviewed the JECFA assessment, and that no new data were reviewed. In response to concerns related to the ADI, the WHO JECFA Secretariat explained that JECFA, in general, when evaluating compounds applies an overall weight-of-evidence approach and reaches its conclusions considering all relevant studies. In the case of ractopamine, the ADI was established based on a human study, as the most relevant study for human health risk assessment, however the most relevant animal studies (in monkeys) were also considered and these supported this ADI.

19. The Committee noted that there was no agreement among the delegations in relation to the interpretation of data that had led to the establishment of the ADI for ractopamine.

² CX/RVDF 09/18/2; CRD2 (Comments of the European Community); CRD3 (Comments of China, Kenya and Philippines)

³ ALINORM 08/31/REP, para. 9

⁴ ALINORM 09/32/25, paras 97-98

⁵ ALINORM 08/31/REP para. 58

20. With regard to the residues studies conducted by China, the FAO JECFA Secretary pointed out that the current MRLs at Step 8 were compatible with the ADI, taking into account of total residues in all four target tissues, and that further increase in the MRLs would have effect on dietary exposure. She was of the view that the data presented would be valuable for the derivation of withdrawal periods, but would not constitute significant new data requiring a re-evaluation of the recommended MRLs.

21. The Committee concluded that there was no significant new data available that would justify the inclusion of ractopamine in the Priority List for complete re-evaluation by JECFA. The European Community, China and Norway expressed their reservation to this conclusion (*see paras 133-137*).

22. The Committee agreed that the issue of broadening the “food basket” to include other tissues would be considered by the in-session working group on Agenda Item 9 (*see para. 150*).

MATTERS ARISING FROM FAO/WHO AND FROM THE 70TH MEETING OF THE JOINT FAO/WHO EXPERT COMMITTEE ON FOOD ADDITIVES (JECFA) (Agenda Item 3)⁶

23. The Representatives of FAO and WHO, referring to document CX/RVDF 09/18/3 informed the Committee on the outcome and recommendations of the 70th meeting of JECFA and on activities carried out by FAO and WHO in the area of scientific advice to Codex and Member countries relevant to the Committee as well as other activities of interest to the Committee.

Outcome of the 70th JECFA meeting

24. The JECFA Secretary reported that ADIs were established and MRLs were recommended for seven compounds and that the results will be discussed by this Committee under Agenda Items 5 (a) and (b).

Malachite green

25. With respect to malachite green, JECFA reviewed extensive literature data for malachite green and its major metabolite leucomalachite green (LMG). In response to a specific question from CCRVDF, JECFA concluded that malachite green can not be supported in food producing animals due to the toxicity of LMG.

Honey

26. The FAO JECFA Secretary reported on the considerations by JECFA regarding possible approaches for the assessment of residues in honey. In its report, JECFA suggested tools for generation of residue data, including considerations on marker residues and dietary exposure, taking into consideration other food products associated with honey such as bee’s wax. JECFA had concluded that given the complex and unique nature of honey and honey bees, further guidance from CCRVDF was necessary before possible specific approaches for residues in honey could be elaborated.

27. The Committee considered the proposed JECFA recommendations one by one and agreed to the following.

28. As regards the recommendations to compile a comprehensive list of veterinary drugs registered for honey production and bee health in order to establish a priority list for evaluation by JECFA and the need for more data regarding honey consumption, the Committee, after some discussion, agreed to request the Codex Secretariat to issue a Circular Letter requesting information on veterinary drugs registered for honey production and bee health and to provide data on honey consumption, considering both direct and indirect honey intake and also to provide information regarding the existence of good veterinary practice in honey production.

29. The Committee also agreed to establish an electronic working group, led by the United Kingdom and working in English only and open to all Codex members and observers, to compile and analyse the information received for consideration by the next Session of the Committee. In addition, the terms of reference for this would include a review of the guidelines of good veterinary practice with respect to honey.

30. As regards the recommendation that the CCRVDF working group on methods of analysis and sampling should consider analytical methods for residues in honey, the Committee noted that it would be discussed under Agenda Item 7.

⁶ CX/RVDF 09/18/3; CX/RVDF 09/18/3 Add.1; CRD4 (Comments of European Community)

31. As regards recommendation that the CCRVDF provide guidance on the appropriate percentile for an estimation of acute intake, the Committee agreed to defer the discussion on this recommendation to a later stage when the information on honey consumption would be made available.

Decision-Tree

32. The JECFA Secretary introduced the document “A risk-based decision tree approach for the safety evaluation of residues of veterinary drugs”, by pointing out that this had to be considered as “work-in-progress”, however is being shared with the Committee at an early stage of development for its general comments. The Secretariat explained that the proposed approach was reflecting the Risk Analysis Principles as Applied by CCRVDF, published in the Codex Procedural Manual, and inherent in the approach was an early interactive dialogue between risk assessors and risk managers. She emphasized the importance of a problem formulation and establishment of a preliminary risk profile, before embarking in a full risk assessment. The proposed risk assessment decision-tree approach was intended to allow for greater flexibility in the advice that JECFA can provide on potential human health effects of residues of veterinary drugs in food. It was pointed out that several aspects require further elaboration through expert consultations, for example, on dietary exposure assessment and on application of the concept of threshold of toxicological concern (TTC) for veterinary drugs. The JECFA Secretariat pointed out that additional resources are required to be able to convene such expert consultations.

33. The Committee agreed with the proposed general principles and supported further work on this matter and noted that sufficient time and opportunity for input and comments by Members was necessary.

34. The JECFA Secretary explained that this 'work-in-progress' document would be published on the relevant FAO and WHO websites for public comments and would allow members sufficient time for commenting. She informed the Committee that the JECFA Secretariat would continue to report back to the CCRVDF on further developments.

FAO and WHO activities

35. The Representative of WHO reported on the outcome of the expert consultation on melamine where basic chemistry, analytical methods, occurrence and exposure of melamine and analogues were reviewed as well as the toxicology and a Tolerable Daily Intake (TDI) established. She informed the Committee that the full report was available at the WHO and FAO websites. She also communicated that a joint FAO/WHO Expert Meeting on the Use of Nanotechnology in Food Production and Agriculture would be held in Rome in June 2009, focusing on the review of current and planned applications, on risk assessment methodology for nanotechnology applications, and on communication issues.

36. The WHO Representative also informed the Committee that WHO has established an Advisory Group on Integrated Surveillance of Antimicrobial resistance (WHO-AGISAR) in December 2008. The overall objective of this advisory group was to assist WHO in charting a strategic plan for prevention and control of foodborne antimicrobial resistance.

37. The Representative of FAO informed the Committee of recent accomplishments in the area of scientific advice and on the completion of the *ad hoc* Expert Meeting on the benefit and risks of the use of chlorine-containing disinfectants and alternatives in food production and food processing held in 2008 and that the full report would be available in the near future.

38. The Representative of FAO also informed the Committee that the final Expert Meeting of the Joint FAO/WHO project to update the principles and methods for risk assessment of chemicals in food had been held in November 2008 to consider the entire document and all comments received during the public consultation, and that the outcome would be published in 2009 as a new Environmental Health Criteria publication.

39. As a follow-up to the FAO/WHO Consultative Process on the Provision of Scientific Advice, the Committee was informed that the framework document was available in several languages and that FAO and WHO had established a Global Initiative for Food-Related Scientific Advice (GIFSA)⁷ to increase awareness to the scientific advice program and mobilize resources.

⁷ For further information contact: FAO Dominique.DiBase@fao.org; at WHO schlundtj@who.int

40. The Committee was further informed on the activities and role of the International Food Safety Authorities Network (INFOSAN) in relation to food incidents and that it played an important role by providing 14 emergency alerts to the full network and 4 alerts to specific member states to assist in the management of the melamine food safety incident.

FAO/IAEA Information on activities of the food and environmental safety sub-programme related to residues of veterinary drugs in foods

41. The IAEA Representative highlighted activities of the Joint FAO/IAEA Division of Nuclear Techniques in Food and Agriculture of interest to the CCRVDF, as presented in CX/RVDF 09/18/3 Add.1. The Committee was informed of the newly initiated Coordinated Research Project “Development of Radiometric and Allied Analytical Methods to Strengthen National Residue Control Programs for Antibiotic and Anthelmintic Veterinary Drug Residues”, which focused on areas of priority and concern to developing countries. The Representative drew the attention of the Committee that IAEA was currently conducting 14 technical cooperation projects to provide assistance in establishing national and regional residues control laboratories. Protocols for quality control/quality assurance for trypanocidal and other veterinary drugs were also being developed, in association with FAO, IFAH and UNIDO, to address the problems associated with the use of counterfeit and low quality veterinary pharmaceutical products.

REPORT OF THE OIE ACTIVITIES, INCLUDING THE HARMONIZATION OF TECHNICAL REQUIREMENTS FOR REGISTRATION OF VETERINARY MEDICINAL PRODUCTS (VICH) (Agenda Item 4)⁸

42. The Observer from OIE, while referring to CX/RVDF 09/18/4, drew the Committee’s attention to four main areas that were relevant to the work of the CCRVDF: the cooperation between the OIE and the Codex Alimentarius Commission; the OIE activities aiming at the improvement of capacity building of its members; antimicrobial resistance; and the OIE and VICH activities.

43. With regard to the first point, the Observer mentioned the ongoing and upcoming activities of the OIE Working Group on Animal Production Food Safety (WGAPFS), which also included experts from Codex, FAO and WHO. The work program for 2008/2009 was detailed.

44. Concerning capacity building, the Observer informed the CCRVDF about the establishment of focal points for veterinary medicinal products in OIE member countries, the implementation of the assessment of the veterinary services through the tool named PVS (performance, vision and strategy) and the organisation of regional conferences.

45. Regarding antimicrobial resistance, the Observer provided information on ongoing and upcoming activities and highlighted the collaboration between FAO, WHO and OIE for the benefit of animal and public health.

46. With respect to cooperation between VICH and OIE, the Committee was informed about four specific actions of interest: i) the establishment of a procedure for the maintenance of the VICH guidelines; ii) the progress of the working group on Metabolism and Residue Kinetics; iii) the establishment of a working group on the development of an Acute Reference Dose; and iv) the revival of the working group on microbiological ADI.

47. The Committee was also informed about the efforts to develop the VICH global outreach at a worldwide level. The delegations were requested to reply an electronic questionnaire in order to obtain information on the current situation of the governance of veterinary medicinal products in the countries and regions and to identify future areas for further harmonisation. The analysis of replies to this questionnaire outcome would help to prepare the Fourth VICH public conference (VICH–IV), scheduled for 24 and 25 June in 2010 in the OIE headquarters in Paris.

48. The Observer from IFAH informed the Committee that the draft Guidelines on metabolism and residue kinetics would be published very soon for consultation and that important initiatives and recommendations would be proposed on the collection of data for additional tissues, study designs for zero withdrawal time, reduction of the number of animals tested etc. The Observer also noted that this current work did not address harmonization of withdrawal periods.

⁸ CX/RVDF 09/18/4

49. In response to questions raised by one delegation, it was clarified that VICH Steering Committee meetings were open to observers also from Latin American countries.

CONSIDERATION OF MAXIMUM RESIDUE LIMITS (MRLs) FOR VETERINARY DRUGS (Agenda Item 5)⁹

DRAFT MRLs FOR VETERINARY DRUGS (AT STEP 7) (Agenda Item 5a)¹⁰

Melengestrol acetate

50. The Committee recalled that at its 17th Session it had agreed to retain the draft MRLs for melengestrol acetate in cattle tissues at Step 7 with the understanding that the European Community would provide new data for a re-evaluation by JECFA, and if JECFA reaffirmed its decision, melengestrol acetate would be advanced to Step 8 at its next Session¹¹.

51. The Committee noted that the 70th Meeting of JECFA had reviewed extensive additional data submitted by the European Community in order to address their concerns and that this review concluded that the new data did not provide any basis to reconsider the ADI. Therefore the previously established ADI and MRLs recommendations were maintained.

52. The European Community, while taking note of the conclusions of JECFA's re-evaluation, reiterated their concern regarding the advancement of the draft MRLs for melengestrol acetate for adoption by the Commission, and indicated that they maintained the view that safety concerns could be envisaged especially for susceptible population groups. This latter view was supported by some delegations. Other delegations supported the JECFA re-evaluation.

53. After some discussion the Committee agreed to advance the draft MRLs for melengestrol acetate in cattle tissues to the 32nd Session of the Commission for adoption at Step 8.

54. The European Community, China, Norway and Switzerland expressed their opposition to this decision.

PROPOSED DRAFT MRLs FOR VETERINARY DRUGS (AT STEP 3) (Agenda Item 5b)¹²

General comments and decisions

55. The European Community drew the attention of the Committee to the fact that there was a need for more appropriate scheduling of JECFA and CCRVDF meetings in order to allow sufficient time for consideration of JECFA report.

56. It was noted that some compounds in the report from JECFA (*see* CX/RVDF 09/18/5) indicated uses as antimicrobial agents and production aids, therefore in order to ensure consistency in denomination of these compounds, the Committee agreed to maintain only reference to the use as antimicrobial agents.

Avilamycin

57. The Committee noted JECFA Secretariat's clarification that an ADI for avilamycin had been established; that the substance was poorly absorbed and extensively metabolized; that validated routine analytical method for determination of the marker residue in edible tissues was available. The Committee agreed to advance all proposed draft MRLs for adoption at Steps 5/8.

Dexamethasone

58. The Committee noted the JECFA Secretariat clarification that validated analytical methods for monitoring of residues had been submitted to JECFA for assessment and that this compound was rapidly eliminated from milk and muscle and that therefore probability of exposure to residues from these tissues was very low. The Committee also noted that adverse human health effects could only be observed from therapeutic uses but not at residue levels found in food, and therefore agreed to advance all proposed draft MRLs for adoption at Steps 5/8.

⁹ CCRVDF/18 INF/01

¹⁰ ALINORM 08/31/31 Appendix IV; CRD6 (Comments of European Community, Kenya and IFAH)

¹¹ ALINORM 08/31/31 para. 43

¹² CX/RVDF 09/18/5; CX/RVDF 09/18/5 Corrigendum; CX/RVDF 09/18/5 Add.1 (Comments of Iran, Philippines, United States of America, Uruguay and IFAH); CX/RVDF 09/18/5 Add.2 (Comments of European Community)

Monensin

59. The European Community indicated that due to the late availability of the JECFA report it did not have sufficient time to assess the MRLs recommended for sheep and goats and proposed to advance these MRLs for adoption at Step 5 only in order to allow more time for their consideration.

60. The United States informed the Committee that it had available new data for cattle liver and proposed to retain all MRLs for cattle at Step 4 until a re-evaluation of JECFA would be carried out.

61. Other delegations were of the view that there was no need to delay the adoption of the MRLs and pointed out that the revision of these MRLs could be done at a later stage after these new data had been evaluated by JECFA.

62. The Committee noted that this compound has been in use for many years and, after some discussion, agreed to advance all MRLs for adoption at Steps 5/8.

63. The European Community expressed their reservation to the advancement of the MRLs for sheep and goats to Steps 5/8 because they would require more time to consider the report.

Narasin

64. The Committee noted that narasin was evaluated by JECFA for the first time. Since no regulatory analytical method had been submitted for residues in cattle, including performance characteristics and validation data, JECFA proposed temporary MRLs in cattle tissues.

65. The European Community indicated that they needed more time to consider the MRLs recommended for cattle and pigs, and proposed advancement of these MRLs only to Step 5.

66. After some discussion the Committee agreed to advance the proposed MRLs for pigs and the temporary MRLs for cattle for adoption at Step 5 and the MRLs for chicken for adoption at Steps 5/8.

Tilmicosin

67. The Committee noted that an ADI had previously been established by JECFA at its 47th meeting, and that Codex MRLs had been established for cattle, pigs and sheep and a temporary MRL for sheep milk.

68. The FAO JECFA Secretary explained that there was insufficient information available to recommend MRLs for sheep milk, eggs and rabbit tissues. In addition, the assessment of the data on sheep milk showed that long withdrawal time of approximately 15 days might be required. Hence JECFA recommended MRLs only for chicken and turkey tissues.

69. The European Community indicated that according to their method of exposure assessment (i.e. TMDI) using their ADI, which is lower than the JECFA ADI, would be exceeded by 313%, and that therefore the proposed MRLs should not be advanced in the Step procedure.

70. The European Community considered that antimicrobial effects on human gut microflora were more appropriate for establishment of the ADI than toxicological endpoints. The WHO JECFA Secretary clarified that JECFA had considered effects on the human gut microflora and noted that in the most relevant study at the highest dose tested no effects were observed and questioned if the EC evaluation was based on additional studies. She emphasized, that based on the data available to JECFA, the toxicological ADI was the most relevant one and expressed the view that the European Community should submit new data for evaluation, if available.

71. Some delegations drew the attention of the Committee to the fact that the current Codex process should be followed and were of the view that the proposed MRLs should be advanced for adoption by the Commission.

72. After some discussion, the Committee agreed to advance the proposed draft MRLs for adoption at Step 5 with the understanding that, if no new data would be submitted by the European Community to support JECFA re-evaluation, these MRLs would be advanced for adoption at Step 8 at its next Session. The European Community and Norway expressed their opposition to this decision. The Committee also agreed to request the 32nd Session of the Commission to withdraw the temporary MRL for tilmicosin in sheep milk.

Triclabendazole

73. The FAO JECFA Secretary indicated that evaluation of this compound was well detailed in the JECFA monograph and explained that the evaluation of the residue studies, relating to cattle and sheep, conducted at the 70th meeting of JECFA, had revealed quite different tissue residue distribution patterns and therefore significantly different MRLs for these species had been recommended. Given the fact that only very limited data were available for the species goat, and that extrapolation of MRLs from cattle or sheep to goats was not possible due to different residue patterns in cattle and sheep, the MRLs for goats recommended at the 66th meeting of JECFA had been withdrawn.

74. The Committee agreed to advance proposed draft MRLs for adoption at Steps 5/8. The Committee also agreed to discontinue the work on the MRLs for goat tissues.

75. Some delegations drew the attention of the Committee to the fact that goats constituted a significant part of the diet, especially in some regions, and therefore proposed that further work on residue studies leading to the recommendations for MRLs for goats be carried out.

76. The FAO JECFA Secretary indicated that further generation of data on residues in goats was necessary and proposed to discuss possible solutions to generate data for submission to JECFA with interested members.

Tylosin

77. The Committee noted that ADI had been established and that MRLs were proposed by the 70th JECFA meeting for cattle, pigs and chicken.

78. The European Community indicated that it needed more time to consider the MRLs for cattle milk and eggs and was not in favour of advancing these MRLs for final adoption.

79. After a short discussion, the Committee agreed to advance all proposed draft MRLs to the 32nd Session of the Commission for adoption at Steps 5/8. The European Community expressed their reservation to the decision to advance for adoption the proposed draft MRL for cattle milk and eggs.

Status of the Draft and Proposed Draft Maximum Residue Limits for Veterinary Drugs

80. Draft and proposed draft MRLs to be forwarded to the 32nd Session of the Commission for adoption at Step 8 and Step 5/8 with the recommendation to omit Steps 6 and 7 are attached as Appendices II and III, respectively. Proposed draft MRLs advanced to Step 5 are attached as Appendix IV.

DRAFT GUIDELINES FOR THE DESIGN AND IMPLEMENTATION OF NATIONAL REGULATORY FOOD SAFETY ASSURANCE PROGRAMMES ASSOCIATED WITH THE USE OF VETERINARY DRUGS IN FOOD PRODUCING ANIMALS (Agenda Item 6)¹³

81. The Committee recalled that its 17th Session had made substantial improvements in the document which resulted in a comprehensive text, highlighting the food chain and based on risk approaches and the shifting of responsibilities to ensure food safety onto producers.¹⁴

82. The Committee agreed to base its discussion on a proposed text prepared by the Chairperson, as presented in CRD5, which took into consideration written comments presented in CX/RVDF 09/18/6 and CX/RVDF 09/18/6 Add.1. The Committee further noted that comments of Uruguay in CX/RVDF 09/18/6 were erroneously attributed to Paraguay.

Specific Comments

83. The Committee considered the document in detail and, in addition to editorial changes, made the following changes and observations:

¹³ ALINORM 08/31/31 App. VI; CL 2007/37-RVDF; CX/RVDF 09/18/6 (Comments of Argentina, Egypt, Iran, Uruguay and United States of America); CX/RVDF 09/18/6 Add.1 (Comments of European Community, Kenya, Philippines and Thailand); CRD5 (Proposed revised document by the Chairperson); CRD7 (Comments of Costa Rica); CRD12 (Comments of New Zealand)

¹⁴ ALINORM 08/31/31 paras 74-75

Introduction and Principle

84. The Committee did not support the inclusion of a new principle (ix) on the need to provide consumers with information and education because it was not specifically addressed by the Guidelines. However, the Committee recognised the value of consumers' education and information and added a sentence in paragraph 2 to this purpose.

Definitions

85. The Committee agreed to remove the definition of "Maximum Residue Limit for Veterinary Drugs (MRLVD or MRL)" because it was already included in the Codex Procedural Manual and thus applied horizontally to all Codex texts. It also deleted the text of the definitions of "Risk profile" and of "Withdrawal time/ Withholding time", which were included in the Codex Procedural Manual and the *Glossary of Terms and Definitions for Veterinary Drugs Residues in Foods* (CAC/MISC 5-1993), respectively. The texts of these two terms relevant to the Guidelines were retained.

Regulatory Framework

86. The title of the sub-heading "Approval" was modified to "Approval by Competent Authority" for clarity.

87. In paragraph 28, bullet (b), the Committee added "and route of administration" for completeness; the proposed modification in bullet (c) was not retained because veterinary drugs could be used for other indications than therapeutic use.

88. In paragraph 32, "Competent Authority" was added for clarity.

89. The Committee amended the fourth sentence of paragraph 37 to clarify that off-label use of veterinary drugs should only be permitted in accordance with direct and written advice from a veterinarian, in accordance with national authorities' laws and regulations.

Verification programmes

90. In paragraph 49, "should" was changed with "may" because not all of the listed issues under bullets (a)–(f) might be in place in countries or apply for all drugs. The inclusion of "processing" in bullet (b) was deleted because it was not relevant to pre-harvest.

Choice of verification programme

91. In paragraph 63, the Committee amended bullet (a) to read "examination of relevant control points of the regulatory control system" for clarity.

92. The Committee did not support the revision of paragraph 65, which altered the purpose of the sentence, and reinserted the original paragraph.

Sample taking

93. In paragraph 77, the end of the first sentence was further amended to clarify that "care should be taken to identify those sub-units clearly".

94. The Committee reinserted the sentence deleted in paragraph 82, which helped to add clarity to the paragraph. The Committee further deleted sub-bullet (a) in paragraph 89 and included sub-bullet (b) as an additional sentence in paragraph 88.

Statistical consideration

95. The Committee deleted paragraph 94 because it was confusing and leading to possible misinterpretation. The concept of the paragraph was included as two additional sentences at the end of paragraph 95 (renumbered #94). The Committee also amended the first sentence of paragraph 95 (renumbered #94) to make more explicit that the frequency of non biased sampling and release programmes was determined by the importing country on the basis of the exporting country's record of compliance.

96. The Committee did not support the revision of paragraph 101 (renumbered #100), which altered the meaning of the sentence, and reinserted the original text. In paragraph 102 (renumbered #101), the Committee added "product tracing" to "traceability" for consistency with the Codex definition.

97. In paragraph 107 (renumbered #106), the Committee added "possible" to "source".

Regulatory action

98. The first sentence of the revised paragraph 114 (renumbered #113) was further amended to read “Laboratories should report all suspect positive samples which they have not been able to positively confirm using established confirmation criteria” for clarity.

99. In paragraph 121(renumbered #120) “non-compliant” was changed to “unsafe” for clarity. The last sentence of paragraph 123 (renumbered #122) was deleted because it was not clear and redundant.

100. In paragraph 130 (renumbered #129), the Committee clarified that appropriate measures to prevent repetition of failure should be applied at the relevant control point.

Appendix B – Sampling of commodities

Sampling Procedure

101. The Committee added a new bullet (h) under paragraph 152 (renumbered #5 of Appendix B), which provided instruction for collection of primary samples where a portion of single unit was less than that described as a primary sample.

Instruction for collection of minimum quantity required for different commodities

102. The Committee agreed to revise the heading of the tables to read “Guidance on sample type and quantity for different commodities” in order to allow for more flexibility. Paragraph 152 (renumbered #5 of Appendix B) was amended for consistency with this decision.

103. The Committee recognised that sampling plans for aquatic animal products and derived edible products of aquatic origin were an area which required a comprehensive debate not only for the CCRVDF but, possibly for other relevant Codex Committees. In view to have sampling plans for these products widely acceptable, it was agreed to remove these products from Table B. The Committee further agreed to establish an electronic working group, led by the United States of America, open to all interested members and observers and working in English only, to prepare a revised table for these products, including minimum quantity required for laboratory sample and instruction for collection, for future inclusion in the Guidelines.

104. The United States of America offered to present a short workshop on sampling of commodities in accordance with Appendix B, at the 19th Session of the CCRVDF.

Method development and validation considerations for residue control methods

105. The Committee revised the third sentence of paragraph 235 (renumbered #194) to clarify that a minimum number of three datasets should be generated over three analysis periods, on at least three separate occasions.

Status of the draft Guidelines for the Design and Implementation of National Regulatory Food Safety Assurance Programmes Associated with the Use of Veterinary Drugs in Food Producing Animals

106. The Committee agreed to forward the draft Guidelines to the 32nd Session of the Commission for adoption at Step 8 (*see* Appendix V) and requested the Commission to revoke the following texts: *Guidelines for the Establishment of a Regulatory Programme for Control of Veterinary Drug Residues in Foods* (CAC/GL 16-1993) and *Code of Practice for Control of the Use of Veterinary Drugs* (CAC/RCP 38-1993) as superseded.

DISCUSSION PAPER ON CONSIDERATION OF METHODS OF ANALYSIS AND SAMPLING IN CCRVDF (REPORT OF THE ELECTRONIC WORKING GROUP ON METHODS OF ANALYSIS AND SAMPLING) (Agenda Item 7)¹⁵

107. The United Kingdom, speaking as the co-Chairperson of the electronic working group on methods of analysis and sampling, introduced the report of the electronic working group as presented in CX/RVDF 09/18/7.

¹⁵ CX/RVDF 09/18/7; CX/RVDF 09/18/7 Add.1 (Comments of Argentina, Egypt, European Community, Iran, Kenya, United States of America and Uruguay)

108. The Committee discussed recommendations proposed by the electronic group and made the following observations and conclusions.

Recommendation (a)

109. As regards recommendation (a) to have the electronic working group to evaluate analytical methods provided to JECFA according to established performance criteria and that analytical methods should be made available to residue testing laboratories, the Committee noted the decision that JECFA should be responsible for reviewing methods for compounds on its agendas from 1998 to the present.

110. Some delegations noted that many methods submitted together with the dossier for JECFA evaluation were proprietary protected, therefore they were not easily available for developing countries and were of the view that other validated methods should be used or made available.

111. The United Kingdom indicated that the Committee had previously agreed that it should be aware of appropriate determination methods in order to advance MRLs for final adoption and should be able to accept methods reviewed by JECFA. The delegation pointed out that the major problem was the lack of methods in countries when products were imported and the substances used in the exporting country might not have been registered for use in the importing country. It also indicated that during registration process, usually, a suitable method of determination was provided to competent authorities. The delegation was of the view that a small group of experts on methods of analysis and sampling should verify only that the proposed methods meet established performance criteria for single laboratory validation.

112. Some countries indicated that methods should be analysed not only for performance characteristics but also in terms of economic feasibility (e.g., fit for purpose) and that the list of methods should be compiled even if they were not fully validated and suggested that such a list could be maintained by IAEA, as was the case for the Codex Committee on Pesticide Residues (CCPR).

113. Some delegations were of the view that further efforts should not be made regarding on the compilation of a specific list of methods and that any method could be used if it complies with performance criteria.

114. To the proposal that JECFA should help countries to make suitable methods for the determination of MRLs available to countries and to help in their validation, the FAO JECFA Secretary explained that JECFA was an independent scientific peer review body and did not perform validation of analytical methods. She further noted that JECFA, as part of the assessment of veterinary drugs, evaluates the analytical methods as well as the performance criteria for methods proposed for detection of residues in animal tissues and other edible products, in order to confirm that a validated analytical method is available and suitable to determine the substance at the level of the recommended MRLs. The Secretary pointed out that information and assessment of the analytical methods were detailed in the JECFA residue monographs published after each JECFA meeting.

115. The Committee noted that JECFA had the appropriate expertise and considered analytical methods for residues when substances were evaluated for setting ADI/MRLs, therefore further evaluation of analytical methods by the CCRVDF was not required for adoption of MRLs.

116. It was proposed to publish a list of countries in which veterinary drugs were authorized with the understanding that other countries that needed methods for these drugs could contact them directly in order to obtain required methods.

117. Some countries did not support this recommendation as usually countries did not own methods and often relied on private accredited laboratories.

118. The Committee noted that there was no agreement on this recommendation and agreed that this matter should be a subject for further consideration. It agreed to establish an electronic working group, led by the United Kingdom with assistance of Canada, open to all interested members and observers and working in English only, to prepare a discussion paper containing proposals on how this issue should be addressed for consideration by the 19th Session of the CCRVDF.

Recommendation (b)

119. The Committee endorsed the proposed recommendation that for the purpose of trade, any analytical method may be used provided it can meet the performance criteria set out in the draft Guidelines for the Design and Implementation of National Regulatory Food Safety Assurance Programmes Associated with the Use of Veterinary Drug Producing Animals (*see* Appendix V to this report).

Recommendation (c)

120. The Committee noted that there was strong support for this recommendation as new methods of analysis became available; however there was a very limited guidance on the development of performance characteristics for multi-residue analysis. The Committee therefore agreed that the electronic working group (*see* para. 118) should also prepare proposals on this matter for consideration at its 19th Session.

Recommendations (d) and (e)

121. The Committee noted that the “Compendium of Methods of Analysis as Suitable for Support to Codex MRLS” was available on the Codex website¹⁶, however many methods presented in this Compendium were elaborated a long time ago, were obsolete and were not normally used anymore in practice. The Committee also noted that updating of the compendium would require significant efforts and resources, and therefore agreed to maintain it at the current status without amending or deleting obsolete methods with the understanding that the electronic working group on methods of analysis and sampling (*see* above) could address this problem while making proposals for recommendation (a).

DRAFT PRIORITY LIST OF VETERINARY DRUGS REQUIRING EVALUATION OR RE-EVALUATION BY JECFA AND WORKING DOCUMENT LISTING VETERINARY DRUGS OF POTENTIAL INTEREST (REPORT OF THE ELECTRONIC WORKING GROUP ON PRIORITY LIST OF VETERINARY DRUGS REQUIRING EVALUATION OR RE-EVALUATION) (Agenda Item 8)¹⁷

122. Australia, as the Chair of the electronic working group, introduced the report of the working group and recalled that the 17th CCRVDF had requested the working group to prepare: (i) a Priority list of veterinary drugs requiring evaluation or re-evaluation by JECFA; and (ii) a working document listing veterinary drugs of potential interest, based on Annex 1 to CX/RVDF 07/17/12 “Starting point for a priority list of veterinary drugs for discussion at the 17th CCRVDF”.

123. The Committee endorsed the recommendation of the working group, not to include in the Priority List any compounds that had been initially included by the working group (*see* Annex 1 of CX/RVDF 09/18/8), since no commitment regarding the availability of scientific data had been provided. The Committee agreed that, in accordance with the “*Risk Analysis Principles Applied by the CCRVDF*”¹⁸ certain criteria needed to be satisfied to place a substance on the Priority List, including the commitment that a dossier would be made available.

124. In this regard, the Committee noted the difficulties, in particular of developing countries, to provide adequate scientific data and have commitment from a sponsor to make available relevant dossiers. It was clarified that for the inclusion of a substance in the Priority List it was only necessary to provide information on the availability of sufficient scientific data and the commitment that a dossier would be made available to the JECFA Secretariat in response to a call for data for a specified meeting. It was therefore necessary for a country to communicate with the sponsor and to obtain the necessary commitment before requesting inclusion of a substance in the priority list.

125. The Committee endorsed the recommendation that only single compounds would be nominated for evaluation in the future.

¹⁶ http://www.codexalimentarius.net/mrls/vetdrugs/vetd_ref/MAS-RVDF_2006_e.pdf

¹⁷ CX/RVDF 09/18/8; CX/RVDF 09/18/8 Add.1 (Comments of Argentina, Egypt, Iran, United States of America and IFAH); CX/RVDF 09/18/8 Add.2 (Comments of Australia, European Community and JECFA); CRD8 (Comments of Thailand); CRD11 (Comments of Guatemala)

¹⁸ Procedural Manual of the Codex Alimentarius Commission

126. The Committee considered compounds to be included in the Priority List and agreed to the proposals of Australia and the United States of America to include monepantel (ADI and MRLs in sheep tissues) and monesin (MRLs in cattle liver), respectively.

127. The Committee also discussed a proposal of the United States of America, presented in CX/RVDF 09/18/8 Add.1, that substances could be considered for the establishment of an ADI by JECFA and MRLs by Codex in advance of, or coincident with, any approval/registration by a national authority. The delegation was of the view that the proposed process would avoid or minimise a substantial number of trade issues and would help to harmonise MRLs. The delegation proposed to test this procedure by including derquantel in the Priority List. The Committee was also informed that a similar proposal had been presented by the United States of America in the Codex Committee on Pesticide Residues (CCPR), however agreement was not reached in the CCPR to pilot test their proposal.

128. Several delegations suggested that the proposal could be useful as it could contribute to accelerate the CCRVDF process for MRL establishment. One delegation suggested considering this proposal within the more general discussion on current problems and solutions for the CCRVDF (*see* Agenda Item 10). Another delegation stressed that such an approach could only work if a strong collaboration between national authorities and JECFA take place.

129. The JECFA Secretariat supported the proposal and noted the need for a pilot project. She explained that when a compound is registered and the use patterns have been defined, JECFA may complete the MRL derivation process. If a compound is not yet registered there needs to be a clear description of intended uses; and if they change after the JECFA evaluation this may impact the MRL. In order to evaluate the impact of such a change in procedure a pilot project should be considered.

130. Another delegation observed that derquantel was a very important compound as an anthelmintic in sheep and that a rapid process for the establishment of Codex MRLs would, among other benefits, contribute to minimise potential trade problems.

131. Although there was not adequate support to start the pilot process, the Committee agreed to include derquantel in the Priority List. It recognised that the nomination of derquantel was justified, recognising that the compound would likely to be registered by the time it would have been evaluated by JECFA.

132. It was suggested that the process for derquantel, including the JECFA evaluation leading to the establishment of Codex MRLs, be assessed in terms of efficiency.

133. China, referring to their written comments, requested the inclusion of ractopamine in the priority list for residue evaluation in pigs. The Committee recalled its discussion under Agenda Item 2 regarding the availability of new scientific data which would justify a re-evaluation by JECFA (*see* para. 21).

134. Some delegations did not support the inclusion of ractopamine in the Priority List, recalling the discussion under Agenda Item 2; while some others supported its inclusion.

135. The JECFA Secretariat indicated that the residue data in pigs presented by China could be assessed by JECFA. She clarified that the residue data for the normal target tissues could be evaluated; however an evaluation for the additional tissues could not be completed since no information on international or regional dietary consumption of such tissues is currently available. This question could be addressed in the context of an expert consultation to address several aspects of exposure assessment (e.g. model diet) (*see* para. 150). Furthermore, the residues analysed in the study included not only the marker residue (ractopamine) used in the recommendation of the MRLs but also ractopamine metabolites and the data would be considered in this context.

136. After some discussion, the Committee agreed to include ractopamine in the Priority List for review of residue depletion data in pigs.

137. The United States of America stated that the inclusion by the CCRVDF of the residue study from China in the Priority List should not have any bearing on the adoption of the current MRLs for ractopamine, held at Step 8 by the Commission.

138. The Committee agreed to forward the Priority List of Veterinary Drugs for Evaluation or Re-evaluation by JECFA to the 32nd Session of the Commission, as attached in Appendix VI. The Committee noted that the Priority List, as presented in Appendix VI, did not include a sufficient number of compounds for the JECFA Secretariat to plan a JECFA meeting for evaluation of veterinary drug residues.

139. The Committee agreed to request the Codex Secretariat to prepare a Circular Letter requesting members and observers to provide comments and information on the priority list of veterinary drugs requiring evaluation or re-evaluation by JECFA.

140. The Committee agreed to establish an electronic working group, led by Australia and open to all interested members and observers and working in English only, to prepare, based on the replies to the Circular Letter (*see* para. 139), a proposal for a priority list of veterinary drugs requiring evaluation or re-evaluation by JECFA with a view to reaching a decision on the safety of residues in food by developing maximum residue limits (MRLs); or informing risk managers on the safety of residues in food if it is likely that an ADI or MRL cannot be set. The Committee agreed that the report of the electronic working group should be made available in a timely manner in order to allow consideration and comments by all members and observers.

141. The Committee also agreed to establish a physical working group, which would meet immediately before its next session, under the chairmanship of Australia, to consider the report of the electronic working group and comments submitted in order to facilitate the discussion in the Plenary.

Starting Point for a Priority List of Veterinary Drugs

142. The Committee noted the offer of the United States of America to assist developing countries in the submission of substances for inclusion in the Priority List in order that these nominations satisfy certain criteria in accordance with the “*Risk Analysis Principles Applied by the CCRVDF*”; and in particular, to assist developing countries in identifying data gaps and facilitating commitment by a sponsor to the provision of dossiers. It was agreed that the Circular Letter on the priority list of veterinary drugs requiring evaluation or re-evaluation by JECFA (*see* para. 139) would also request developing countries to indicate those priority compounds for which this assistance would be required and provide other relevant information. In view of this development, the Committee noted that at this time no further work was necessary on those compounds listed in the “Starting Point for a Priority List of Veterinary Drugs” for which not enough information was available.

DISCUSSION PAPER ON CURRENT PRACTICES AND NEEDS FOR FURTHER WORK BY THE COMMITTEE (REPORT OF THE ELECTRONIC WORKING GROUP ON RISK MANAGEMENT TOPICS AND OPTIONS) (Agenda Item 9)¹⁹

143. The Committee recalled that under this Agenda Item it would also consider the proposal for new work that was referred back by the 31st Session of the Commission (*see* para. 8).

In-session working group on Risk Management Topics and Options

144. France, as the Chair of the in-session working group, briefly introduced the report and the relevant recommendations of the working group, as contained in CRD13.

Improving communication between JECFA and the Committee on general subjects

145. The Committee endorsed the recommendations to request that: (i) the JECFA Secretariat post on the JECFA websites a list of general topics that the JECFA meeting would discuss as early as possible in order to allow for timely inputs from interested members and observers; and (ii) when JECFA starts implementing a change in its assessment process, allow the following session of the CCRVDF to review the impact on the recommended MRLs, by providing a comparison between values obtained through the old and the new methodology.

Acceptability of the Estimated Daily Intake (EDI) approach

146. The Committee agreed with the assessment of the in-session working group that the EDI approach was an improvement relative to the current methodology for the evaluation of the risk from chronic exposure only and could be successfully used if adequate data packages were made available; however the EDI approach did not cover the risk arising from acute and sub-acute exposure.

¹⁹ CX/RVDF 09/18/9 (Part 1 and 2); CX/RVDF 09/18/9 Add.1 (Comments of Argentina, Canada, Kenya, Iran and IFAH); CRD9 (Comments of Thailand); CRD10 (Comments of European Community); CRD13 (Report of the in-session Working Group on Risk Management Options and Topics for the CCRVDF)

147. The Committee supported further work on acute and sub-acute exposure assessment, which would be addressed in the future during the development of the “decision-tree” paper.

Use of the Estimated Daily Intake (EDI) (Topic A); Utilization of full ADI (Topic B); Use of Regional Consumption Factors (Topic E); additional comments of the United States of America

148. The Committee endorsed the recommendation that the CCRVDF review all the factors taken into account in connection with establishing the ADI and the current process of recommending MRLs. It agreed to establish an electronic working group, led by France, open to all interested members and observers and working in English only. The working group will collect comments from members and observers and prepare a discussion paper for further discussion at its 19th Session. It was noted that active and constructive participation of interested members and observers was critical for the consideration of this topic.

149. The Committee agreed to establish a physical working group, which would meet immediately before its next session, under the chairmanship of France, to consider the report of the electronic working group and comments submitted in order to facilitate the discussion in the Plenary.

Enlargement of the current “food basket” (Topic E)

150. The Committee recalled that it had requested the in-session working group to discuss this topic during consideration of Agenda Item 2 (*see* para. 22). To facilitate its decision, the Committee endorsed the recommendation to request FAO/WHO to convene an Expert consultation on dietary exposure assessment as it relates to veterinary drug residues in food. It agreed that the Expert consultation could address the following aspects:

- Review of the current model diet (market-basket) approach applied by JECFA;
- Possible simplification of the current food basket tool;
- Possibility to develop several model diets to reflect regional differences in consumption pattern; and
- Develop approaches for acute and sub-chronic dietary exposure assessment.

151. The JECFA Secretariat noted to the Committee the need for necessary funding support for holding the Expert consultation.

Starter cultures (Topic C)

152. Some delegations were of the view that MRLs should only be based on food safety and not on effects on starter cultures and recalled the discussion held at the 16th CCRVDF on this subject (*see* ALINORM 06/29/31 paras 55-60). The JECFA Secretariat clarified how JECFA currently considers inhibition of activity on starter cultures and, based on these effects, might recommend lower MRLs to avoid possible problems regarding dairy processing. The Committee noted that it would no longer need to require such consideration in the future as it endorsed the recommendation on a CCRVDF policy that “*When establishing a MRL for a veterinary drug, the residues of which JECFA has evaluated for their effect on starter cultures and has recommended a MRL for milk, on only the basis of food safety consideration, the Committee shall append a risk management statement informing Codex Members that they may therefore adapt national/regional MRLs in order to address this technological aspect for trade of fresh liquid milk intended for processing using starter culture*”.

Appending risk management recommendations to MRLs (Topic D)

153. The Committee noted that the recommendation in paragraph 36 of CX/RVDF 09/18/9 Part 1, should not be assumed to be the regular practice for the CCRVDF. Therefore after some discussion, the Committee agreed to add clarification at the end of this recommendation that it should only be used on an exceptional case and based on scientific information. and endorsed the following recommendation: “*The Committee will append risk management recommendations to MRLs, as footnotes, (i) on a case by case basis, where appropriate; (ii) in order to assist risk managers in formulating adequate risk management provisions; (iii) as a means of providing guidance on Good Veterinary Practice (possibly including, but not limited to, duration and frequency of administration, extra/off label use, restricting the marketing of certain veterinary drugs with respect to e.g. species, production group, route of administration, pharmaceutical form, withdrawal period ...) or food technological aspects; (iv) on exceptional case and based on science*”.

Old drug policy (Topic F)

154. The Committee noted that JECFA had addressed this matter in the past and that it would be further considered in the development of the “decision tree” paper, and therefore it agreed to discontinue consideration of this topic until JECFA finishes its deliberations.

Threshold of toxicological concern for veterinary drugs (Topic G)

155. The Committee noted the clarification by the JECFA Secretariat that this subject was covered by the scope of ongoing work on the “decision tree” paper and agreed to monitor the progress of this work by JECFA.

Residues at injection sites (Topic H)

156. To the request that the Committee continue the work on this issue, the Committee noted that this matter had been discussed intensively for some time in the Committee, however the work had been discontinued as it was not possible to reach agreement on this issue. The Committee therefore confirmed that no more work on residues at injection sites was appropriate.

Harmonization of withdrawal period's calculation (Topic I)

157. The Committee noted that harmonization of withdrawal period calculations was important for countries; however it would need significant resources. The Committee also noted that some members had their own national guidance on this matter publicly available at websites and agreed that there will be no more work on this matter for the time being.

Risk Management Recommendations/Guidance for Veterinary Drugs for Which no ADI and MRL has been Recommended by JECFA due to Specific Human Health Concerns or Lack of Information Needed to Resolve Existing Human Health Concerns

158. The Committee recalled that the 17th CCRVDF had forwarded a project document on Risk Management Recommendation for Veterinary Drugs without ADI and/or MRLs to the Commission for approval as new work for the Committee; and that the 31st Session of the Commission noted a proposal to revise the project document to broaden the scope of new work on risk management decisions to also include substances for which no ADI/MRL were set because the information needed to evaluate human health concerns was lacking. In view of the substantial change in the scope of the proposal, the Commission decided to return the new work proposed back to the CCRVDF for further consideration.

159. Some delegations expressed their concern that the revised project document, as attached in Annex 1 of CX/RVDF 09/18/2, contained significant changes to the scope of the proposed new work that made the proposed new work more problematic as it was not clear enough on the final context of the work to be completed. Delegations proposed to revise the project document with the understanding that the revised document would be considered by the next Session of the Committee.

160. The JECFA Secretariat drew the attention of the Committee to the fact that the Committee had not yet taken action on a number of substances for which JECFA had completed its evaluation and had identified a clear human health concern and urged the Committee to start elaborating risk management options for these substances in order to protect the health of consumers. This view was supported by some delegations.

161. Some delegations proposed several amendments to the project document, however other delegations noted that, due to time constraints, it would be a very difficult to have an open and thorough discussion at this Session, noting that the subject was very controversial among delegations.

162. Some delegations urged the Committee to take urgent actions on substances such as malachite green and chloramphenicol, as these compounds are not authorised for the use for food producing animals in many countries. Other delegations pointed out that such actions should be extended to other compounds such as carbadox and olaquinox for which JECFA also identified clear health concerns.

163. After some discussion the Committee agreed to state that malachite green and chloramphenicol should not be used for food producing animals.

164. Some delegations were of the view that making such generalized statements for these substances might not fit with their national legal framework and have impact on risk management options available to their governments.

165. In order to make progress on this matter, the Committee agreed to establish an electronic working group, led by the United States of America and open to all interested members and observers and working in English only, which would:

- Define the scope for the new work addressing risk management recommendations for veterinary drugs for which no ADI and MRL has been recommended by JECFA due to specific human health concerns or lack of information needed to resolve existing human health concerns;
- Develop a process by which the Committee will promulgate risk management recommendations;
- Make proposals on how to address the remaining veterinary drugs for which JECFA clearly identified human health concerns listed in Annex II of CX/RVDF 09/18/8 ; and
- Propose procedures for conveying these risk management recommendations in the Codex standard setting process.

166. The Committee agreed that these proposals would be considered at its 19th Session.

167. In view of this decision, the Committee noted that at this time no additional work was necessary on the “Starting Point for a Priority List of Veterinary Drugs”.

OTHER BUSINESS AND FUTURE WORK (Agenda Item 10)

CCRVDF current problems and solutions

168. The Committee had an open and informal discussion on problems that the CCRVDF was currently facing and possible solutions to these problems. The Chairperson provided a summary of some of points raised by delegations, which is provided below.

A. Outreach to Other Countries, Especially Developing Countries

169. National requirements usually dictate that MRLs be established within each country. Many developing countries rely on MRLs established by Codex. Some countries often make note that they cannot provide the data that are necessary for JECFA evaluations to provide MRLs that are relevant to their needs. This situation often results in important domestic public health concerns and trade problems not being addressed.

170. Some countries may benefit from programmes to improve technical skills, help identify national or regional needs, and provide other important assistance. Mentoring relationships or country partnerships with better communication might permit enhanced understanding of the JECFA process and data requirements, as well as processes of other countries. The CCRVDF should consider undertaking surveys to determine the unique or specific needs of some countries and then to develop strategic plans to address those needs. The CCRVDF should encourage more participation in its activities, especially from developing countries because an understanding of the specific circumstances (e.g., local consumption patterns) in some countries is critical to accomplishing Codex and CCRVDF goals.

171. The special needs of developing countries in the area of analytical methods must be carefully considered.

172. Countries should list their MRL priority needs essential to ensure public health's protection and provide that information to the CCRVDF. Sponsors should provide data to JECFA to support the development of the MRLs needed by developing countries. Codex should consider expanding its Trust Fund to permit more participation from developing countries.

B. Possible Revisions Requiring Further Discussion of CCRVDF Risk Management Policies and Procedures and JECFA Risk Assessment Policies

Policies:

173. Codex MRLs are generally viewed by the world as food safety standards, and JECFA when recommending MRLs also considers good veterinary practice. Some believe that many of these JECFA MRLs are disproportionately conservative and do not reflect an appropriate safety standard for international trade.

174. The CCRVDF should consider having JECFA implement an approach to recommend MRLs where there is a “one tissue/one milk/one egg” assumption and where MRLs are derived directly from the ADI. Some of the benefits of this approach include, for example: improvement of compliance and reduction of trade problems, lessening of the need for extremely sensitive analytical methods, making the JECFA MRL process more predictable, reducing the number of MRLs that may be needed, making unnecessary the need to redefine the “food basket” to accommodate additional tissues, and making unnecessary the need to use the EDI concept because a return to the TMDI approach would be possible.

175. However, the understanding that MRLs should be more representative of safety standards needs to be balanced against the generally accepted principle that all chemicals used in food production should be utilized at the lowest levels necessary to achieve their intended purpose.

176. The CCRVDF needs to address the causes and consequences that can result from having different approaches in establishing MRLs among national regulatory authorities and JECFA. CCRVDF needs to consider establishing and recommending a standardized approach to setting MRLs. The CCRVDF should consider bringing into the Committee more MRLs for veterinary drugs that have been approved at the national level in other countries. The CCRVDF also needs to consider developing guidance on veterinary drugs that should not be used in food-producing animals.

Procedures:

177. Despite some progress in recent years, the CCRVDF process is still viewed by some as too slow and burdensome. The CCRVDF needs to consider “streamlining” the 8 Step Codex process in the development of Codex MRLs by considering modern communication tools/media and by recommending changes to the Codex Procedural Manual where appropriate to permit more flexibility and efficiency. The CCRVDF should examine closely the procedures of the CCPR, for example, that might improve efficiency within the CCRVDF. The CCRVDF should make it a practice to use more electronic working groups to permit greater participation by countries, including holding more electronic intersession working groups. The CCRVDF should consider permitting more flexibility in Codex procedures to allow dossier submissions for review by JECFA coincident with first national approval. In addition, the CCRVDF should improve the timing of JECFA and CCRVDF meetings to permit countries/regions adequate time to review JECFA assessments prior to the CCRVDF sessions.

178. In making any revisions to its risk management policies and procedures or to JECFA’s risk assessment policies, the CCRVDF should consider that Codex is a rules-based organization, and that Codex standards have special status within the WTO Sanitary and Phytosanitary (SPS) Measures Agreement, and that transparency is essential.

179. The Committee expressed appreciation for this new approach to look at the work of the CCRVDF. It noted that several problems mentioned in the discussion were currently being addressed by the Committee. It was suggested that electronic working groups, including those established at the present sessions, might look at this discussion and take note of the issues, if appropriate, that they are currently addressing. Remaining issues might be considered at the 19th Session of the CCRVDF.

DATE AND PLACE OF NEXT SESSION (Agenda Item 11)

180. The Committee was informed that its 19th Session would be held in tentatively two years time, subject to further discussion between the Codex and United States Secretariats.

SUMMARY STATUS OF WORK

SUBJECT MATTER	STEP	ACTION BY:	DOCUMENT REFERENCE (ALINORM 09/32/31)
Draft Maximum Residue Limits for: - melengestrol acetate	8	32 nd CAC	Para. 80 and Appendix II
Draft Guidelines for the design and implementation of national regulatory food safety assurance programmes associated with the use of veterinary drug residues in foods	8	32 nd CAC	Para. 106 and Appendix V
Proposed draft Maximum Residue Limits for: - avilamycin - dexamethasone - monensin - narasin (chicken tissues) - triclabendazole - tylosin	5/8	32 nd CAC	Para. 80 and Appendix III
Proposed draft Maximum Residue Limits for: - narasin (cattle and sheep tissues) - tilmicosin	5	32 nd CAC	Para. 80 and Appendix IV
Priority list of veterinary drugs requiring evaluation of re-evaluation by JECFA		32 nd CAC	Para. 138 and Appendix VI
Proposed draft Maximum Residue Limits for: - triclabendazole (in goat tissues)	discontinued		Para. 74
Discussion paper of veterinary drugs in honey production		electronic working group (United Kingdom)	Para. 29
Sampling plan for residue control for aquatic animal products and derived edible products of aquatic origin		electronic working group (United States of America)	Para. 103
Discussion paper on analytical methods	-	electronic working group (United Kingdom)	Paras 118 and 120
Proposal for a priority list of veterinary drugs requiring evaluation of re-evaluation by JECFA (report of the electronic working group on Priority)	-	electronic working group (Australia)	Para. 140
Discussion paper on factors taken into account in connection with establishing the ADI and the current process of recommending MRLs	-	electronic working group (France)	Para. 148
Report of the electronic working group on risk management recommendations for veterinary drugs with no ADI and MRL		electronic working group (United States of America)	Para. 165

Appendix I

**LIST OF PARTICIPANTS
LISTE DES PARTICIPANTS
LISTA DE PARTICIPANTES**

- Chairperson: **Dr Bernadette DUNHAM**
 Président: Director, Center for Veterinary Medicine
 Presidente: Food and Drug Administration
 U.S. Department of Health and Human Services
 7519 Standish Place, MPN4
 Rockville, MD 20855, United States
 Tel: 240-276-9000
 Fax: 240-276-9001
 Email: Bernadette.Dunham@fda.hhs.gov
- Co -Chairperson: **Dr Ricardo PAMPLONA**
 Co -Président: Head of Biological Products Division
 Co- Presidente: Ministry of Agriculture, Livestock and Food Supply
 Esplanada dos Ministérios
 Bloco D anexo A sala 448
 Brasilia, DF Brazil
 Tel: +55 61 3218 2704
 Fax: +55 61 3218 2874
 Email: Ricardo.pamplona@agricultura.gov.br
- Assistant to Chairperson: **Dr Merton SMITH**
 Assistant au Président: Special Assistant for International Activities
 Assistente al Presidente U.S. Department of Health and Human Services
 Food and Drug Administration
 Center for Veterinary Medicine
 7519 Standish Place, MPN4
 Rockville, MD 20855, United States
 Tel : 240-276-9025
 Fax : 240-276-9030
 Email : Merton.Smith@fda.hhs.gov
- Assistant to Co-Chairperson: **Dr Marcelo MOTA**
 Assistant au Co-Président: Coordinator for International Zoosanitary Matters
 Assistente al Co-Présidente; Ministry of Agriculture, Livestock and Food Supply
 Secretariat of Agribusiness International Relations
 Esplanada dos Ministérios
 Bloco D – Edifício Sede – Sala 349
 Brasília/DF - CEP : 70043-900 Brasil
 Tel :+ 55 61 3218 2968
 Fax : + 55 61 3225 4738
 Email: marcelo.mota@agricultura.gov.br
- Assistant to Co-Chairperson: **Ms Suzana BRESSLAU**
 Assistant au Co-Président: Veterinary Official Inspector
 Assistente al Co-Présidente Ministry of Agriculture, Livestock, and Food Supply
 Esplanada dos Ministérios
 Bloco D Anexo A Sala 443
 Brasilia DF Brazil Zip Code 70043-900
 Tel: + 55-61-3218 2861
 Fax: +55 61 3218 2727
 Email: suzana.bresslau@agricultura.gov.br

AUSTRALIA – AUSTRALIE – AUSTRALIA**Dr Jim DERRICK**

Manager – Animal Product Programs
National Residue Survey
Australian Government
Department of Agriculture, Fisheries and Forestry
GPO Box 858
Canberra ACT 2601, Australia
Tel : +61 2 6272 4019
Fax : +61 2 6272 4023
Email : jim.derrick@daff.gov.au

Dr Peter HOLDSWORTH

Chief Executive Officer
Animal Health Alliance (Australia) Ltd
Locked Bag 916
Canberra ACT 2601, Australia
Tel: +61 2 6257 9022
Fax: +61 2 6257 9055
Email: peter.holdsworth@animalhealthalliance.org.au

Dr Edwin John MURBY

Principal Chemist
National Measurement Institute
PO Box 385
Pymble NSW 2073, Australia
Tel: +61 2 9449 0193
Fax: +61 2 9449 1653
Email: john.murby@measurement.gov.au

Dr Robert MUNRO

Manager, Veterinary Residues
Australian Pesticides and Veterinary Medicines Authority
PO Box 6182
Kingston ACT 2611, Australia
Tel: +61 2 6210 4832
Fax: +61 2 6210 4741
Email: Robert.Munro@apvma.gov.au

Dr Margaret CURTIS

Manager, Global Research and Regulatory
Elanco Animal Health
2001 West Main Street
Greenfield, Indiana 46140 USA
Tel: +1 317 655 2922
Fax: +1 317 277 4167
Email: margcurtis@lilly.com

AUSTRIA – AUTRICHE**Dipl Ing Thomas W. KUHN**

Austrian Agency for Health and Food Safety
Competence Centre Veterinary Drugs and Hormones
Spargelfeldstrasse 191
A-1220 Wien, Austria
Tel: 0043 (0) 50555-32600
Fax: 0043 (0) 50555-32630
Email: thomas.kuhn@ages.at

BELGIUM - BELGIQUE – BÉLGICA**Dr Chantal RETTIGNER**

Veterinary Expert DG Control Policy
Federal Agency for the Safety of the Food Chain
FASFC, DG Control Policy, Direction Animal Health and
Security of Animal Products, CA-Botanique, Food Safety
Center,
Boulevard du Jardin botanique 55, B-1000
Brussels, Belgium
Tel : +32 (0)2 211 85 85
Fax : +32 (0)2 211 86 30
Email : chantal.rettigner@afsca.be

BRAZIL – BRÉSIL – BRASIL**Mr Marcos LEANDRO Jr.**

Veterinary Official Inspector
Ministry of Agriculture, Livestock and Food Supply
Esplanada Dos Ministérios
Bloco D, Anexo A Sala 447 Brasília – DF CEP 70043-900
Tel: +55 61 3218 2611
Fax: +55 61 3218 874 (3218-2874)
Email: marcos.leandro@agricultura.gov.br

Mr Evádio PEREIRA

MAPA
Av. Eng Hilde – Brando de Gois
150, RIBBMA, 4006 9678
Email: evadio.pereira@agricultura.gov.br

Ms Lígia Lindner SCHREINER

Expert on Regulation
National Health Surveillance Agency
SIA Trecho 5, Área Especial 57, Bloco D, 2º. andar
GGALI. Caixa Postal 11617
Brasília -DF, Brazil, CEP 71205-050
Tel: +55 (61)3462-5340
Fax: +55 (61)3462-5315
Email: ligia.schreiner@anvisa.gov.br

Ms Paula Roberta MENDES

Expert on Regulation
National Health Surveillance Agency
SIA Trecho 5, Área Especial 57, Bloco D, 2º. andar
GGALI. Caixa Postal 11617
Brasília -DF, Brazil, CEP 71205-050
Tel: +55 (61)3462-5340
Fax: +55 (61)3462-5315
Email: paula.mendes@anvisa.gov.br

Mr Guilherme MENDES

Veterinary Official Inspector
Ministry of Agriculture, Livestock, and Food Supply
Esplanada dos Ministérios
Bloco D Anexo A Sala 448
Brasília DF Brazil
Tel: + 55-61-3218 2704
Email: guilherme.mendes@agricultura.gov.br

Ms Theomar SILVA

Veterinary Official Inspector
Ministry of Agriculture, Livestock, and Food Supply
Av. Raja Gabaglia, 245
Belo Horizonte-Minas
Gerais, Brazil 30 380 090
Tel: + 55-31 3250 0422
Fax: +55 6131 3250 0414
Email: theomar.silva@agricultura.gov.br

Dr João PALERMO NETO

Professor, University of Sao Paulo
Av. Dr. Orlando Marques de Paiva, No. 85
Zip Code: 05340-000, São Paulo, Brazil
Tel: +5511 30917957
Fax: +5511 30917829
Email: jpalermo@usp.br

Mr Egon SILVA

Veterinary Official Inspector
 Ministry of Agriculture, Livestock, and Food Supply
 Esplanada dos Ministérios
 Bloco D Anexo A Sala 448
 Brasília DF Brazil, Zip Code 70043-900
 Tel: + 55-61-3218 2704
 Fax: 61 3218 2874
 Email: egon.silva@agricultura.gov.br

Mr Adauto RODRIGUES

Veterinary Official Inspector
 Ministry of Agriculture, Livestock, and Food Supply
 Esplanada dos Ministérios
 Bloco D Anexo A Sala 448
 Brasília DF Brazil, Zip Code 70043-900
 Tel: + 55-61-3218 2611
 Fax: +55 61 3218 2727
 Email: adauto.rodrigues@agricultura.gov.br

Mr Leandro FEIJÓ

Veterinary Official Inspector
 Ministry of Agriculture, Livestock, and Food Supply
 Esplanada dos Ministérios
 Bloco D Sala 448 - B
 Brasília DF Brazil, Zip Code 70043 - 900
 Tel: + 55-61-3218 2329
 Fax: +55 61 3226 9799
 Email: leandro.feijo@agricultura.gov.br

Dr Héber BRENNER

Veterinary Official Inspector
 Ministry of Agriculture, Livestock, and Food Supply
 Esplanada dos Ministérios
 Bloco D Sala 448B
 Brasília DF Brazil CEP: 70.043-900
 Tel: + 55-61 3218 2329
 Fax: +55 61 3226 9799
 Email: heber.brenner@agricultura.gov.br

Ms Josefa ABUCÁTER

Federal Inspector Analyst
 Ministry of Agriculture, Livestock, and Food Supply
 LANAGROPEDRO LEOPOLDO - MG
 Tel: +55 31 3660 9610
 Fax: +55 31 3661 8325
 Email: josefa.lima@agricultura.gov.br

Ms Marta SEVERO

Federal Inspector Analyst
 Ministry of Agriculture, Livestock and Food Supply
 Lanagro/RS Estrada da Ponta Gossa, 3036
 Porto Alegre – RS – Brazil
 Tel: +55 5132 48 2133
 Fax: +55 5132 48 2133
 Email: marta.severo@agricultura.gov.br

Ms Marcia VILLA

Veterinary Official Inspector
 Ministry of Agriculture, Livestock, and Food Supply
 Esplanada dos Ministérios
 Bloco D Anexo A Sala 401
 Brasília DF Brazil 70043-900
 Tel: + 55-61-3218 2170
 Email: marcia.villa@agricultura.gov.br

Ms Suzana BRESSLAU

Veterinary Official Inspector
 Ministry of Agriculture, Livestock, and Food Supply
 Esplanada dos Ministérios
 Bloco D Anexo A Sala 443
 Brasília DF Brazil Zip Code 70043-900
 Tel: + 55-61-3218 2861
 Fax: +55 61 3218 2727
 Email: suzana.bresslau@agricultura.gov.br

Ms Fabiane GOMES

Expert on Regulation
 National Health Surveillance Agency
 SIA, Trecho 5, Área Especial_57, Lote 200, Bloco D,
 Subsolo, CEP 71205-050, Brasília-DF
 Tel: +55(61)3462-6507
 Fax: +55(61)3462-5726
 Email: fabiane.gomes@anvisa.gov.br

Ms Ester AGUIAR

Veterinary Official Inspector
 Ministry of Agriculture, Livestock, and Food Supply
 Esplanada dos Ministérios
 Bloco D Anexo A Sala 443
 Brasília DF Brazil Zip Code 70043-900
 Tel: + 55-61-3218 2438
 Fax: +55 61 3218 2727
 Email: ester.aguiar@agricultura.gov.br

Mr Roberto VASCONCELOS

Health Official Inspector
 National Health Surveillance Agency
 SIA, Trecho 5, Área Especial 57 Lote 200
 Bloco D, CEP 71.205 – 050 GGAU, 2º Andar
 Tel: +55 61 3462 5340
 Fax: +55 61 3462 5315
 Email: Roberto.vasconcelos@anvisa.gov.br

Dr Cesar LOPES

Technical & Regulatory Director
 Sindan – Union of Veterinary Products Industries
 Av. Tancredo de A. Neves, 1111 – 07112-070
 Guarulhos – SP – Brasil
 Tel: +55 (11) 2185-4420
 Fax: +55 (11) 2185-4455
 Email: cesar.lopes@pahc.com

Dr Clea CAMARGO

Coordinator AH
 Abiquif
 Av. Morumbi, 8264
 São Paulo – SP – Brazil 04703-002
 Tel: 55 11 21446849
 Fax: 55 11_21446198
 Email: camargo_clea@lilly.com

Ms Flávia FERREIRA DE CASTRO

Technical and Regulatory Manager
 SINDIRAÇÕES – Brazilian Animal Feed Industry Association
 Avenida Paulista, 1313, CJ 1050 10o andar cep 01311-923
 São Paulo – SP – Brasil
 Tel: 55 11 35411212
 Fax: 55 11 35411212
 Email: flavia@sindiracoes.org.br

Mr Nicolau Aredério SOURA

Ministry of Agriculture
 Av English Hildeltsanude de Sais
 150 – Ritteila, Natal, RN Brasília
 Tel: 84 4006 8675
 Fax: 4006 8651
 Email: nicolau.sousa@agricultura.gov.br

Mr Alexandre NUNES

Veterinary Official Inspector
 Ministry of Agriculture, Livestock, and Food Supply
 Av Rodrigues Alves 129, Saia 613
 Rio de Janeiro/RJ
 Brasília - DF, Brasil CEP: 20081-250
 Tel: + 55-21 2233 9624
 Fax: + 55-21 2233 9624
 Email: alexandre.nunes@agricultura.gov.br

Mr Roberto MENESCAL

Veterinary Official Inspector
 Ministry of Agriculture, Livestock, and Food Supply
 Rua José, Verissimo, No. 420, Taruma – Curitiba Parana –
 CEP 82 820 000
 Brasília - DF, Brasil
 Tel: + 55-61-3218 2611
 Fax: + 55-61-32182874
 Email: roberto.menescal@agricultura.gov.br

Dr Fabiana GALTAROSSA XAVIER

Veterinary Official Inspector
 Ministry of Agriculture, Livestock, and Food Supply
 Esplanada Dos Ministérios, Bloco D, Anexo A, Sala 448
 CEP 70.043_900, Brasília DF Brazil
 Tel: + 55-61-3218 2704
 Fax: + 55-61-32182874
 Email: fabiana.xavier@agricultura.gov.br

Mr Leonardo VIANA DE ALMEIDA

Federal Official Inspector
 Ministry of Agriculture
 Rua 13 de Maio, nº 1558, 4º andar
 São Paulo - SP - Brasil CEP: 01327-002
 Tel: 55 11 3251-0400
 Fax: 55 11 3251-0400 ramal 1414
 Email: leonardo.viana@agricultura.gov.br

Mr Wilkson REZENDE

Federal Official Inspector
 Ministry of Agriculture, Livestock, and Food Supply
 Esplanada dos Ministérios Bloco D Anexo A Sala 443
 Brasília - DF, Brasil, Zip Code 70043-900
 Tel: + 55-61-3218 2438
 Fax: + 55-61-32182727
 Email: wilkson.rezende@agricultura.gov.br

BURUNDI**Dr Gerard NIGARURA**

Head of Testing, National Veterinary Laboratory
 Burundi
 Tel: (+257) 22222553; (+257) 77746668
 E-mail: dgniga@hotmail.com

CAMEROON - CAMEROUN – CAMERÚN**Mr Martin Paul MINDJOS MOMENY**

Sécretaire Techniques due Comité National du Codex
 Chef de la Cellule des Normes et de la
 Certification à la Division de la Normalisation et de la
 Qualité au Ministère de l'Industrie,
 des Mines et du Développement Technologique au Cameroun
 P.O. Box 4404 Minimid/DNQ, Yaounde, Cameroon
 Tel: 00 237 94 69 43 40
 Fax: 00 237 22 22 64 96
 Email: mindjos@yahoo.fr

Dr Alexandre NGATCHOU

Membre du Comité National du Codex
 Sous-Directeur du la Médecine Vétérinaire au Ministère de
 l'Élevage, des pêches et des Industries Animales

Mr Léonard ATANGANA

Membre du Comité Nation du Codex
 Chef du Bureau de Contrôle des Normes Alimentaires au
 Ministère de la Santé Publique
 Yaoundé, Cameroun

CANADA – CANADÁ**Dr Manisha MEHROTRA**

Director, Human Safety Division,
 Veterinary Drugs Directorate, HPFB
 11 Holland Avenue, Suite 14 , AL: 3000A
 Ottawa, Ontario, K1A 0K9, Canada
 Tel: (613) 941-8775
 Fax: (613) 957-3861
 Email: manisha_mehrotra@hc-sc.gc.ca

Mr Javad SHABNAM

Evaluator, Human Safety Division,
 Veterinary Drugs Directorate, HPFB
 Health Canada
 Holland Cross Complex
 11 Holland Avenue, Suite 14 (3000A),
 Ottawa, Ontario, K1A 0K9, Canada
 Tel: (613) 957-8545
 Fax: (613) 957-3861
 Email: javad_shabnam@hc-sc.gc.ca

Dr Joe BOISON

Senior Research Scientist
 Centre for Veterinary Drug Residues
 Canadian Food Inspection Agency (CFIA)
 116 Veterinary Road
 Saskatoon, Saskatchewan, S7N 2R3, Canada
 Tel.: (306) 975-5358
 Fax: (306) 975-5711
 Email: joe.boison@inspection.gc.ca

CHAD – CHAD – TCHAD**Mr Kabé Zoua DJOURBA**

OIE Contact Point,
 Chef de Division Hygiene des Denrees Alimentaires
 Direction des Services Vétérinaires
 Ndjaména BP 750
 Ministère de l'Élevage et des Ressources Animales
 Tel: 002356374327
 Email: kabezoua@yahoo.fr

CHINA – CHINE – CHINA**Dr Zhongze FENG**

Deputy Director, China Institute of Veterinary Drug Control
 No. 8 Zhongguancun South Street
 Haidian District, Beijing, PR China
 Tel: 86 10 62105888
 Fax: 86 10 62103582
 Email: fengzhongze@ivdc.gov.cn

Mr Yichun DONG

China Institute of Veterinary Drug Control
 No. 8 Zhongguancun South Street
 Haidian District, Beijing, PR China
 Tel: 86 10 6210 3545
 Fax: 86 10 6210 3582
 Email: dongyichun@ivdc.gov.cn

Dr Shixin XU

Director, Division of Pharmaceutical Evaluation
China Institute of Veterinary Drug Control
#8 Zhongguancun South Street
Haidian District, Beijing 100081
Tel: +86 10 6210 3556
Fax: +86 6210 3560
Email: xushixin@ivdc.gov.cn or xushixin@msn.com

Mr Xuewan XU

Engineer
Development Center for Science & Technology
Ministry of Agriculture
20 Maizidian Street, Chaoyang District
Beijing, PR China
Tel: +86 10 5919 5082
Fax: +86 10 5919 4550
Email: xuxuewan@agri.gov.cn

Ms Yuting GENG

Officer, Ministry of Agriculture
11 Nongzhanguan Nanli,
Chaoyang District, Beijing, PR China 100125
Tel: 86 10 5919 2849
Fax: 86 10 5919 1652
Email: yzc@ivdc.gov.cn

Prof Zonghui YUAN

Professor, Huazhong Agricultural University
Shizishan Street, hongsha District,
Wuhan 430070, PR China
Tel: 86 27 8728 7186
Fax: 86 27 8728 2232
Email: yuan5802@mail.hzau.edu.cn

Prof Jianzhong SHEN

Professor
China Agricultural University
Beijing, China 100094
Tel: +86 10 6273 2803
Fax: 86 10 6273 1032
Email: sjz@cau.edu.cn

Prof Liping SUN

CICOS, Ministry of Agriculture
No. 11, Nongzhanguannanli
Chaoyang District, Beijing, China
Tel: 59192448
Fax: 59192448
Email: sunliping@agri.gov.cn

COLOMBIA**Dr Elizabeth JIMENEZ LAVERDE**

Ingeniera de Alimentos Especialista
en Analysis Instrumental, INVIMA
Calle 26 No. 51-20 CAN
Bogotá Colombia
Tel: 3151970
Fax: 3151970
Email: eli.verde@hotmail.com

COSTA RICA**Dr José Luis ROJAS**

Médico Veterinario
Ministry of Agricultura (MAG) SENASA
Barreal de Heredia, Lagonilla
Heredia – Campus Benjamin Nunez
Costa Rica
Tel: 2260 8300
Fax: 2260 5483
Email: jrojas@senasa.go.cr

CUBA**Ms Yudit RODRIGUEZ COIPEL**

Master en Ciencias
Grupo Empresarial LABIOFAM
Ave. Independencia Km 16 ½ Boyeros
Ciudad de la Habana, Cuba
Tel: 53 7 6849658
Fax: 53 7 6830326
Email: Labiofam@ceniai.inf.cu or nc@ncnorma.cu

Mr Miguel Oscar GARCIA ROCHE

Instituto de Nutrición e Higiene de los Alimentos
Infant 1158, La Habana, 10300
Ciudad de la Habana, Cuba
Tel: 53 7 878 2880
Fax: 537 836 8048
Email: miguelgarcia@infomed.sld.cu; nc@ncnorma.cu

DENMARK – DANEMARK – DINAMARCA**Dr Anne Rath PETERSEN**

Veterinary Officer
Danish Veterinary and Food Administration
Moerkhoej Bygade 19, 2860 Soeborg, DK
Tel: +45 33 95 64 10
Fax: +45 33 95 60 60
Email: arp@fvst.dk

**CZECH REPUBLIC – RÉPUBLIQUE TCHÈQUE –
REPÚBLICA CHECA****Dr Lucie POKLUDOVA**

Assessor of the Residues of Veterinary Medicinal Products
Institute for State Control of Veterinary Biologicals and
Medicaments
Hudcova 56 A, Brno-Medlány,
Postal Code 621 00, Czech Republic
Tel: +420 541 518 208
Fax: +420 541 212 607
Email: pokludova@uskvbl.cz

Dr Martina REJTHAROVÁ

Analytical Chemist, Quality Manager
Institute for State Control of Veterinary Biologicals and
Medicaments
Hudcova 56 A, Brno-Medlány,
Postal Code 621 00, Czech Republic
Tel: +420 541 518 234
Fax: +420 541 212 607
Email: rejtharova@uskvbl.cz

Dr Leos CELEDA

Permanent Representation of the Czech Republic to the EU
15, rue Caroly
1050 Brussels
Belgium
Tel: +32 2 2139 427
Fax: +32 2 2139 184
Email: leos_celeda@mzv.cz

Mr Cesar CORTES

Head of Unit, General Secretariat of the Council of the EU
JL 4040 GM 22
175 rue de la Loi
1048 Brussels, Belgium
Tel: 0032.2-281.6114
Fax: 0032.2-281.6198
Email: cesar.cortes@consilium.europa.eu

EGYPT – ÉGYPTTE – EGIPTO**Dr Moustafa A. AZIZ**

Professor of Vet. Pharmacology
Kafrelsheikh University
22 Mohamed Kamel Moursi
St. Dokki Giza, Cairo, Egypt
Tel: 002 023 337 5648
Fax: 002 023 337 5648
Email: moustaziz@hotmail.com

EUROPEAN COMMUNITY (MEMBER ORGANIZATION) – COMMUNAUTÉ EUROPÉENNE (ORGANISATION MEMBRE) – COMUNIDAD EUROPEA (ORGANIZACIÓN MIEMBRO)**Dr Risto HOLMA**

Policy Officer
European Commission
Health and Consumers Directorate-General (SANCO)
Rue Froissart 101 -02/48
B-1049 Brussels, Belgium
Tel: 32 2 299 86 83
Fax: 32 2 299 85 66
Email: risto.holma@ec.europa.eu

Dr Kornelia GREIN

Head of Sector – Safety of Veterinary Medicines
European Medicines Agency (EMA)
7, Westferry Circus, Canary Wharf,
London E14 4HB
Tel: 44 207 4188432
Fax: 44 207 4188447
Email: kornelia.grein@emea.europa.eu

FINLAND - FINLANDE – FINLANDIA**Dr Leena RÄSÄNEN**

Veterinary Counsellor
Ministry of Agriculture and Forestry
Department of Food and Health
PO Box 30, FI-00023 Government
Finland
Tel: +358-9-1605 2207
Fax: +358-9-1605 3338
Email: leena.rasanen@mmm.fi

FRANCE – FRANCIA**Ms Catherine LAMBERT**

Agence Nationale du Médicament Vétérinaire
AFSSA
Mission Affaires internationales
La Haute Marche – Javené – BP 90 203
35302 Fougères
Tel : 33 2 99 94 78 87
Fax : 33 2 99 94 78 99
Email : c.lambert@anmv.afssa.fr

Mr Pascal AUDEBERT

Point de contact du Codex Alimentarius en France
Premier Ministre
Secrétariat général des Affaires européennes
2, boulevard Diderot
75572 Paris CEDEX 12
Tel : 33 1 44 87 16 03
Fax : 33 1 44 87 16 04
Email : sgae-codex-fr@sgae.gouv.fr;
pascal.audebert@sgae.gouv.fr

Mr Alexandre BLANC-GONNET

Inspédeur de Sante de Publique Veterinaire
Ministère de l'agriculture et de la pêche DGAL
Bureau des intrants et de la santé publique en élevage
Direction Generale de L'alimentation
251 Rue de Vaugirard
75532 Paris CEDEX 15
Tel : 33 1 4955 5804
Fax : 33 1 49 55 4398
Email : alexandre.blanc-gonnet@agriculture.gouv.fr

Dr Georges MONSALLIER

SIMV
50 Rue de Paradis
11 Rue des Messageries
Paris, 75010
Tel : 00.33.2 23 20 75 82 or +33 1 53 34 43 40
Fax : 33 1 53 34 43 44
Email : georges.monsallier@wanadoo.fr

GERMANY – ALLEMAGNE – ALEMANIA**Dr Undine BUETTNER-PETER**

Head of unit veterinary medicinal products and residues
Federal Ministry of Food Agriculture and Consumer
Protection
Rochusstraße. 1
D-53123 Bonn
Tel: +49 (0) 228 99 529 4644
Fax: +49 (0) 228 99 529 4946
Email: 326@bmelv.bund.de

Dr Reinhard KROKER

Head of Department “Veterinary Drugs”
BVL (Federal Office of Consumer Protection and Food
Safety)
BVL, Department 3
Mauerstraße 39-42
10117 Berlin, Germany
Tel: 0049-30 18 444 30000
Fax: 0049-30 18 444 30008
Email: reinhard.kroker@bvl.bund.de

Dr Ludwig KLOSTERMANN

Head of Policy & Issues Management
Bayer Animal Health GmbH
Gebäude 6210
51368 Leverkusen
Tel: +49(0) 2173 38 3861
Fax: +49(0) 2173 38 2823
Email: Ludwig.klostermann@bayerhealthcare.com

Dr Alexander BOETTNER

Head of Global Regulatory Strategy
Intervet Innovation GmbH, Zur Propstei
55270 Schwabenheim, Germany
Tel: 0049 – (0) 6130-948-190
Fax: 0049 – (0) 6130-948-504
Email: alexander.boettner@sp.intervet.com

Dr Wolfgang RADECK

Scientific Officer
BVL (Federal Office of Consumer Protection and Food
Safety)
BVL, Department 5
Diedersdorfer Weg 1
12277 Berlin, Germany
Tel: 0049/30 18 412-2325
Fax: 0049/30 18 412-2300
Email: wolfgang.radeck@bvl.bund.de

GHANA**Dr Musheibu MOHAMMED-ALFA**

Principal Regulatory Officer
Food and Drugs Board
P.O. Box CT 2783
Cantonments – Accra, Ghana
Tel: 0233 244 337247
Fax: 233 21 227994
Email: Mushalfa107@yahoo.co.uk

GUATEMALA**Dr MV Antonio FERRATÉ, MSc**

Jefe del Area de Inocuidad de los Alimentos
Ministerio de Agricultura, Ganadería y Alimentación
7ª Avenida 12-90 Zona 13, Guatemala City
Tel: (502) 2413 7466
Fax: (502) 2413 7454
Email: antonio.ferrate@yahoo.com;
codexguatemala@yahoo.com

Ing Ana MARROQUÍN, MA

Coordinadora Codex Alimentarius
Ministerio de Agricultura, Ganadería y Alimentación
7ª Avenida 12-90 Zona 13
Guatemala City, Guatemala
Tel: 502 2413 7466
Fax: 50224137454
Email: codexguatemal@yahoo.com; apazos@maga.gob.gt

HAITI - HAÏTI – HAITÍ**Mr Jean Ernst SAINT-FLEUR**

Assistant Directeur, chef de Service, Bromatologie/Chimie
Toxicologie
Laboratoire Veterinaire et de Controle de Qualite des
Aliments de
Tamarinier (LVCQAT)
Ministere de l'Agriculture des Ressources Naturelles et du
Developpement Rural (MARNDR)
Km15, Bon repos, Port-au-Prince Haiti
Tel: (509) 2513-5733(bur); (509)3638-2148 (cell)
Email : ernstcoa@yahoo.ft

**IRAN (ISLAMIC REPUBLIC OF) – IRAN
(RÉPUBLIQUE ISLAMIQUE D') – IRÁN (REPÚBLICA
ISLÁMICA DEL)****Dr Maziar TAGHAVI**

Institute of Standard & Industrial Research of Iran (ISIRI)
Standard Square, Karaj, Iran
Tel: +989123610557
Fax: +98(261)2803889
Email: mtaghavi@isiri.org.ir

IRAQ**Mr Isam Mohammad SAKAR**

Supervisor/Chemist
Ministry of Health, Directorate of Preventive Health
Central Public Health Laboratories
Al-Andalus SQ . P.O.B.(826), Baghdad, Iraq
Tel: +9647901604377
Email: alsady2000@yahoo.com

Dr Lamyaa Ibrahim Hamzah ALALWEIA

Supervisor/Physicist
Ministry of Health, Directorate of Preventive Health
Central Public Health Laboratories
Al-Andalus SQ . P.O.B.(826), Baghdad, Iraq
Tel: +9647903356634
Email: alsady2000@yahoo.com

JAPAN – JAPON – JAPÓN**Dr Chieko IKEDA**

Director, Office of International Food Safety
Policy Planning and Communication Division
Dept. of Food Safety, Ministry of Health, Labour, and
Welfare
100-8916, 1-2-2, Kasumigaseki, Chiyoda-ku, Tokyo, Japan
Tel: +81-3-3595-2326
Fax: +81-3-3503-7965
Email: codexj@mhlw.go.jp

Ms Tomoko INOUE

Section Chief
Food Safety Commission Secretariat
Prudential Tower 6F, 2-13-10
Nagatacyo, Chiyoda-ku, Tokyo
100-8989, Japan
Tel: 81 3 5251 9149
Fax: 81 3 3591-2236
Email: tomoko.inoue@cao.go.jp

Mr Ryosuke OGAWA

Director, International Affairs Division
Food Safety and Consumer Affairs Bureau
Ministry of Agriculture, Forestry, and Fisheries
1-2-1, Kasumigaseki, Chiyodaku
Tokyo, Japan
Tel: +81 3 3502 8732
Fax: +81 3 3507 4232
Email: ryosuke_ogawa@nm.maff.go.jp

Dr Yuuichirou EJIMA

Assistant Director
Standards and Evaluation Division,
Department of Food Safety, Pharmaceutical and Food Safety
Bureau
Ministry of Health, Labour, and Welfare
1-2-2, Kasumigaseki, Chiyoda-ku
100-8916, Japan
Tel: +81-3-3595-2341
Fax: +81-3-3501-4868
Email: codexj@mhlw.go.jp

Dr Yuuko ENDOH

Chief of General Medicament Section
Assay Division II
National Veterinary Assay Laboratory, MAFF
1-15-1 Tokura Kokubunji
Tokyo 185-8511, JAPAN
Tel: 81 42 321 1849
Fax: 81 42 321 1769
Email: endoyuk@nval.go.jp

Dr Ken NODA

Associate Director, Animal Product Safety Division
Food Safety and Consumer Affairs Bureau
Ministry of Agriculture, Forestry, and Fisheries
1-2-1 Kasumigaseki, Chiyoda-ku
Tokyo , 100-8950, Japan
Tel: +81-3-3502-8181 ext.4532
Fax: +81-3-3502-8275
Email: ken_noda@nm.maff.go.jp

KENYA**Dr Moses GATHURA GICHIA**

Senior Assistant Director of Veterinary Services
 Department of Veterinary Services,
 Private Bag 00625,
 Kangemi, Nairobi, Kenya
 Tel: +254733557134 or +254206750642
 Email: medwrin@yahoo.com

Ms Seruya ASHIEMBI

Lab Analyst
 Kenya Bureau of Standards
 PO Box 54974 00200
 Nairobi, Kenya
 Tel: 254 02 546090 or 25402 694 8303
 Fax: 254-02 604031
 Email: info@kebs.org or Ashiembis@kebs.org

KOREA, REPUBLIC OF - CORÉE, RÉPUBLIQUE DE-COREA, REPÚBLICA DE**Dr Sang Hee JEONG**

Deputy Director
 National Veterinary Research & Quarantine Service
 Ministry of Food, Agriculture, Forestry, and Fisheries
 480, Anyang-6-dong,
 Manan-gu, Anyang-city, Gyeonggi-do, Korea (430-824)
 Tel: 82 31 467 1837
 Fax: 82 31 467 1845
 Email: jeongsh@nvrqs.go.kr

Dr Jeong Woo KANG

Scientific Officer
 National Veterinary Research & Quarantine Service
 Ministry of Food, Agriculture, Forestry, and Fisheries
 480, Anyang-6-dong,
 Manan-gu, Anyang-city, Gyeonggi-do, Korea, (430-824)
 Tel: 82 31 467 1840
 Fax: 82 31 467 1845
 Email: hijach@nvrqs.go.kr

Dr Hae Jung YOON

Scientist, Division of Food Chemical Residues
 Korea Food & Drug Administration
 194 Tongil-ro, Nokbunbong #5
 Eunpyung GU, Seoul, Korea 122-704
 Tel: 82 2 389 1675
 Fax: 82 2 355 6037
 Email: hjyoon@kfda.go.kr

Dr Jong Sup JEON

Scientific Officer, Division of Food Chemical Residues
 Korea Food & Drug Administration
 194 Tongil-ro, Nokbunbong #5
 Eunpyung GU, Seoul, Korea, 122-704
 Tel: 82 2 380 1675
 Fax: 82 2 355 6037
 Email: jjs0907@kfda.go.kr

Ms Sung Hion YI

Senior Researcher
 Ministry of Health, Welfare, and Family Affairs
 75 Yulgong-ro, Jongro-gu
 Seoul, Korea
 Tel: 82-2-2023-7794
 Fax: 82-2-2023-7780
 Email: sunghion@mw.go.kr

LIBYAN ARAB JAMAHIRIYA – JAMAHIRIYA ARABE LIBYENNE – JAMAHIRIJA ÁRABE LIBIA**Dr Mohamed ZURGHANI**

Member of the Libyan Codex Committee
 National Center for Standardization and Metrology
 P.O. Box 9496
 Tripoli, Libyan Arab Jamahiriya
 Tel: +218914378542
 Fax: +218213506599
 Email: taha.zorgani@yahoo.com

MADAGASCAR**Ms Beby RAHANTAMALALA**

Codex Contact Point
 Ministry of Trade
 BP 454
 Madagascar
 Tel: 261331472459
 Email: dnq.sml@moov.mg

MALAWI**Dr Bernard CHIMERA**

Deputy Director for Animal Health
 Ministry of Agriculture and Food Security
 Department of Animal Health and Livestock Development
 P.O. Box 2096
 Lilongwe
 Tel: 265-9-315-766
 Fax: 265-1-751-349
 Email: bernard.chimera@yahoo.com

MALI – MALÍ**Mr Sékouba KEITA**

Chef de Division Appui Scientifique et Technique
 à l'élaboration de la Réglementation/ Documentation
 Ministère de la Santé
 Agence Nationale de la Sécurité Sanitaire des Aliments
 Quartier du Fleuve, Centre Commercial, Rue: 305, BP :
 E2362
 Bamako, Mali
 Tel: (223) 20 22 07 54/ 7915 60 31
 Fax: (223) 7915 60 31
 Email: sekokake@yahoo.fr

MOZAMBIQUE**Ms Carla Maria Dias de Conceição MENEZES**

Agriculture Research Institute of Mozambique (IAM)
 Directorate of Animal Science (DCA)
 Mozambique km 1.5 Road – Maputo-
 Mozambique; P.O. box 1410
 Tel: +258-21-475170/1
 Fax: +258-21-475172
 Email: carlamenezes786@yahoo.com.br

NAMIBIA – NAMIBIA – NAMIBIE**Ms Julia Ipawa SHIMWINO**

Veterinary Diagnostician Specialist
 Central Veterinary Laboratory (CVL)
 Ministry of Agriculture, Water, and Forestry
 P/B 13187, Goethe Street, No. 24
 Windhoek, Namibia
 Tel: 00 264 61 237684
 Fax: 00 264 61 220099
 Email: j.shimwino@cvl.com.na or jshimwino@yahoo

NETHERLANDS – PAYS-BAS – PAÍSES BAJOS**Mr Floris LEIJDEKKERS**

Policy Officer
 Ministry of Agriculture, Nature & Food Quality
 P.O. Box 20401
 NL – 2500 EK The Hague
 Tel: +31 70 378 6029
 Fax: +31 70 378 6141
 Email: f.b.leijdekkers@minlnv.nl

Ms Astrid BULDER

Researcher of Toxicology and Risk Assessment
 RIKILT Institute of Food Safety, Wageningen UR
 Bornsesteeg 45, 6708 PD Wageningen
 The Netherlands
 Tel: 0317 480370
 Fax: 0317 487717
 Email: Astrid.Bulder@wur.nl

NEW ZEALAND – NOUVELLE-ZÉLANDE – NUEVA ZELANDIA**Dr Bill JOLLY**

Deputy Director (Export Standards)
 New Zealand Food Safety Authority
 86 Jervois Quay
 PO Box 2835
 Wellington, New Zealand
 Tel: +64 4 894 2621
 Fax: +64 4 894 2675
 Email: bill.jolly@nzfsa.govt.nz

NORWAY – NORVÈGE – NORUEGA**Mr Stian JOHNSEN**

Adviser
 Norwegian Food Safety Authority
 Head Office
 Felles Postmottak, P.O. Box 383
 N-2381 Brumunddal, Norway
 Tel: +47 23216720
 Fax: +47 23216801
 Email: stjjo@mattilsynet.no

PAKISTAN – PAKISTÁN**Dr Qurban ALI**

Principal Scientific Officer / Director General
 National Veterinary Laboratories
 Ministry of Livestock & Dairy Development
 At NARC Gate # 2, Park Road
 Islamabad – Pakistan
 Tel: 92 51 9255108 or 92 300 5033710 (cell)
 Fax: 92 51 9255105
 Email: drqurban@yahoo.com

PANAMA – PANAMÁ**Ms Carmen E. PERALTA M.**

Licenciada en Química
 Ministerio de Desarrollo
 Agropecuario (MIDA),
 Dirección de Salud Animal
 Panama
 Tel: (507)266-0187, 266-2303
 Fax: (507) 220-3266, 266-2943
 Email: carperm27@yahoo.com; cperalta@mida.gob.pa

PARAGUAY**Mr Oscar IGLESIAS BENITEZ**

Químico, SENACSA
 [Servicio Nacional de Calidad y Salud Animal]
 Km 10 ½ Ruta Mcal. Estigarribia
 San Lorenzo Casilla de Correo N° 1110 –
 Asunción, Paraguay
 Tel: 021510509
 Fax: 021510509
 Email: oiglesias@senacsa.gov.py

Dr Maria Rosa DOLDAN HICAR

Gerente, Microbioticos Paraguay SRL
 Medicos del Chaco 2270
 Asunción, Paraguay
 Tel: (595 21) 553716
 Email: paraguay@microbioticos.com

PHILIPPINES – FILIPINAS**Dr Marvin VICENTE**

Supervising Meat Control Officer
 National Meat Inspection Service
 Department of Agriculture
 Visayas Avenue, Diliman
 Quezon City 1101, Philippines
 Tel: 632 924 7971; 924 7980
 Fax: 632 924 7973
 Email: vicentemarvin@yahoo.com

Dr Alpha Mateo

Science Research Specialist II
 Department of Agriculture (DA – BAFPS)
 Bureau of Agriculture and Fisheries Product Standards
 BPI Compound Visayas Avenue
 Diliman, Quezon City, Philippines 1101
 Tel: 632 920 6131
 Fax: 632 455 2858
 Email: alpha_mateo@yahoo.com; bafpsda@yahoo.com

PORTUGAL**Dr Helena PONTE**

Head of Division
 Direcção-Geral de Veterinária
 Largo da Academia Nacional de Belas Artes N°2
 1249-105 Lisboa, Portugal
 Tel: 00 351 21 323 95 36
 Fax: 00 351 21 323 95 65
 Email: Hponte@dgv.min-agricultura.pt

SERBIA, REPUBLIC OF – SERBIE**Mr Srdjan STEFANOVIĆ**

Analyst, Research Assistant
 Institute of Meat Hygiene and Technology
 Kacanskog 13
 11000 Belgrade, Serbia
 Tel: +381-11-2650-655
 Fax: +381-11-2651-825
 Email: ssrdjan@inmesbgd.com

SOUTH AFRICA - AFRIQUE DU SUD – SUDÁFRICA**Ms Salome Margaret MOLEFE**

Deputy Director, Chemical Safety
 Directorate: Food Control
 Department of Health
 Private Bag X 828
 Pretoria, South Africa, 0001
 Tel: +27 12 312 0154
 Fax: +27 12 312 3162/3180
 Email: MolefS@health.gov.za

Ms Kefiloe MOMPATI

Medicines Regulatory Officer
 Veterinary Medicines Unit
 Directorate: Medicines, Evaluation, and Research
 Department of Health
 Private Bag X 828, Pretoria, South Africa
 Tel: + 21 012 312 0299
 Fax: +27 012 312 0367
 Email: mompak@health.gov.za

Ms Talita ZWARTZ

Meat Technologist
 Directorate: Veterinary Quarantine and Public Health
 Department of Agriculture
 Private Bag X 138, Pretoria, South Africa, 0001
 Tel: +27 12 3197649
 Fax: +27 12 3296892
 Email: TalitaZ@nda.agric.za

Ms Wiana LOUW

Manager, Veterinary Residues
 South African Bureau of Standards
 Private Ba X191
 Pretoria, South Africa, 0001
 Tel: +27 12 428 6301
 Fax: +27 12 428 6618
 Email: louwws@sabs.co.za

Dr Mmalencoe MOROE-RULASHE

Agriculture Management Advisor
 Directorate: Food Safety and Quality Assurance
 Department of Agriculture
 Private Bag X 343
 Pretoria, South Africa, 0001
 Tel: +27 12 319 6671
 Fax: +27 12 319 6867
 Email: MmalencoeM@nda.agric.za

Dr Elrisa TALJAARD

Technical and Laboratory Manager, Residue Lab
 Agricultural Research Council, Onderstepoort Veterinary
 Inst.
 Private Bag X 05
 Onderstepoort, 0110, South Africa
 Tel: +27 12 529 9151
 Fax: +27 12 529 9311
 Email: TaljaardE@arc.agric.za

SPAIN – ESPAGNE – ESPAÑA**Ms Gema CORTES**

Senior Asesor, AEMPS
 Campezo 1
 28022 – Madrid, España
 Tel: +3491 8225 431
 Fax: +3491 8225 443
 Email: gcortes@agemed.es

Mr César CASADO

Jefe de Servicio de Gestion de Residuos
 Ministerio De Sanidad Y Política Social
 Agencia Espanola de Seguridad, Alimentaria y Nutricion
 C/Alcalá 56, planta 4
 28071 Madrid, Spain
 Tel: +0034 91 3380620
 Fax: +0034 9133806169
 Email: ccasado@msps.es

SWEDEN -SUISSE - SUECIA**Dr Viveka Larsson**

Senior Veterinary Officer
 National Food Administration
 Box 622, SB – 75126 Uppsala, Sweden
 Tel: +4618 1755 00
 Fax: 4618 1058 48
 Email: bvila@slv.se

Ms Bitte ASPENSTRÖM – FAGERLUND

Toxicologist
 National Food Administration
 Box 622, SE 75126 Uppsala, Sweden
 Tel: 46 1817 1446
 Fax: 46 1810 5848
 Email: bfas@slv.se

Dr Hakan JOHNSSON

Box 622, 75126
 Uppsala, Sweden
 Tel: +4618175705
 Fax: +4618 1058 48
 Email: hakan.johnsson@slv.se

SWITZERLAND – SUISSE – SUIZA**Dr Margrit ABEL-KROEKER**

Dr. Med. Vet./Scientific Staff
 Swiss Federal Office of Public Health
 Consumer Protection Directorate
 Food Safety Division
 CH – 3003 Berne, Switzerland
 Tel : 41 31 325 91 94
 Fax : 41 31 322 95 74
 Email : margrit.abel@bag.admin.ch

THAILAND – THAÏLANDE – TAILANDIA**Ms Nunthiya UNPRASERT**

Director, Fish Inspection and Quality Control Division
 Department of Fisheries
 50 Paholyothin Road, Ladyao, Chatujak
 Bangkok 10900, Thailand
 Tel: 66 2558 0150
 Fax: 66 2558 0134
 Email: nanthiyau@fisheries.go.th

Dr Sasi JARDENPOJ

Senior Veterinarian
 Department of Livestock Development
 Phayathai Road
 Ratchaaree, Bangkok, Thailand
 Tel: 02 653 4444 ext. 3121
 Fax: 661 2 653 4917
 Email: sasijaroenpoj@yahoo.com

Ms Yupa LAOJINDAPUN

National Bureau of Agricultural Commodities and
 Food Standards
 Ministry of Agriculture and Cooperatives
 50 Phahonyotin Road, Ladyao Chatuchak
 Bangkok 10900, Thailand
 Tel: +66 2561 2277 ext. 1431
 Fax: +66 2561 3373; 662 561 3357
 Email: yapa@acfs.go.th; laojindapun@gmail.com

Dr Sujittra PHONGVIVAT

Senior Veterinarian Officer
Bureau of Quality Control of Livestock Products
Department of Livestock Development
Tiwanond Road, Meliang, Pathumtani 12000
Tel: 662 9679 705
Fax: 662 967 9705
Email: sujittra_dvm@yahoo.com, sujittrap@dld.go.th

TURKEY - TURQUIE – TURQUÍA**Dr Aysin BAŞSATAN YORULMAZ**

Ministry of Agriculture and Rural Affairs
General Directorate of Protection and Control
Akay Cad. No:3 Bakanliklar/Ankara 06100
Tel: +90 312 417 41 76 ext 6213/ext 6210/ext 6204
Fax: +90 311 425 44 16
Email: codex@kkgm.gov.tr

UNITED KINGDOM – ROYAUME-UNI – REINO UNIDO**Mr John FITZGERALD**

Director of Operations
Veterinary Medicines Directorate
Woodham Lane, New Haw
Addlestone, Surrey dd
KT15 3LS
Tel: +44 1932 338303
Fax: +44 1932 338348
Email: j.fitzgerald@vmd.defra.gsi.gov.uk

Dr Jack KAY

R&D Manager
Veterinary Medicines Directorate
Woodham Lane, New Haw
Addlestone, Surrey
KT15 3LS, U.K.
Tel: +44 1932 338323
Fax: +44 1932 336618
Email: j.kay@vmd.defra.gsi.gov.uk

**UNITED STATES OF AMERICA- ÉTATS-UNIS
D'AMÉRIQUE – ESTADOS UNIDOS DE AMÉRICA****Dr Steven D. VAUGHN**

Director, Office of New Animal Drug Evaluation
U.S. Department of Health and Human Services
Food and Drug Administration
Center for Veterinary Medicine
Office of New Animal Drug Evaluation
7500 Standish Place, MPN2
Rockville, MD 20855
Tel: 240-276-8300
Fax: 240-276-8242
Email: Steven.Vaughn@fda.hhs.gov

Dr Charles PIXLEY

Director of Laboratory Quality Assurance Division
US Department of Agriculture
Food Safety and Inspection Service
USDA-FSIS-OPHS-LQAD
950 College Station Road
Athens, GA 30605
Tel: 706-546-3559
Fax: 706-546-3452
Email: charles.pixley@fsis.usda.gov

Ms Brandi L. ROBINSON

Executive Secretary to the Delegation
Executive Assistant to the Director
Office of New Animal Drug Evaluation
U.S. Department of Health and Human Services
Food and Drug Administration
Center for Veterinary Medicine
Office of New Animal Drug Evaluation
7500 Standish Place, MPN2
Rockville, MD 20855
Tel: 240-276-8359
Fax: 240-276-8242
Email: Brandi.Robinson@fda.hhs.gov

Ms Karen STUCK

US Codex Manager
USDA Headquarters
1400 Independence Ave SW
Room 227^E, Whitten Office Bldg.
Washington, DC 20250
Tel: 202 690 1667 or 202 384 5591
Fax: 202 720 3357
Email: Karen.Stuck@osec.usda.gov

Dr Todd ARMSTRONG

Director, Regulatory Affairs
Elanco Animal Health
2001 West Main Street
Greenfield, IN 46140
Tel: 317-655-0957
Fax: 317-277-4755
Email: tarmstrong@lilly.com

Dr Larry STOBBS

Global Regulatory Expert
Anson Group, 10473 S. 50 W.
Pendleton, IN 46064
Tel: 317-372-3198
Email: l.a.stobbs@gmail.com

Dr Lynn FRIEDLANDER

Supervisory Physiologist
U.S. Department of Health and Human Services
Food and Drug Administration
Center for Veterinary Medicine
Office of New Animal Drug Evaluation
Division of Human Food Safety
Residue Chemistry Team, HFV-151
7500 Standish Place, MPN2
Rockville, MD 20855
Tel: 240-276-8226
Fax: 240-276-8118
Email: Lynn.Friedlander@fda.hhs.gov

Ms Valerie REEVES

Chemist
U.S. Department of Health and Human Services
Food and Drug Administration
Center for Veterinary Medicine
Office of New Animal Drug Evaluation
7500 Standish Place, MPN2
Rockville, MD 20855
Tel: 240 276 8204
Fax: 240 276 8118
Email: Valerie.Reeves@fda.hhs.gov

Dr Kevin GREENLESS

Senior Advisor for Science and Policy
 U.S. Department of Health and Human Services
 Food and Drug Administration
 Center for Veterinary Medicine
 Office of New Animal Drug Evaluation
 HFV-100
 7500 Standish Place, MPN2
 Rockville, MD 20855
 Tel: 240 276 8214
 Fax: 240 276 8118
 Email: Kevin.Greenlees@fda.hhs.gov

Dr Dong YAN

Biologist
 U.S. Department of Health and Human Services
 Food and Drug Administration
 Center for Veterinary Medicine
 Office of New Animal Drug Evaluation
 7500 Standish Place, MPN2
 Rockville, MD 20855
 Tel: 240 276 8117
 Fax: 240 276 8118
 Email: dong.yan@fda.hhs.gov

Ms Sondra C. FLICK

Director, Government & Industry Affairs
 Alpharma Inc.
 400 Crossing Boulevard
 Bridgewater, NJ 08807
 Tel: 908-429-6000, ext. 58503
 Fax: 908-429-8392
 Email: Sandy.flick@alpharma.com

Mr Paul DUQUETTE

Director, Global Regulatory Affairs
 Phibro Animal Health
 65 Challenger Road, 3rd Floor
 Ridgefield Park, NJ 07660
 Tel: 201-329-7375
 Fax: 201-329-7042
 Email: Paul.Duquette@pahc.com

Dr Richard L. ELLIS

Technical Advisor, RLE Consult
 8081 Wacabee Drive
 Myrtle Beach, SC 29579-5229
 Tel: 843-278-8188
 Fax: 843-278-8188
 Email: Rle_foodsafety@yahoo.com

Mr David EGELHOFER

International Trade Specialist
 US Dept. of Agriculture
 1400 Independence Ave SW
 Washington, DC 20250
 Tel: 202 690 1669
 Fax: 202 690 3316
 Email: david.egelhofer@fas.usda.gov

Dr Richard COULTER

Vice President, Scientific and Regulatory Affairs
 Phibro Animal Health
 65 Challenger Road
 Ridgefield Park, NJ 07660
 United States
 Tel: 201-329-7374
 Fax: 201-329-7042
 Email: Richard.Coulter@pahc.com

URUGUAY**Ms Nancy MACHADO**

Química Farmacéutica
 Ministerio de Ganadería, Agricultura y Pesca
 Ruta 8, Km.17500, CP 12100
 Montevideo, Uruguay
 Tel: (598-2) 222 10 63-int.121
 Fax: (598-2) 222 10 63- int .122
 Email: nmachado@mgap.gub.uy

Dr Jorge ALVES

Doctor en Medicina y Tecnología Veterinaria
 Instituto Nacional de Carnes (INAC)
 Rincón 545 , CP 11000
 Montevideo, Uruguay
 Tel: (598-2)916 04 30 int.480
 Fax: (598-2)915 0875
 Email: jalves@inac.gub.uy

VIET NAM**Dr VU Ngoc Quynh**

Director of the Vietnam Codex Office,
 Vietnam Codex Contact Point,
 Vietnam National Codex Committee
 70 Tran Hung Dao Street
 Hanoi, Vietnam
 Tel: +84 439 426 605
 Fax: +84 438 222 520
 Email : vnquynhcodex@tcvn.gov.vn

Dr NGUYEN Quoc An

Vice Chief of Veterinary Drug Management Division
 Department of Animal Health (D.A.H.)
 15/78 Giai Phong, Truong Chinh str,
 Phuong Mai, Dong Da, Hanoi, Vietnam
 Tel: +84-4.38687150
 Fax: +84-4.38691311
 Email : annnguyenquoc51@gmail.com;
 Phungthao2006@gmail.com

Dr NGUYEN Van Ly

Principal Official
 Department of Science, Technology and Environment
 Ministry of Agriculture and Rural Development
 No 2 Ngoc Ha Street,
 Ba Dinh District, Hanoi
 Tel : 0913 030090
 Fax : 44 592 126
 Email : nguyenvanly@hotmail.com

ZAMBIA – ZAMBIE**Dr Yona SINKALA**

Epidemiologist
 Department of Veterinary and Livestock Development
 P.O. Box 30041
 Lusaka, Zambia
 Tel: +260 211 229 470
 Fax: +260 211 229 470
 Email: ysinkala@nalcidvld.gov.zm

Dr Martha HAMASUKI

Veterinary Research Officer
 Central Veterinary Research Institute
 P.O. Box 33980
 Lusaka, Zambia
 Tel: +260 977 832 642 or 211 213 444
 Fax: +260 211 213 444
 Email: hamasukimarta@yahoo.com

ZIMBABWE**Dr Phillipa CHENGETA**

Acting Deputy Director of Veterinary & Public Health
 Division of Veterinary Technical Services
 P O Box CY 551 Causeway
 Harare, Zimbabwe
 Tel : 263-4 705 885/7 or 263 4 705 885/7
 Fax : 263-04-791516
 Email : dvts@africaonline.co.zw; philliech@yahoo.com

Mr Bamusi SAIDI

Chief Veterinary Laboratory Technologist,
 Technical Manager
 Central Veterinary Laboratory
 Diagnostics and Research Branch
 Division of Veterinary Technical Services
 Ministry of Agriculture
 P.O. Box Cy551 Causeway
 Harare, Zimbabwe
 Tel: 263 4 705 885/7
 Fax: 263 4 791 516
 Email: bamusi@gmail.com; vetlabs@africaonline.co.zw

**INTERNATIONAL GOVERNMENTAL
 ORGANIZATIONS – ORGANISATIONS
 GOUVERNEMENTALES INTERNATIONALES –
 ORGANIZACIONES GUBERNAMENTALES
 INTERNACIONALES**

**FAO/IAEA AGRICULTURE PROGRAMME ON
 NUCLEAR TECHNIQUES IN FOOD AND
 AGRICULTURE**

Mr Rajendra PATEL

Food and Environmental Protection Section
 Joint FAO/IAEA Division of Nuclear Techniques in Food
 and Agriculture
 International Atomic Energy Agency
 P.O. Box 100, 1400 Vienna, Austria
 Fax: +43 1 26007
 Email: r.k.patel@iaea.org or raj.patel@rhul.ac.uk
 Web: <http://www-naweb.iaea.org/nafa/fep/index.html>

Mr Alfredo Marcial MONTES NINO

Consultant
 Calle Halcon, 2
 28230 Las Rozas, Madrid, Spain
 Tel: +34 680 8093 85
 Fax: +34 91 708 4563
 Email: montesninio@telefonica.net

**WORLD ORGANIZATION FOR ANIMAL HEALTH
 (OIE) / ORGANISATION MONDIALE DE LA SANTÉ
 ANIMALE (OIE) / ORGANIZACIÓN MUNDIAL DE
 SANIDAD ANIMAL (OIE)**

Dr Patrick DEHAUMONT

Director of OIE Collaborating Center for
 Veterinary Medicinal Products
 AFSSA (French Agency for Veterinary Medicinal Products)
 BP 90203, 38302 Fougères
 Tel : 83 (2) 99 94 7871
 Fax : 83.2.99 94 7899
 Email : p.dehaumont@anmv.afssa.fr

**INTERNATIONAL NON GOVERNMENTAL
 ORGANIZATIONS – ORGANISATIONS
 NONGOUVERNEMENTALES - INTERNATIONALES
 ORGANIZACIONES NO GUBERNAMENTALES**

**INTERNATIONAL FEDERATION FOR ANIMAL
 HEALTH - FÉDÉRATION INTERNATIONALE POUR
 LA SANTÉ ANIMALE (IFAH)**

Ms Barbara FREISCHEM

Executive Director,
 International Federation for Animal Health
 Rue Defacqz, 1, 1000 Brussels, Belgium
 Tel: +32-2-5410111
 Fax: +32-2-5410119
 Email: b.freischem@ifahsec.org

Dr David GOTTSCHALL

Research Fellow
 Pfizer Animal Health
 7000 Portage Road (0225-190-045)
 Kalamazoo, Michigan 49001-0199
 United States
 Tel: 269-833-2466
 Fax: 269-833-2707
 Email: gottsd@pfizer.com

Dr Robert C. LIVINGSTON

Director, International Affairs and Regulatory Policy
 Animal Health Institute
 1325 G Street NW, Suite 700
 Washington, DC 20005
 Tel: 202-637-2440
 Fax: 202 393 1667
 Email: rlivingston@ahi.org

Dr Thomas Burnett

Research Advisor
 ELANCO Animal Health
 2001 West Main Street
 Greenfield, IN 46140
 Tel: +1-317-374-4952
 Fax: +1-317-277-4167
 Email: tjburnett@lilly.com

Mr Dennis Erpelding

Manager, Elanco Government Relations,
 Public Affairs and Communications
 ELANCO Animal Health
 2001 West Main Street, GL18
 Greenfield, IN 46140
 Tel: 317-276-2721; 317-332-3873
 Fax: 317-433-6353
 Email: erpelding_dennis_l@lilly.com

Mr Rick CLAYTON

Technical Director,
 IFAH-Europe
 Rue Defacqz, 1
 1000 Brussels, Belgium
 Tel: +32 2 543 7576
 Fax: +32 2 537 0049
 Email: rclayton@ifahsec.org

FOOD AND AGRICULTURAL ORGANIZATION/ORGANISATION DES NATIONS UNIES POUR L'ALIMENTATION E L'AGRICULTURE/ ORGANIZACIÓN DE LAS NACIONES UNIDAS PARA LA AGRICULTURA Y LA ALIMENTACIÓN (FAO)

Dr Annika WENNBERG

FAO JECFA Secretary
Nutrition and Consumer Protection Division
Food and Agriculture Organization of the United Nations
Viale delle Terme di Caracalla
00153 Rome, Italy
Tel: + 39 06 5705 3283
Fax: + 39 06 5705 4593
Email: Annika.Wennberg@fao.org

WORLD HEALTH ORGANIZATION WORLD HEALTH ORGANIZATIONS (WHO) / ORGANISATION MONDIALE DE LA SANTÉ (OMS) /ORGANIZACIÓN MONDIAL DE LA SALUD (OMS)

Dr Angelika TRITSCHER

WHO Joint Secretary to JECFA and JMPR
Department of Food Safety, Zoonosis and Foodborne Diseases
World Health Organization
20, Avenue Appia, CH-1211 Geneva 27
Switzerland
Tel: +41 22 791 3569
Fax: +41 22 791 4807
Email: tritschera@who.int

Dr Awa AIDARA-KANE

Scientist, Department of Food Safety, Zoonosis and Foodborne Diseases
World Health Organization
20, Avenue Appia, CH-1211 Geneva 27
Switzerland
Tel: +41 22 791 24 03
Fax: +41 22 791 48 07
Email: aidaraanea@who.int

SECRETARIATS – SECRÉTARIATS- SECRETARÍAS

CODEX SECRETARIAT - CODEX SECRÉTARIAT - CODEX SECRETARÍA

Ms Annamaria BRUNO

Food Standards Officer
Joint FAO/WHO Food Standards Programme
Viale delle Terme di Caracalla
00153 Rome, Italy
Tel : 39 06 570 56254
Fax : 39 06 570 54593
Email : annamaria.bruno@fao.org

Mr YmShik LEE

Food Standards Officer
Joint FAO/WHO Food Standards Programme
Viale delle Terme di Caracalla
000153 Rome, Italy
Tel : 39 06570 55854
Fax : 39 06570 54593
Email : Ymshik.Lee@fao.org

Dr Jeronimas MASKELIUNAS

Food Standards Officer
Joint FAO/WHO Food Standards Programme
Viale delle Terme di Caracalla
00153 Roma, Italy
Tel: + 39 06570 53697
Fax: + 39 06570 54593
E-mail: jeronimas.maskeliunas@fao.org

UNITED STATES SECRETARIAT – SECRÉTARIAT DES ÉTATS UNIS – SECRETARÍA DE LOS ESTADOS UNIDOS

Ms Jasmine MATTHEWS

Program Analyst
United States Department of Agriculture
Food Safety and Inspection Service
Room 4867 South Building
1400 Independence Avenue, SW
Washington, D.C. 20250
Tel : 202-690-1124
Fax : 202-720-3157
Email : Jasmine.Matthews@fsis.usda.gov

Mr Syed ALI

International Policy Issue Analyst
US Codex Office
USDA Food Safety and Inspection Service
1400 Independence Ave, SW
South Building, Room 4861
Washington, DC 20250
Tel: 202-205-7760
Fax: 202-720-3157

Ms Samantha BAILEY

International Program Specialist
USDA/Foreign Agricultural Service
Office of Capacity Building and Development
Trade & Scientific Capacity Building Division
Room 3832 S Stop 1085
1400 Independence Ave., SW
Washington, D.C. 20250
Tel: 202-720-3372
Fax: 202-690-3982
Email: Samantha.Bailey@fas.usda.gov

Ms Kate NICKLES

International Program Specialist
USDA/Foreign Agricultural Service
Office of Capacity Building and Development
Trade & Scientific Capacity Building Division
Room 3832-S Stop 1085
14th & Independence Ave., SW
Washington, D.C. 20250
Tel: (202) 720-1230
Fax: (202) 690-3982
Email: kate.nickles@fas.usda.gov

BRAZILIAN SECRETARIAT – SECRÉTARIAT DU BRÉSIL – SECRETARÍA DE BRASIL

Mr Rogério PEREIRA DA SILVA

Coordinator for Codex Alimentarius Matters
Ministry of Agriculture, Livestock and Food Supply
Secretariat of Agribusiness International Relations
Esplanada dos Ministérios
Bloco D – Edifício Sede – Sala 349
Brasília/DF - CEP : 70043-900
Tel :+ 55 61 3218 2968
Fax : + 55 61 3225 4738
Email : rogerio.silva@agricultura.gov.br

Ms Telma GONDO

General Coordinator of Agribusiness International Promotion
Ministry of Agriculture, Livestock and Food Supply
Secretariat of Agribusiness International Relations
Esplanada dos Ministérios
Bloco D – Edifício Sede – Sala 349
Brasília/DF - CEP : 70043-900
Tel :+ 55 61 3218 2510
Fax : + 55 61 3225 4738
Email : telma.gondo@agricultura.gov.br

Ms Tharyana KORNJEZUK

Coordinator of Public Relations & Ceremonial Matters
Ministry of Agriculture, Livestock and Food Supply
Department of Governmental Social Communication
Esplanada dos Ministérios
Bloco D – Edifício Sede – Sala 834
Brasília/DF - CEP : 70043-900
Tel :+ 55 61 3218 2244
Fax : + 55 61 3225 1815
Email : tharyana.kornijezuk@agricultura.gov.br

Ms Rosane HENN

Coordinator of Events & National Promotion
Ministry of Agriculture, Livestock and Food Supply
Department of Governmental Social Communication
Esplanada dos Ministérios
Bloco D – Edifício Sede – Sala 834
Brasília/DF - CEP : 70043-900
Tel :+ 55 61 3218 2797
Fax : + 55 61 3225 2892
Email : rosane.henn@agricultura.gov.br ; eventos-
gm@agricultura.gov.br

Dr Célio BROVINO PORTO

Secretary of Agribusiness International Relations
Ministry of Agriculture, Livestock and Food Supply
Secretariat of Agribusiness International Relations
Esplanada dos Ministérios
Bloco D – Edifício Sede – Gabinete SRI
Brasília/DF - CEP : 70043-900
Tel :+ 55 61 3218 2510
Fax : + 55 61 3225 4738
Email : celio.porto@agricultura.gov.br

DRAFT MAXIMUM RESIDUE LIMITS FOR VETERINARY DRUGS

(at Step 8 of the Elaboration Procedure)

Melengestrol Acetate (production aid)**Acceptable Daily Intake:** 0-0.03 µg/kg bw (54th JECFA, 2000)**Residue Definition:** Melengestrol acetate

Species	Tissue	MRLs (µg/kg)	Step	JECFA	ALINORM
Cattle	Muscle	1	8	66	16III, 17IV
Cattle	Liver	10	8	54, 58, 66	16III, 17IV
Cattle	Kidney	2	8	66	16III, 17IV
Cattle	Fat	18	8	54, 58, 66	13V, 14IV, 16III, 17IV

Keys for List of MRLs for Veterinary Drugs

Step: (r), revised MRL; (a), amended MRL; T, temporary MRL.

JECFA: Meeting number of the Joint FAO/WHO Expert Committee on Food Additives where the MRL was recommended/considered.

CCRVDF: Session number of the CCRVDF where the MRL was considered and Appendix number of its report where the MRL is contained.

PROPOSED DRAFT MAXIMUM RESIDUE LIMITS FOR VETERINARY DRUGS

(at Step 5/8 of the Elaboration Procedure)

Avilamycin (antimicrobial agent)

Acceptable Daily Intake: 0–2 mg/kg body weight on the basis of a NOAEL of 150 mg avilamycin activity/kg body weight per day and a safety factor of 100 and rounding to one significant figure (70th JECFA, 2008).

Residue Definition: Dichloroisoevernic acid (DIA).

Species	Tissue	MRLs (µg/kg)	Step	JECFA	ALINORM
Pigs	Muscle	200	5/8	70	
Pigs	Liver	300	5/8	70	
Pigs	Kidney	200	5/8	70	
Pigs	Skin/Fat	200	5/8	70	
Chicken	Muscle	200	5/8	70	
Chicken	Liver	300	5/8	70	
Chicken	Kidney	200	5/8	70	
Chicken	Skin/Fat	200	5/8	70	
Turkey	Muscle	200	5/8	70	
Turkey	Liver	300	5/8	70	
Turkey	Kidney	200	5/8	70	
Turkey	Skin/Fat	200	5/8	70	
Rabbits	Muscle	200	5/8	70	
Rabbits	Liver	300	5/8	70	
Rabbits	Kidney	200	5/8	70	
Rabbits	Skin/Fat	200	5/8	70	

Dexamethasone (glucocorticosteroid)

Acceptable Daily Intake: 0–0.015 µg/kg body weight (42nd JECFA, 1995).

Residue Definition: Dexamethasone.

Species	Tissue	MRLs (µg/kg)	Step	JECFA	ALINORM
Cattle	Muscle	1.0	5/8	70	
Cattle	Liver	2.0	5/8	70	
Cattle	Kidney	1.0	5/8	70	
Cattle	Milk	0.3 µg/l	5/8	70	
Pigs	Muscle	1.0	5/8	70	
Pigs	Liver	2.0	5/8	70	
Pigs	Kidney	1.0	5/8	70	
Horses	Muscle	1.0	5/8	70	
Horses	Liver	2.0	5/8	70	
Horses	Kidney	1.0	5/8	70	

Keys for List of MRLs for Veterinary Drugs

Step: (r), revised MRL; (a), amended MRL; T, temporary MRL.

JECFA: Meeting number of the Joint FAO/WHO Expert Committee on Food Additives where the MRL was recommended/considered.

CCRVDF: Session number of the CCRVDF where the MRL was considered and Appendix number of its report where the MRL is contained.

Monensin (antimicrobial agent)

Acceptable Daily Intake: 0–10 µg/kg body weight on the basis of a NOAEL of 1.14 mg/kg body weight per day and a safety factor of 100 and rounding to one significant figure. (70th JECFA, 2008).

Residue Definition: Monensin.

Species	Tissue	MRLs (µg/kg)	Step	JECFA	ALINORM
Cattle	Muscle	10	5/8	70	
Cattle	Liver	20	5/8	70	
Cattle	Kidney	10	5/8	70	
Cattle	Fat	100	5/8	70	
Cattle	Milk	2	5/8	70	
Sheep	Muscle	10	5/8	70	
Sheep	Liver	20	5/8	70	
Sheep	Kidney	10	5/8	70	
Sheep	Fat	100	5/8	70	
Goats	Muscle	10	5/8	70	
Goats	Liver	20	5/8	70	
Goats	Kidney	10	5/8	70	
Goats	Fat	100	5/8	70	
Chicken	Muscle	10	5/8	70	
Chicken	Liver	10	5/8	70	
Chicken	Kidney	10	5/8	70	
Chicken	Fat	100	5/8	70	
Turkey	Muscle	10	5/8	70	
Turkey	Liver	10	5/8	70	
Turkey	Kidney	10	5/8	70	
Turkey	Fat	100	5/8	70	
Quail	Muscle	10	5/8	70	
Quail	Liver	10	5/8	70	
Quail	Kidney	10	5/8	70	
Quail	Fat	100	5/8	70	

Narasin (antimicrobial agent)

Acceptable Daily Intake: 0–5 µg/kg body weight on the basis of a NOAEL of 0.5 mg/kg body weight per day and a safety factor of 100 (70th JECFA, 2008).

Residue Definition: Narasin A.

Species	Tissue	MRLs (µg/kg)	Step	JECFA	ALINORM
Chicken	Muscle	15	5/8	70	
Chicken	Liver	50	5/8	70	
Chicken	Kidney	15	5/8	70	
Chicken	Fat	50	5/8	70	

Triclabendazole (anthelmintic)

Acceptable Daily Intake: 0–3 µg/kg body weight (40th JECFA, 1993).

Residue Definition: Ketotriclabendazole.

Species	Tissue	MRLs (µg/kg)	Step	JECFA	ALINORM
Cattle	Muscle	250	5/8	70	
Cattle	Liver	850	5/8	70	
Cattle	Kidney	400	5/8	70	
Cattle	Skin/Fat	100	5/8	70	
Sheep	Muscle	200	5/8	70	
Sheep	Liver	300	5/8	70	
Sheep	Kidney	200	5/8	70	
Sheep	Skin/Fat	100	5/8	70	

Tylosin (antimicrobial agent)

Acceptable Daily Intake: 0–30 µg/kg body weight based on a microbiological end-point derived from in vitro MIC susceptibility testing and faecal binding data (MIC calc = 1.698) (70th JECFA, 2008).

Residue Definition: Tylosin A.

Species	Tissue	MRLs (µg/kg)	Step	JECFA	ALNORM
Cattle	Muscle	100	5/8	70	
Cattle	Liver	100	5/8	70	
Cattle	Kidney	100	5/8	70	
Cattle	Fat	100	5/8	70	
Cattle	Milk	100	5/8	70	
Pigs	Muscle	100	5/8	70	
Pigs	Liver	100	5/8	70	
Pigs	Kidney	100	5/8	70	
Pigs	Fat	100	5/8	70	
Chicken	Muscle	100	5/8	70	
Chicken	Liver	100	5/8	70	
Chicken	Kidney	100	5/8	70	
Chicken	Skin/Fat	100	5/8	70	
Chicken	Eggs	300	5/8	70	

PROPOSED DRAFT MAXIMUM RESIDUE LIMITS FOR VETERINARY DRUGS

(at Step 5 of the Elaboration Procedure)

Narasin (antimicrobial agent)**Acceptable Daily Intake:** 0–5 µg/kg body weight on the basis of a NOAEL of 0.5 mg/kg body weight per day and a safety factor of 100 (70th JECFA, 2008).**Residue Definition:** Narasin A.

Species	Tissue	MRLs (µg/kg)	Step	JECFA	ALINORM
Cattle	Muscle	15 T ^a	5	70	
Cattle	Liver	50 T ^a	5	70	
Cattle	Kidney	15 T ^a	5	70	
Cattle	Fat	50 T ^a	5	70	
Pigs	Muscle	15	5	70	
Pigs	Liver	50	5	70	
Pigs	Kidney	15	5	70	
Pigs	Fat	50	5	70	

^a The MRL is temporary. Before re-evaluation of narasin with the aim of recommending MRLs in tissues of cattle, the Committee would require a detailed description of a regulatory method, including its performance characteristics and validation data. This information is required by the end of 2010.

Tilmicosin (antimicrobial agent)**Acceptable Daily Intake:** 0–40 µg/kg body weight (47th JECFA, 1998).**Residue Definition:** Tilmicosin.

Species	Tissue	MRLs (µg/kg)	Step	JECFA	ALINORM
Chicken	Muscle	150	5	70	
Chicken	Liver	2400	5	70	
Chicken	Kidney	600	5	70	
Chicken	Skin/Fat	250	5	70	
Turkey	Muscle	100	5	70	
Turkey	Liver	1400	5	70	
Turkey	Kidney	1200	5	70	
Turkey	Skin/Fat	250	5	70	

**DRAFT GUIDELINES FOR THE DESIGN AND IMPLEMENTATION OF NATIONAL
REGULATORY FOOD SAFETY ASSURANCE PROGRAMME ASSOCIATED WITH THE USE
OF VETERINARY DRUGS IN FOOD PRODUCING ANIMALS**

(at Step 8 of the Elaboration Procedure)

Table of Contents

	paragraphs
Introduction	1-5
Scope	6
General Principles	7-12
Approach based on risk	13-20
Definitions (for the purpose of these Guidelines)	
Regulatory Framework	
Roles	21-23
Approval by competent authority	24-29
Information on veterinary drugs	30
Sale and use	31-36
Responsibilities of business operators (best practice guidance)	37-46
Verification programmes	
Purpose	47-49
General design principles	50-52
System and targeted verification programme design	53
Risk profiling	54-62
Choice of verification programme	
System verification programmes	63-67
Risk targeted verification programmes	68-69
Surveys	70
Review	71-72
Sample taking	
General principles	73-74
Traceability/product tracing	75-77
Statistical considerations	
General	78-87
Retention of consignments during laboratory analysis	88
Result interpretation	89-91
Port of entry testing programmes (specific requirements)	92-109
Regulatory Action	
Investigation of non-compliances	110-113
Measures in case of non-compliance: Conduct	114-119
Measures in case of non-compliance: Product	120-124
Corrective action in case of non-compliance	125-129
Interaction between the control programmes of two competent authorities	130-133
ANALYTICAL METHODS FOR RESIDUE CONTROL	
General considerations on analytical methods for residue control	

Introduction	134-136
Integrating analytical methods for residue control	137-143
Consideration for selection and validation of analytical methods	
Identification of Methods Requirements	144-146
Implementing other Codex Alimentarius Commission Guidelines	147-148
Method Validation and Fitness for Purpose	149-154
Single Laboratory Validation – The Criteria Approach	155-156
Attributes of analytical methods for residues of veterinary drugs in foods	
Introduction	157
Method development consideration	158-159
Analytical performance characteristics	
Performance Characteristics of Screening Methods	160-163
Performance Characteristics for Quantitative Methods	164-174
Performance Characteristics for Confirmatory Methods	175-181
General Performance Characteristics for Methods for Use in a Regulatory Control Programme	182-185
Method development and validation considerations for residue control methods	
Selection of Appropriate Test Material for Validation	186-189
Measurement Uncertainty	190
Use of Internal Standards	191
Environmental Considerations	192
Choice of Validation Model	193-194
Quality Control and Quality Assurance	195
Appendix A - Sampling strategies	
Non-biased sampling	
Purpose	1
Statistical considerations on sampling population size	2-6
Sampling Confidence reporting	7-10
Directed or targeted sampling	
Purpose	11-13
Appendix B - Sampling of commodities	
Scope	1
Definitions	
Sampling procedures	2-9
Specific sample preparation instructions for honey	10
Statistical concerns	11
Stratified random sampling	12-15
Systematic sampling	16-17
Biased or estimated worst case sampling	18-19
Preparation of laboratory samples	20-22
Shipment of laboratory samples	23
Result interpretation in the laboratory	24-25
Sampling records	26-27
Guidance on sample type and quantity for different commodities	
Table A: – meat and poultry products	
Table B: – milk, eggs and dairy products	

DRAFT GUIDELINES FOR THE DESIGN AND IMPLEMENTATION OF NATIONAL REGULATORY FOOD SAFETY ASSURANCE PROGRAMME ASSOCIATED WITH THE USE OF VETERINARY DRUGS IN FOOD PRODUCING ANIMALS

Introduction

1. Modern food production systems should be designed and managed to ensure that the exposure of food producing animals to veterinary drugs does not pose a risk to human health.
2. The commercial entities involved in the production and marketing of food have the primary responsibility for ensuring food safety. The role of competent authorities is to control the use of veterinary drugs and to verify that appropriate practices are being applied and effective measures are in place within the veterinary drug distribution and food production systems to provide effective protection for consumer health and ensure fair practice in the food trade, consistent with the goals of Codex Alimentarius. All parties also have a responsibility to provide consumers information and education to facilitate sound choice of food products of animal origin.
3. The application of a programme based on risk to all food types should provide the controls and verification consistent with the risk that the food type may pose to consumers. The application of an approach based on risk across all food groups and hazard classes should allow a more focussed application of resources to those areas which are most likely to generate real human health protection gains.
4. Risk profiles for different hazards may vary by country, region, species and/or production system. The application of a control and verification assurance programme based on risk should provide the necessary basis for exporting countries to certify the safety of exported food, and for importing countries to have the confidence to accept such consignments.
5. It is recognized that in particular developing countries may need a transition period and/or technical assistance regarding the full implementation of these Guidelines.

Scope

6. This guide is intended to provide the overarching principles and guidance for governments on the design and implementation of national and trade related food safety assurance programmes for residues of veterinary drugs. The current and future annexes to this guide may provide a further refinement of guidance on issues which may be relevant to the control and verification programmes for products from certain species. These annexes should be read in conjunction with the principles outlined in this guide.

General Principles

7. Programmes for the control of residues of veterinary drugs in foods should:
 - i. Be based on risk using realistic risk profiles assessed as reasonably likely to be associated with food derived from the relevant productions system(s);
 - ii. Be prevention focussed based on the realistic risk profiles associated with the probable or known use of approved, non-approved and prohibited veterinary drugs in the production system;
 - iii. Include regulatory measures proportionate to the relative human health risk associated with these hazards compared with other food-associated hazards;
 - iv. Ensure all parties involved in the production, marketing and processing system of the animals and/or the food products derived from them are held accountable to ensure that unsafe animal products will not be sold as a result of their action or inaction;
 - v. Recognise that pre-harvest controls and practices are the primary means for ensuring safe food;
 - vi. Recognise that the primary role of audits and sampling programmes is to verify the implementation and effectiveness of the pre-harvest controls and practices;
 - vii. Focus on system and population based assurances; and
 - viii. Be cost effective and have the support of stakeholders.

8. It should be recognised that veterinary drugs are regulated in many countries for a variety of reasons, such as animal health, animal welfare and protection of the environment. Where these uses and the related standards do not fall under the mandate of the Codex Alimentarius Commission, they should be clearly identified and justified where, for reason of efficiency, they form part of the Competent Authority's residue control programme.

9. The Codex Alimentarius Commission's recommended sampling procedures for residues of veterinary drugs in food are exempted from the general sampling procedures of food commodities developed by the *Codex Committee on Methods of Analysis and Sampling*. Accordingly, this guideline includes sampling procedures relevant for the entire control programme.

10. The safety of foods is achieved by the implementation of appropriate rules applied from primary production or import to retail or export and requires the participation of all parties involved. Competent Authorities should verify correct implementation of programmes and, where necessary, if action has been taken.

11. The reliability of laboratory results is important for the decision making of Competent Authorities. Thus official laboratories should use methods validated as fit for purpose and work under internationally accepted (e.g. ISO 17025) quality management principles.

12. A control programme designed and implemented according to this guideline provides reassurance for importing countries to accept consignments certified as safe by the exporting country.

Approach based on risk

13. An approach based on risk applied across the entire production chain and on all food groups and potential hazards will allow Competent Authorities to focus application of resources to areas of highest risk which are most likely to have an impact on consumer health protection.

14. Continuous application of good practices and regular control contribute more significantly to food safety than end product testing.

15. Residues may exert an adverse effect on consumers in a number of ways, such as:

- (a) Chronic toxicological adverse effects;
- (b) Acute pharmacological effects on consumers and on the microflora of the gastrointestinal tract of consumers;
- (c) Allergic reactions.

16. Different types of controls and monitoring programme may be justified where the risk assessment identifies one or more of these other end-points as being significant for human health. Detections of non-compliant residues (e.g. those exceeding applicable MRLs) justify regulatory follow up.

17. Animals and/or production systems can be exposed to a variety of veterinary drugs and other chemicals that may as a result be present in the products derived from them. Their importance for consumer health protection, however, varies with type and source.

18. An understanding of the circumstances required for each veterinary drug input to actually pose a risk to consumers of animal products, along with an estimate of the relative likelihood of this occurring, is essential to determine the appropriate controls and verification programmes which should be included in the design of national residue control and verification programmes.

19. The application of a control and verification programme based on risk should provide the necessary basis for exporting countries to certify, where required, the safety of exported food, and for importing countries, subject to any additional assessment they deem necessary, to accept such consignments.

20. The same principles should apply to export assurance programmes as are applied to the design and implementation of national assurance programmes.

Definitions (for the purposes of these Guidelines)

Competent Authority(ies) means the official government organisation/agency(ies) having jurisdiction¹.

Approved means officially authorised or recognised by a competent authority.

Based on risk means focussed on and proportionate to an estimate of the probability and severity of an adverse effect occurring in consumers.

Risk profiles are defined in the Codex Procedural Manual. For veterinary drugs they relate a production system to a potential consumer health risk. They are the basis for approvals and use restrictions.

System verification means obtaining overall information on the extent of application of the practices and controls.

Risk targeted verification programmes means inspection/audit and/or sampling/laboratory analysis of specific suppliers or products aimed at the detection of non-compliance.

Non-biased sampling refers to the random sampling of specified populations to provide information about the occurrence of residue non-compliances, typically on an annual, national basis. Compounds selected for non-biased sampling are usually based on risk profiles and the availability of laboratory methods suitable for regulatory purposes. The results of non-biased sampling are a measure of the effectiveness and appropriateness of the controls and practices within a wider segment of the production system.

Survey refers to the collection of additional data aimed at the investigation of residues linked to a specific veterinary drug use or production type.

Withdrawal time/ Withholding time (food harvest restriction) are defined in the *Codex Glossary of Terms and Definitions (Veterinary Drugs Residues in Foods)* (CAC/MISC 5-1993). A period of time may also be represented by a combination of events or other factors.

Production system means the methods or activities used to produce food for human consumption.

Quality control (in residue laboratories) means monitoring those factors associated with the analysis of a sample by a tester.

Quality assurance (in residue laboratories) means independent review to ensure that the analytical programme is performing in an acceptable manner.

Quality management system ensures that a laboratory is managed and operated in a manner that meets the requirements of an internationally recognized quality standard to produce quality data and results (e.g. ISO 17025: 2005).

Regulatory Framework

Roles

21. Business operators/commercial entities involved in the production, processing and marketing of food have the primary responsibility for ensuring food safety.

22. Competent Authorities regulate the use of veterinary drugs, verify that appropriate practices are applied and that effective measures are in place within the veterinary drug distribution and food production system to provide effective protection of consumers and facilitate trade, consistent with the goals of Codex Alimentarius.

23. The competent authority responsible for providing consumer assurances for foods must ensure that it has sufficient knowledge of and control over veterinary drugs that are being sold and used within the production systems and that it has sufficient knowledge of food safety.

¹ Definition used in the *Codex Guidelines for the Production, Processing, Labelling and Marketing of Organically Produced Foods* (CAC/GL 32-1999).

Approval by competent authority

Criteria

24. Appropriate official approval criteria should be established. These criteria may include the acceptance of the assessments of other recognised competent authorities where use patterns are likely to be similar.
25. Approval systems should:
- (a) Require an evaluation of the human safety of residues of the veterinary drug relying on a risk analysis and establishing, where appropriate, maximum residue limits;
 - (b) Take into account the needs of the producers in order to reduce the temptation to use unapproved veterinary drugs or prohibited substances.
26. Approval systems should take into account that risk profiles and management options may vary substantially among production systems and regions.

Approval restrictions

27. The conditions for the approval of veterinary drugs should be specified in the appropriate national regulations.
28. To mitigate potential risk, restrictions may be imposed on:
- (a) Formulations;
 - (b) Criteria of use (e.g. time, species) and route of administration;
 - (c) Indications for use; and
 - (d) Withdrawal time/withholding time/food harvest restriction.

National register

29. All formulations of veterinary drugs approved in a country should be recorded in a national register.

Information on veterinary drugs

30. Information and/or education programmes on suitable use to provide effective treatment while affording protection of consumers should be provided for each approved veterinary product formulation.

Sale and use

31. National/regional regulations should establish which veterinary drugs may be sold domestically and how these may be used. Formulations not recorded in the national register should not be used and sanctions should be in place to act as a deterrent against such use.
32. It may be appropriate, where justified by a relevant risk profile for Competent Authorities, to impose additional conditions on the sale and use of certain veterinary drugs to ensure appropriate use and to prevent misuse or abuse.
33. Sale and use conditions may include:
- (a) Requiring all sales to be subject to a prescription from a veterinarian or other professional with approved competencies;
 - (b) Restricting administration to individuals or professionals with approved competencies;
 - (c) Requiring all treated animals/production systems to be identified in specified ways;
 - (d) Requiring all uses to be recorded and/or notified to a unified database(s).
34. Efficacy and the necessity of use conditions should be regularly reviewed against the local risk profile. In doing this it should be considered that the non-availability of necessary treatments may encourage use of non-approved veterinary drugs or prohibited substances.

35. Competent Authorities may establish legislation/regulation that allows, as an exception, the use of non-approved veterinary drugs off-label/extra label in accordance with direct and written veterinary advice and oversight. Such legislation should be consistent with national and/or international guidance and technical information on this issue.

36. In animals from which milk, eggs or honey, respectively, are collected for human consumption, only veterinary drugs specifically approved for use in lactating animals, laying birds and honey bees should be used. Specific exemptions may be made for off-label/extra label use.

Responsibilities of business operators (best practice guidance)

37. Producers should only use veterinary drugs which have been approved for use in food producing animals. Non-approved veterinary drugs should not be used. Veterinary drugs should be used strictly in accordance with the officially approved/recognised instructions. Off-label use of veterinary drugs should only be permitted in accordance with direct and written advice from a veterinarian in accordance with national authorities' laws and regulations. Such advice should be consistent with national and/or international guidance documents and technical information on this issue.

38. Producers should be encouraged to seek advice of veterinarians or other competent professionals on the application of the correct withdrawal time, where the label direction for use may not be available or may not be clear.

39. Records should be kept of all details of the treatment and the withdrawal time/withholding time required before the animal or product from the animal can be harvested for human consumption.

40. Business operators (whether primary producers or others) should be required to communicate food harvesting restrictions (withdrawal/withholding times) still in place on the animal or animal product at the time of sale to subsequent purchasers of the animal(s).

41. Processors should be required to ensure that they only purchase and/or process animals and/or animal products from suppliers (whether primary producer or others) who can credibly attest to the suitability/safety of the animal or animal product for the purpose intended.

42. Producers should have appropriate on-farm food safety assurance measures in place with respect to the use of and/or exposure of food-producing animals to veterinary drugs. All workers directly involved with the animals should be familiar with these measures.

43. Producers should be able to identify all food-producing animals, or lots of these animals, which have been treated with or exposed to veterinary drugs to ensure compliance with withdrawal/withholding times.

44. Continuous food safety assurance measures such as record keeping should ensure that products (e.g. milk, eggs, honey) are harvested only if appropriate withdrawal/withholding times have been followed.

45. Treated or exposed animals for which the withdrawal time/withholding time has not elapsed should be kept separate from animals that have not been treated, or be positively identified to reduce the potential for mistakes.

46. Products from animals under harvest restrictions should be handled in such a way that ensures their product does not mix with that being harvested for human consumption. Any equipment likely to be contaminated should be adequately cleaned prior to being used on other animals.

Verification programmes

Purpose

47. A verification programme that combines audits/inspection of various control points and point of harvest testing should be implemented. This approach will reduce reliance on chemical analyses and provide a higher degree of assurance.

48. The overall objective of the verification programme is to provide an appropriate degree of confidence that the practices and controls in place are adequate and being applied to the extent necessary to ensure the health of consumers of animal products. It will therefore attempt to ensure that exposure to residues in excess of the ADI rarely occurs.

49. Verification programmes may contribute to the:

- (a) Verification of assumptions made in the registration process;
- (b) Identification of unacceptable production, marketing and/or chains of advice;
- (c) Evaluation of the effectiveness of veterinary drug label information as it relates to food safety;
- (d) Evaluation of the effectiveness of education or risk reduction programmes;
- (e) Evaluation of Quality Management Systems;
- (f) Verification of implementation and effectiveness of corrective actions.

General design principles

50. Verification programmes should cover, as appropriate, the entire food chain. A combined system of inspection/audits and sampling/laboratory analysis should be implemented. The frequency, point and type of activity should be based on an assessment of the risk to provide the most effective control.

51. Verification programmes can be classified as follows according to objective and criteria applied to the sample selection:

- (a) System verification programmes;
- (b) Risk-targeted verification programmes;
- (c) Surveys;
- (d) Port of entry testing programmes.

52. Verification programmes may focus on assessing the

- (a) Effectiveness of a control system; and/or
- (b) Compliance by individuals or groups.

System and targeted verification programme design

53. Verification programmes should:

- (a) Define their purpose;
- (b) Identify the population being sampled;
- (c) State whether the sampling is non-biased or targeted (directed); and
 - base the number of samples for non-biased sampling protocols on statistics;
 - pre-determine targeting criteria to direct sampling;
- (d) Pre-determine the criteria to be applied to the analysis of the results;
- (e) Define sampling and identification procedures that allow tracing each sample back to its origin and independent confirmation of the finding in case of dispute.

Risk Profiling

54. It is the responsibility of the Competent Authorities to determine the risk profiles for their country and/or production system.

55. The frequency and intensity of verification or inspection/audit of each drug residue chosen to be monitored under the system verification programme should depend on the veterinary drug and use profile.

56. Risk profile considerations concerning veterinary drugs include:

- (a) The type of hazard presented;
- (b) The class and severity of the adverse human health effect associated with the residue (e.g. chronic toxicity, acute pharmacological, allergic reaction, or microbiological disturbance);

- (c) The use and/or production circumstances required to produce residues and the likelihood of these occurring in foods derived from the production system at concentrations and in frequencies presenting a risk to consumer health;
- (d) The dietary consumption required for the residue to give rise to a realistic consumer health risk.

57. Competent Authorities should attempt to make realistic estimates of the types, quantities and use patterns of veterinary drugs in their jurisdiction.

58. Subsequently the following should be considered:

- (a) Circumstances required for each veterinary drug to cause an adverse health impact on consumers;
- (b) Likelihood of such circumstances occurring.

59. When considering and ranking the residues associated with the veterinary drugs likely to be present at some stage in the production system potential sources and exposure pathways should be described.

60. The following sources of veterinary drug residue should be considered:

- (a) Veterinary drugs authorised in the jurisdiction of the Competent Authority;
- (b) Veterinary drugs that are known to be, or suspected of being misused.

61. The exposure pathways of veterinary drug residue should be considered:

- (a) Intended e.g. direct administration to the animals;
- (b) Indirect administration to the animals through addition to feed or water;
- (c) Unintended contamination via e.g. feed, water, or the environment.

62. Competent Authorities should, as appropriate to the risk profiles in the country and/or production system, consider the following potential pre-harvest control points for audit/inspection in the verification programme:

- (a) The sellers and purchasers of veterinary drugs to verify what is being sold and how they are being marketed;
- (b) The users of veterinary drugs (including farmers, veterinarians and feed compounders) to verify how drugs are actually being used in the production systems, e.g. according to label, what records are being kept and how the treatment status of animals is identified;
- (c) The animal and animal product distributors to verify that any food harvest restrictions associated with the animal or product are effectively communicated;
- (d) The assurance systems used by processors and/or producers to ensure the suitability of the animals or product they are being supplied with for the purposes they intend using it for.

Choice of verification programme

System verification programmes

63. In setting up system verification programmes the following should be considered:

- (a) Examination of the relevant control points of the control system;
- (b) Non-biased sampling of a specified population with broadly similar attributes so that the results can be used to derive a statistical confidence as to the extent of control present in that population as a whole.

64. System verification programmes can focus on the degree of application of specific controls in the process or can focus on monitoring the residues in the animals/products at or close to the point of harvest.

65. Non-biased sampling programmes should be used in order to find out whether one of the controls within the system needs adjusting. They should not be relied upon for product evaluation.

66. Where the Competent Authority has linked the approval of a veterinary drug to particular use conditions/restrictions in order to avoid misuse or abuse, the appropriateness of the use conditions/use restrictions should be regularly verified with risk-targeted verification programmes as to their efficacy and necessity to manage the risk posed by the use of the veterinary drug.

67. Generally non-biased sampling protocols are not efficient in detecting low incidences of non-compliance. Where such incidences are a potential significant risk to human health other assurance programmes should be employed.

Risk targeted verification programmes

68. In setting up risk targeted verification programmes the following should be considered:

- (a) Previous performance, history of non-compliance;
- (b) The quality management components usually relied on;
- (c) Potential risk factors which may be correlated with an increased use of veterinary drugs such as;
 - high somatic cell counts in milk, or
 - significant ante- or post-mortem findings e.g. injection site lesions or resolving pathology;
- (d) Any other information linked to non-compliance and drug use.

69. Competent Authorities may complement the risk-targeted pre-harvest verification programmes with established risk-targeted post-harvest verification programmes.

Surveys

70. Surveys may be performed to:

- (a) Assess the initial situation before a verification programme is started;
- (b) Evaluate the efficiency and appropriateness of specific aspects of control programmes;
- (c) Monitor the impact that variables, such as location, season, or age, may have on the presence, absence or concentration of a residue.

Review

71. Control and verification programmes should be regularly reviewed to ensure their continued efficacy and/or necessity, as well as to review the potential impact of changes to the risk profiles.

72. Where a significant incidence of non-compliance is identified in any one year and consequent changes to the control programme implemented, a higher standard of verification may be appropriate until the effectiveness of the corrective actions has been demonstrated. Some of the selected lower risk profile veterinary drugs should be considered for rotation in and out of the programme based on history of compliance to ensure that the scope is as wide as possible.

Sample taking

General principles

73. Appropriate mechanisms to prevent possible bias occurring in both the selection and taking of samples should be put in place.

74. Ideally, samples should be taken before animals and/or products are commingled with animals or product from other suppliers.

Traceability/product tracing

75. Competent Authorities should ensure that all samples can, throughout the sampling, storing, shipping, analysis and reporting, be traced back to their origin.

76. Each sample needs to be clearly identified so that appropriate follow-on actions can be applied in case of non-compliant results.

77. If sub-units of a consignment are sampled, care should be taken to identify those sub-units clearly. Sufficient sample should be taken to allow for unprocessed sub-units to be retained allowing possible independent confirmation of the findings.

Statistical considerations

General

78. The number of samples for system verification programmes can be statistically pre-determined (*see* Appendix A for additional guidance).

79. In designing a sampling protocol it is essential to define both the purpose of the programme and the population of interest. It is also important to define the criteria to be applied when analysing the results with respect to the need/desirability for any further action, and especially how such criteria and actions directly relate to the protection of human health.

80. Ultimately “a population” made up of “units of food consumed” is the most relevant to human health. However, as it is the application of appropriate pre-harvest practices and controls which ensures food safety, a sampling strategy which verifies both the appropriateness and extent of compliance of these pre-harvest practices and controls can be used to provide appropriate assurances that the health of consumers is unlikely to be negatively affected. Generally the population of interest for targeting pre-harvest compliance/appropriateness verification information will be those population units to which common practices and controls should be applied such as:

- (a) The seller of the veterinary drug input into the production system;
- (b) The producer;
- (c) The supplier of the animals or animal product to the processor; or
- (d) The processor.

81. However, because the potential consequences to human health are much larger when large production units (farms) are out of control, the usual pre-harvest population randomly sampled is a standardised unit of production sold at any one time e.g. individual animal, vat of milk, barrel of honey, or defined weight of aquaculture product. In this way the larger producers/suppliers should effectively have a greater probability of being sampled while still maintaining the randomness of the sampling protocol.

82. Generally, conclusions will be drawn from the prevalence, or lack thereof, of non-complying results in the units sampled during the production season or calendar year. However, where problems are found during the course of the production season, corrective actions may have already been applied and have started to have a positive effect well before the end of production season or calendar year. For small populations, or for either low risk or reasonably stable exposure scenarios, several production seasons or calendar years may be used/ needed to collect the number of samples statistically determined to give the required confidence.

83. Where it is possible to further refine and describe the affected population associated with defined risk factors such as season, region or specific type of production, then a correlation of the sampling protocol to such a co-variable may be justified.

84. The point at which a sample is taken depends on the objective of the specific programme. Where the objective is to verify the effectiveness of controls at the supplier stage, generally samples are taken at the point of sale/harvest in order to correlate the unit sampled with a supplier or producer.

85. On-farm sampling may also be used as part of a pre-harvest quality assurance programme or where there are concerns associated with the possible use of substances prohibited by the Competent Authority.

86. Where the objective is to verify the overall effectiveness of a system at ensuring the general population's exposure is less than the ADI then multiple sample units can be combined before analysis, or commingled product sampled and analysed.

87. Where the objective is to verify the credibility and effectiveness of the control and verification programmes present in an exporting country, samples may be taken from standardised units of export at the port of entry. Such secondary verification programmes have quite different design considerations with respect to their objective, the population of interest and the type of response to any identified incidence of non-compliance. The statistical tables in Appendix A are not relevant to such programmes and the number of samples should reflect the importing country's confidence in the performance of the exporting country.

Retention of consignments during laboratory analysis

88. Competent authorities should not routinely retain lots of production associated with randomly selected samples pending the availability of the analytical results. Competent Authorities may routinely retain lots of production where it is considered likely that a risk targeted test will produce non-compliant results that present a potential risk for consumer health.

Result interpretation

89. A greater degree of assurance is achieved if verification programmes such as statistically based systems involving non-biased sampling and risk targeted (e.g. specific suppliers or products) are operated in parallel.

90. The results of risk targeted verification programmes alone do not allow conclusions on the exposure of the general population with residues of veterinary drugs.

91. Conclusions on the exposure of the general population can be drawn from the combining the results of:

- (a) Statistically based system verification programmes involving non-biased sampling; and
- (b) Risk targeted verification programmes.

Port of entry testing programmes (specific requirements)

92. Competent Authorities should consider port of entry testing programmes only as a secondary system verification tool.

93. The matrices used in port of entry programmes may vary from those used for national verification programmes.

94. Except where a risk to health is suspected or detected, certified product should be subjected to non-biased sampling and release programmes at a frequency determined by the importing country based on the exporting country's record of compliance. Consignments of animal products tend to be heterogeneous by nature and will often be made up from a variety of animals, farms and processing dates. Results will reflect the performance of the national control and verification system as a whole and should not be extrapolated to specific judgements on other units within the consignment except where a common pre-harvest risk factor is shared and a direct health threat is indicated.

95. The application of directed or targeted sampling in port of entry sampling programmes is only appropriate where it is known or suspected that products share the same risk profile.

96. However, following the detection of non-compliant results during port of entry programmes, importing countries may increase the overall frequency of testing of directly related food of animal origin from the exporting country for a period as an added verification of the effectiveness of any additional controls being implemented by the exporting country.

97. In the interpretation of laboratory results of consignments of animal products it should be considered that these are made up of commingled product from a variety of animals, farms and processing dates and, therefore, heterogeneous. Because of this, results should not be taken to judge other units of a consignment except where units share a common pre-harvest risk factor and where a direct risk to health is suspected or detected.

98. Results of port of entry testing programmes should only be communicated if confirmed with methods fully validated for the specific matrix and analyte.

99. Laboratory reports on non-compliant results should include:

- (a) A description of the method used;

- (b) Performance characteristics of the method of analysis (including the confidence interval of the result).

100. Laboratory reports on non-compliant results should be distributed to all parties affected by the result (e.g. the owner of the consignment and the certifying competent authority of the exporting country).

101. Competent Authorities of importing countries should provide exporting countries regularly with the results of their verification programmes including information for purposes of traceability/product tracing.

102. In cases of non-compliance with the food safety parameters, competent authorities from the exporting country should conduct a trace back, apply appropriate corrective actions and then provide a summary of these to the importing country.

103. Where the type, incidence and/or frequency of non-compliance detected raises concerns as to whether the imports are meeting the standard of human health protection required by the importing country, then additional assurances may be requested.

104. The importing country may also choose to increase the frequency of port of entry verification to confirm that the assurances given are in fact addressing the problem.

105. Where residues of substances that should not be used in food producing animals in either the exporting or the importing country are detected in port of entry testing, both competent authorities should co-operate in order to identify potentially similarly affected food of animal origin and to resolve any potential wider control problem.

106. Resolution of such problems will require the originating country to conduct an analysis to determine the possible source of such residues, the identification of deficiencies within the country's own control and monitoring system, and subsequent application of appropriate additional controls and measures to address the situation.

107. In cases where the exporting country is a less developed nation, consideration should be given by the importing country to the provision of technical assistance to help resolve the issue.

108. The application of new sampling and testing methods may reveal the presence of types and concentrations of residues previously unknown to exist by one or both parties. The determination of the source of such residues and their significance may take some time.

109. Where the presence of such residues is associated with previously accepted production practices, the implementation of changes, should these be deemed necessary, may require an extended period of time for capacity building.

Regulatory Action

Investigation of non-compliances

110. Competent authorities should investigate each non-compliant result to ascertain the contributing factors which lead to its occurrence and the systemic significance of the identified case.

111. An attempt should be made to identify the substances and the consumer health significance of their occurrence in food.

112. When an animal tissue/food contains residues in excess of the relevant MRL at the point of harvest the following possibilities should be considered:

- (a) The veterinary drug was not used according to label or prescription instructions;
- (b) A non-authorized veterinary drug or formulation was used;
- (c) The recommended withholding time was not observed or is not appropriate;
- (d) Treated and non-treated animals were commingled;
- (e) Unintended exposure to feed, water or contaminated environment occurred;
- (f) The food is part of the statistically predictable small percentage of animals with residues in excess of the MRL even when the required withdrawal period has elapsed;

(g) Sample contamination, analytical method problems or analytical error.

113. Laboratories should report all suspect positive samples which they have not been able to positively confirm using established confirmation criteria. This will allow competent authority to identify possible patterns of non-compliance.

Measures in case of non-compliance: Conduct

114. Competent authorities should adjust the scale and type of response to identified non-compliances to the relative importance that the respective hazard has for consumer health protection.

115. Competent authorities should take proportionate action when considering whether the non-compliance is the result of negligence or intent.

116. Competent authorities should in case of isolated mistakes due to ignorance or negligence require that appropriate advice and training measures are followed.

117. In the case of proven negligence or intent punitive measures in line with the Codex member's penal system should be considered (e.g. condemnations, fines, movement controls, etc.) to act as a deterrent.

118. Competent authorities should, in case of widespread non-compliance, advise stakeholders and motivate the respective business sector to initiate the necessary changes.

119. Competent authorities should verify that appropriate corrective action is taken and monitor the success of these measures through inspection/audits and/or sampling/laboratory analysis.

Measures in case of non-compliance: Product

120. Unsafe product should not be passed as fit for human consumption and should be disposed of appropriately.

121. Where the results of samples taken on farm for risk targeted verification programmes do not provide the necessary confidence that the rest of the lot has been produced using appropriate practices and controls, the lot should not be passed for human consumption until sufficient information can be generated to provide the required degree of assurance as to its safety.

122. Where the results indicate there is a direct risk to consumer health, an attempt should be made to trace and remove all similarly affected products.

123. In non-biased sampling programmes the unidentified proportion may represent a much greater potential threat to consumers than the identified proportion. Accordingly, any actions taken with respect to the identified non-compliant lot are less significant than the actions taken on the system as a whole.

124. When pre-harvest controls are not carried out or are unreliable due to a high incidence of misuse of veterinary drugs, more frequent post-harvest verification may be appropriate to provide the required degree of consumer assurance. This should be regarded as an interim measure only until the appropriate corrective actions to the control programme have been put in place and subsequently demonstrated to be effective.

Corrective action in case of non-compliance

125. Depending on the results of such investigations local and/or systemic corrective actions may be considered appropriate to prevent reoccurrence.

126. Where the investigation of non-compliances indicates that use and distribution provisions for the substance(s) are inappropriate, competent authorities should take appropriate corrective action by modifying approval and distribution rules.

127. Where the investigation of non-compliances identifies local or systemic control failures, competent authorities should ensure that appropriate corrective action is taken at the relevant points.

128. The competent authority should verify that the measures are taken. Respective action should be proportionate in time and intensity to the consumer health hazard, scale and frequency of the non-compliance.

129. In cases where the failure lies outside of the direct control of the business operator the competent authority should prevent repetition of the failure by applying appropriate measures at the relevant control point.

Interaction between the control programmes of two competent authorities

130. Competent authorities should co-operate to ensure consumer health in all countries is protected.

131. This co-operation aims at achieving better assurance than can be achieved through sole reliance on port of entry inspection programmes.

132. Trading countries should exchange copies of their control and verification programmes along with the results of these programmes from preceding years on a regular basis.

133. In order to facilitate trade from developing countries longer transition periods and technical assistance regarding all aspects of a residue control programme should be considered.

ANALYTICAL METHODS FOR RESIDUE CONTROL**General Consideration on Analytical Methods for Residue Control****Introduction**

134. Analytical methods used to determine compliance with maximum residue limit for veterinary drugs (MRLVDs) should be suitable for routine use by competent authorities of member governments for their testing programmes for all residues of veterinary drugs and substances which may be used as veterinary drugs. This includes certain pesticides which have veterinary uses and that may be present as residues in commodities. These methods may be used for the analysis of randomly selected survey samples in a national regulatory control programme to determine compliance with established MRLVDs, for the analysis of targeted samples when there is reason to suspect non-compliance with MRLVDs or for the collection of data for use in estimation of intake.

135. Methods may also be required in regulatory control programmes for the detection of residues of substances for which ADIs and MRLVDs have not been established by the Codex Alimentarius Commission. For some substances, the toxicological evaluation leads to the conclusion that an ADI or MRLVD should not be established. For such substances, the determination of the lowest concentration at which the residue can be detected and the identity confirmed in a food is a primary concern in the method validation. Performance characteristics related to quantitative analyses may be less critical for such substances, where detection and confirmation of the presence of the substance as a residue is the major issue. Confirmation of identity of a residue is generally based on the comparison of a set of characteristics of a detected substance with those of a known standard of the suspected residue.

136. Suitably validated methods are not always available for all possible combinations of veterinary drug residues and foods. Competent authorities responsible for designing national residue control programmes should ensure that appropriate residue methods of analysis are used to assure compliance with Codex MRLVDs. This may sometimes require the development and validation of a new analytical method or the extension of the validation of an existing analytical method to include a new combination of analyte and matrix. Appropriate regulatory action may then be taken against adulterated products, consistent with the reliability of the analytical data.

Integrating analytical methods for residue control

137. Analytical methods for veterinary drug residues in foods must reliably detect the presence of an analyte of interest, determine its concentration and correctly identify the analyte. When residues resulting from the use of approved veterinary drugs are detected at concentrations above an established MRLVD, the results should be confirmed before regulatory enforcement actions are taken. In the case of substances which have been banned from use in food-producing animals by a competent authority, or for which an ADI and MRLVDs have not been established for toxicological reasons, the confirmed presence of residues at any concentration in a food may result in regulatory action.

138. The principal performance attributes of analytical methods used in residue control programmes are dependent on whether a method is intended to simply detect, to quantify, or to confirm the presence of a target residue. Completion of a full collaborative study² is not a requirement for recognition of a method to be placed in one of these three categories.

139. Screening methods are qualitative or semi-quantitative in nature and are used as screening methods to identify the presence (or absence) of samples from a herd or lot which may contain residues which exceed an MRLVD or other regulatory action limit established by a competent authority. These methods may not provide adequate information to accurately define the concentration present or, to confirm the structure of a residue but may be used to quickly determine which products require further testing and which can be released. They may be applied to a sample at the point of entry into the food chain, site of inspection or on receipt of a sample at the laboratory to determine if the sample contains residues which may exceed a regulatory limit. Such methods usually provide greater analytical efficiency, can sometimes be performed in non-laboratory environments and may be less expensive for use in regulatory control programmes than tests conducted within a laboratory. Use of screening methods allows the laboratory resources to be focused on analysis of the presumptive positive (suspect) samples identified using this test. These methods, which should have a defined and low false negative rate, should not be used alone for residue control purposes on official samples without the availability of suitably validated quantitative and/or confirmatory methods to apply to any samples identified as potentially not in compliance with an MRLVD.

140. Quantitative methods provide quantitative information which may be used to determine if residues in a particular sample exceed an MRLVD or other regulatory action limit, but do not provide unequivocal confirmation of the identity of the residue. Such methods which provide quantitative results must perform in good statistical control within the analytical range that brackets the MRLVD or regulatory action limit.

141. Confirmatory methods provide unequivocal confirmation of the identity of the residue and may also confirm the quantity present. Confirmatory methods are the most definitive and frequently are based on combined chromatographic and mass spectrometric techniques, such as liquid chromatography – mass spectrometry (LC/MS). Such methods when used for confirmation of residue identity should provide reliable structural information within established statistical limits. When the confirmatory method does not provide quantitative information, the quantification result of the original quantitative method should be verified by analysis of replicate test portions using the original quantitative method or a suitably validated alternative quantitative method.

142. These three categories of methods – screening, quantitative and confirmatory - often share some performance characteristics. In addition, each category has other specific considerations. Understanding the relationship between these three categories of methods is important in the development and operation of a balanced residue control programme. These three categories of methods may be applied sequentially in a residue control programme.

143. Samples which test “positive” with the screening method are considered as suspect and are usually designated for further laboratory testing using more definitive methods. This could include repeat testing of replicate test portions with a screening method, but typically quantitative and/or confirmatory methods are used in the laboratory to establish that the sample does contain residues in excess of the regulatory limit. Such tests should be conducted on new test portions of the sample material used in the initial screening test to confirm that the analyte detected in the initial test is definitely the suspected compound and that the MRLVD (or other regulatory action limit established by the authority) has indeed been exceeded. The performance attributes, or characteristics, which must be determined during method validation for each type of method – screening, quantitative, confirmatory – are presented in the Chapter “*Attributes of Analytical Methods for Residues of Veterinary Drugs in Foods*” below.

² Horwitz, W. 1995. Protocol for the design, conduct and interpretation of method performance studies. *Pure and Applied Chemistry*, 67:331-343.

Consideration for selection and validation of analytical methods

Identification of Methods Requirements

Method scope

144. The intended purpose of the method is usually defined in a statement of *scope* which defines the analytes (residues), the matrices (tissues, milk, honey, etc.) and the concentration range to which the method applies. It also states whether the method is intended for screening, quantitative, or confirmatory use. The Competent Authority must establish an appropriate *marker residue* for each drug for which an MRLVD has been established and should also designate a preferred *target tissue* to be sampled for testing.

Marker residue

145. The MRLVD is expressed in terms of the marker residue, which may be the parent drug, a major metabolite, a sum of parent drug and/or metabolites or a reaction product formed from the drug residues during analysis. In some cases, the parent drug or the metabolite may be present in the form of a bound residue which requires chemical or enzymatic treatment or incubation to be released for analysis. It is important that the marker residue should, whenever possible, provide unequivocal evidence of exposure to the drug. In rare situations, it is necessary to use compounds as marker residues which may also result from sources other than exposure to the drug. In such cases, additional information is required to ascertain the probable source of the residue is exposure to the drug. An example of such a situation is the use of semi-carbazide, which may occur from other sources, as a marker residue for the drug nitrofurazone.

Target Tissue

146. The usual target tissue selected by competent authorities to be tested for veterinary drug residues in a residue control programme is the edible tissue in which residues of the marker residue occur at the highest concentrations and are most persistent. For lipophilic substances, the usual target tissue is fat. For most other substances, the target tissue is liver or kidney, depending on the primary route of elimination. One of these tissues is usually the target tissue designated for use in testing of domestically produced foods of animal origin. The organ tissues may not be available for testing imported products, so muscle tissue may be the target tissue for testing of these commodities. In some cases, such as drugs which are normally administered as injectable formulations, testing of muscle tissue from suspected injection sites may be required. The regulatory programme manager and the laboratory managers need to clearly identify the testing objectives and the analytical requirements required in terms of target tissues, marker residues and concentration ranges to ensure suitable methods are used in the regulatory control programme. In certain situations, Competent Authorities may also use biological fluids such as urine or serum to indicate the presence or absence of residues of interest.

Implementing other Codex Alimentarius Commission Guidelines

147. The Codex Alimentarius Commission has issued a guideline for laboratories involved in the import/export testing of foods³ which recommends that such laboratories should:

- (a) Use internal quality control procedures, such as those described in the “Harmonised Guidelines for Internal Quality Control in Analytical Chemistry laboratories⁴”;
- (b) Participate in appropriate proficiency testing schemes for food analysis which confirm to the requirement laid out in “the International Harmonized Protocol for Proficiency Testing of (Chemical) Analytical Laboratories⁵”;
- (c) Comply with the general criteria for testing laboratories laid down in ISO/IEC Guide 17025:2005 “General requirements for the competence of calibration and testing laboratories”; and
- (d) Whenever available, use methods which have been validated according to the principles laid down by the Codex Alimentarius Commission.

³ CAC/GL 27-1997. Guidelines for the Assessment of the Competence of Testing Laboratories Involved in the Import and Export Control of Food.

⁴ *Pure and Applied Chemistry*, **67** (1995): 649-666.

⁵ *Pure and Applied Chemistry*, **78** (2006) 145-196.

148. Methods used for analyses of veterinary drug residues in foods should be capable of detecting the compounds included in the residue control programme. The analytical recovery and precision for the target foodstuffs should meet the criteria stated elsewhere in this document. The methods should be used within an established laboratory Quality Management System which is consistent with the principles in the document on internal quality control referenced above. When methods which have not been subjected to a multi-laboratory performance trial are used in a regulatory programme for control of veterinary drug residues in foods, the quality control and quality assurance procedures applied with these methods require careful definition, implementation, and monitoring. In the case of methods which have been through multi-laboratory trials, performance characteristics, such as recovery and precision, are defined through the results obtained during the study. For a method validated within a single laboratory, data must be generated to define the performance characteristics expected of the method when used by analysts within that laboratory. The ongoing performance must be monitored through the Quality Management System in place in the laboratory.

Method Validation and Fitness for Purpose

149. The process of method validation is intended to demonstrate that a method is *fit-for-purpose*. This means that in the hands of a properly trained analyst using the specified equipment and materials, and following the procedures described in the method, reliable and consistent results can be obtained within specified statistical limits for the analysis of a sample. The validation should address the issues of marker residue, target tissue and concentration range identified by the laboratory in consultation with the residue programme manager. When the method protocol is followed, using suitable analytical standards, results within the established performance limits should be obtained on the same or equivalent sample material by a trained analyst in any experienced residue control laboratory.

150. Multi-laboratory method performance studies generally satisfy the analytical requirements for use in a regulatory programme. These methods are subjected to a properly designed inter-laboratory study with analysts in independent laboratories, so that different sources of reagents, materials, and equipment are used by the participants.

151. Quantitative methods studied collaboratively according to the revised harmonized protocol adopted in 1995 by AOAC International, the International Union of Pure and Applied Chemistry (IUPAC), and the International Standards Organization (ISO) have been evaluated in a minimum of 8 laboratories, unless highly complex equipment or other unusual requirements were identified (in such cases, a minimum of 5 participating laboratories is required)⁷. Collaborative studies of qualitative methods currently require a minimum of 10 participating laboratories. Collaborative studies conducted prior to 1995 completed method evaluation in a minimum of six laboratories in an acceptable, statistically designed study. These multi-laboratory method performance studies generally satisfy the analytical requirements for use in a regulatory programme, as information on method performance in the hands of different analysts in different laboratories is obtained through these studies. However, relatively few of the analytical methods currently used in residue control programmes for veterinary drug residues in foods have been validated by such a multi-laboratory study. Collaborative study designs are based on the analyses of coded duplicate test materials which represent the combinations of analytes, matrices, and concentrations included in the scope of the method and include an independent peer-review of both the study design and the results. In some situations, multi-laboratory studies may be conducted which do not have the minimum number of laboratories required to qualify as a collaborative study. Such studies, when conducted using the same scientific principles of design, evaluation, and review as are applied in collaborative studies, can provide useful information on method performance in the hands of multiple analysts in different laboratories, but do not provide the same degree of statistical confidence obtained from the results of a collaborative study.

152. Multi-laboratory and collaborative studies of methods usually do not encompass all possible combinations of residue, tissue and species to which the method may subsequently be applied. Methods may be extended to include related analytes, additional tissues, species or products (or combinations of these not included in the original multi-laboratory study) by completing additional within-laboratory studies. Analytical results from method extension studies may require additional review before use in a regulatory programme. Whenever possible, analytical results obtained using methods that have not been validated by traditional inter-laboratory study should be compared with results obtained using a method which has been validated through a collaborative or multi-laboratory study or tested using sample materials from a recognized proficiency programme. The comparison should be based on a statistically acceptable study design using portions of the same (homogeneous) samples. The data from such studies should be independently reviewed by a qualified third party (such as a QA unit, a peer group of regulatory scientists, auditors of national accreditation body) to determine the comparability of method performance.

153. Some residue control methods that have been demonstrated to be suitable to determine compliance with MRLVDs have a history of use in one or more expert laboratories, but have not been subjected to a formal multi-laboratory study. These methods were demonstrated to be suitable at the time of initial regulatory use and have continued in use over an extended period of time either in the absence of alternative validated methods, or because they remain a preferred choice for reasons which may include use of available technology, cost, reliability and suitability for use within the constraints of a national programme. Although evidence of a formal collaborative or multi-laboratory method trial is lacking, the method performance has been demonstrated through successful use and from quality control data in one or more laboratories over time.

154. Most regulatory laboratories rely on the use of veterinary drug residue methods which have not have been subjected to a multi-laboratory study. Factors which have contributed to this situation include a requirement for specialized expertise or equipment, cost of such studies, lack of suitable collaborating laboratories, analyte and/or sample instability and rapidly changing technologies. While for many years the focus on equivalency of analytical results was based on the use of standardized methods which had performance characteristics defined based on collaborative study, accredited laboratories now operate in an environment where it is the responsibility of the individual laboratory to demonstrate that the methods used and the analytical results produced meet performance criteria established in consultation with a client. In the absence of methods validated through inter-laboratory method trials, regulatory laboratories must frequently use analytical methods which have been subjected to studies conducted within their own laboratory to characterize the method performance.

Single Laboratory Validation – The Criteria Approach

155. A guidance document on single laboratory validation of methods, “Harmonized Guidelines for Single-Laboratory Validation of Methods of Analysis”, has been published as a technical report by the IUPAC⁶. The Procedural Manual⁷ recognizes that inter-laboratory validated methods are not always available or applicable, particularly for multi-analyte/ multi-substrate methods and new analytes. In such cases, methods may be validated in a single laboratory to meet the General Criteria for the Selection of Methods of Analysis, as well as the additional criteria:

- (a) The method is validated according to an internationally recognized protocol (for example, the IUPAC Guidelines for Single Laboratory Validation of Methods of Analysis, referenced above);
- (b) Use of the method is embedded in a Quality Management System in compliance with the ISO/IEC 17025 (2005) Standard or with the Principles of Good Laboratory Practice;
- (c) The method should be complemented with information on accuracy demonstrated for instance by:
 - regular participation in proficiency schemes, where available;
 - calibration using certified reference materials, where applicable;
 - recovery studies performed at the expected concentration of the analytes;

⁶ Thompson, M., Ellison, S.L.R. & Wood, R. (2002) Harmonized Guidelines for Single-Laboratory Validation of Methods of Analysis. *Pure and Applied Chemistry* 74: 835-855.

⁷ FAO/WHO Codex Alimentarius Commission Procedural Manual.

- verification of result with other validated method where available.

156. The criteria approach, which combines a single laboratory validation model with a requirement that methods meet specific performance specifications, has been adopted by some regulatory authorities.

Attributes of Analytical Methods for Residues of Veterinary Drugs in Foods

Introduction

157. The performance characteristics of analytical methods used to determine compliance with MRLVDs must be defined and proposed methods evaluated accordingly. This will assure reliable analytical results and provide a secure basis for determining residues of veterinary drugs in foods for commodities in international trade. The chapter “*General Considerations of Analytical Methods for Residue Control*” above, presents a discussion of general types or categories of regulatory methods, and provides a scheme for using these analytical methods based upon their intended purpose in a regulatory framework. In the discussion below, attributes common to the three categories of methods (referred to as Confirmatory, Quantitative and Screening methods) for determining compliance with Codex MRLVDs are presented. The additional attributes that are applicable to only one or two categories of methods are also discussed.

Method development considerations

158. The development of an analytical method requires analysts experienced in the analytical techniques to be used, as well as appropriate laboratory space, equipment, and financial support. Before initiating method development activities, the intended use and need for a method in a residue control programme should be established, including the required performance parameters. Other considerations include the required scope of the method (compound or class of compounds of interest and types of sample materials), potential interfering substances, the required performance characteristic of the measurements system, the pertinent physical and chemical properties that may influence method performance, the specificity of the desired testing system and how it will be determined, analyte and reagent stability data and purity of reagents, the acceptable operating conditions for meeting method performance factors, sample preparation guidelines, environmental factors that may influence method performance, safety considerations, and any other specific information pertinent to programme needs. In particular, stability of standards, both under normal conditions of storage and use and during processing of samples, should be assessed. Analyte stability in samples during typical conditions of sample storage prior to analysis should also be determined, including any period for which a sample may be held pending a potential re-analysis for confirmatory purposes.

159. Establishing method performance attributes is essential, as these provide the necessary information for food safety agencies to develop and manage their public health programmes. Performance attributes for analytical methods also provide a basis for good management decisions in future planning, evaluation, and product disposition. For the animal health care industry, it provides a guideline for knowing exactly what performance must be achieved in developing analytical procedures. All will benefit by having well defined analytical method performance factors. Method performance requirements will vary, depending on whether the method is used for the screening, quantification, or confirmation of a residue for which Maximum Residue Limits have been established, or for residues of a drug for which an ADI and MRLVDs have not been recommended. In the latter case, the Competent Authority may establish a minimum performance standard which must be met by analytical methods used for regulatory control purposes. However, when no safe concentrations of these compounds in foods have been established, the Competent Authority may review such limits periodically to ensure they reflect improvements in technology and analytical capability. When such limits have not been formally established by the Competent Authority, they are usually established *de facto* by the detection capabilities of the methods used in the regulatory laboratories.

Analytical performance characteristics

Performance Characteristics of Screening Methods

160. Screening methods are usually either qualitative or semi-quantitative in nature, with the objective being to discriminate samples which contain no detectable residues above a threshold value (“negatives”) from those which may contain residues above that value (“positives”). The validation strategy therefore focuses on establishing a threshold concentration above which results are “positive”, determining a statistically based rate for both “false positive” and “false negative” results, testing for interferences and establishing appropriate conditions of use.

161. For a screening test, particularly those involving test kit technologies, the term “*sensitivity*” refers to the lowest concentration at which the target analyte may be reliably detected within defined statistical limits. In the AOAC Performance Tested Program™ for test kits, this is determined experimentally by testing a minimum of 30 residue-free sample materials fortified with the analyte at the target concentration. The sample materials should be from at least six different sources (that is, at least 5 replicates from each of at least 6 sources), all of which should yield a positive result when fortified at the target concentration. Three or more negative results constitute a failure of the sensitivity test. If one or two of the results are negative, the experiment should be repeated and two negative results would then constitute failure. The experiment should be repeated with known incurred material at the target concentration, if such material is available.

162. The “*selectivity*” of a screening method refers to the ability of the test to determine that samples which give a negative response are truly negative. The test must also be able to distinguish the presence of the target compound, or group of compounds, from other substances which may be present in the sample material. It normally is not as great as that of a quantitative method, because screening methods often take advantage of a structural feature common to a group or class of compounds. These methods, which generally fit into the screening methods category, are often based on microbiological growth inhibition, immunoassays, or chromogenic responses which may not unambiguously identify a compound. The selectivity of a screening method may be increased when it is used as a detection system after chromatographic or other separation technique. To demonstrate a selectivity rate of at least 90% with 95% confidence (which is recommended for screening tests), 30 replicate analyses are conducted on representative blank sample matrix materials from a minimum of six different sources. All results should be negative. Additional tests for potential interferences and cross-reactivity may then be conducted by testing blank matrix material fortified with potential interfering substances, such as other drugs which might be used in animal treatment, potential environmental contaminants, drug metabolites, or chemically related compounds. Again, responses should be negative when these compounds are present at concentrations which might reasonably be expected to be present in a sample.

163. The “cut-off” or threshold for the test for a particular compound is established by conducting concentration-response experiments, typically using 30 replicates (from at least six sources) fortified at each of a series of increasing concentrations. Once the concentrations have been established where all 30 replicates give a negative response and all 30 replicates give a positive response, the experiment is repeated using the blank matrix materials fortified at four evenly spaced concentrations between the “all negative” and “all positive” concentrations. An additional set is tested at a concentration 20% above the “all positive” concentration. Statistical analysis of the results enables the user to establish a reliable detection concentration at the required confidence level (usually 95%)⁸.

⁸ Finney, D.J. (1978) *Statistical Method in Biological Assay*, 3rd edition. MacMillan Publishing Co., New York.

Performance Characteristics for Quantitative Methods

164. *Selectivity*, the ability of an analytical method to detect and discriminate the signal response from a compound in the presence of other compounds which may be present in the sample material, is of particular importance in defining the performance characteristics of methods used in regulatory control programmes for veterinary drug residues in foods. There are two aspects which must be considered – the ability of the method to provide a signal response which is free from interferences from other compounds which may be present in a sample or sample extract and the ability of the method to unequivocally identify a signal response as being exclusively related to a specific compound. For a quantitative method, the requirement is that the signal used for quantification should relate only to the target analyte and not contain contributions for co-extracted materials. Chromatographic analyses based on peaks which are not fully resolved provide less reliable quantitative results. Use of element-specific detectors or detection wavelengths or mass-selective detectors which are more specific to a particular compound or structure, combined with chromatographic separation, improves the selectivity of quantitative methods for veterinary drug residues in foods.

165. In addition to the selectivity of a method, the ability of the method to provide a quantitative result which is reliable must be demonstrated. This consists of two factors:

- (a) The closeness of the result to the true or accepted value for the concentration of analyte present in the sample material, expressed in terms of *accuracy*, *trueness*, or *bias*; and
- (b) The ability of the method to provide consistent results on replicate determinations, expressed in terms of *precision* (*repeatability* and *reproducibility*).

166. It is recommended that methods used to support Codex MRLVDs should meet the performance standards for trueness and precision listed in Table 3, where CV_A refers to the coefficient of variation determined by test portions of blank matrix fortified prior to extraction and CV_L is the overall laboratory variability which includes a 10% estimate for variability of sample processing⁹.

Table 3. Performance criteria which should be met by methods suitable for use as quantitative analytical methods to support MRLVDs for residues of veterinary drugs in foods¹⁰

Concentration µg/kg	Coefficient of Variability (CV)				Trueness
	Repeatability (Within- Laboratory, CV _A) %	Repeatability (Within- Laboratory, CV _L) %	Reproducibility (Between- Laboratory, CV _A) %	Reproducibility (Between- Laboratory, CV _L) %	Range of Mean % Recovery
≤ 1	35	36	53	54	50-120
1 to 10	30	32	45	46	60-120
10 to 100	20	22	32	34	70-120
100 to 1000	15	18	23	25	70-110
≥ 1000	10	14	16	19	70-110

⁹ Alder, L., Holland, PT, Lantos, J, Lee, M, MacNeil, JD (chairman), O'Rangers, J, van Zoonen, P, Ambrus, A (scientific secretary). 2000. Report of the AOAC/FAO/IAEA/IUPAC Expert Consultation on Single-Laboratory Validation of Analytical Methods for Trace-Level Concentrations of Organic Chemicals, Miskolc, Hungary, 8-11 November, 1999. Report published on the website of the International Atomic Energy Agency (IAEA) http://www.iaea.org/trc/pest-qa_val2.htm (accessed 18 September, 2007).

¹⁰ CAC/GL 37-2001 Harmonized IUPAC Guidelines for the use of Recovery Information in Analytical Measurement; see also Thompson, M., Ellison, S., Fajgelj, A., Willetts, P., & Wood, R. (1999) Harmonised Guidelines for the Use of Recovery Information in Analytical Measurement, *Pure Applied Chemistry*, **71**: 337-348.

167. The *accuracy* of a method may be determined by analysis of a certified reference material, by comparison of results with those obtained using another method for which the performance parameters have previously been rigorously established (typically, a collaboratively studied method) or, in the absence of reference materials or methods validated by inter-laboratory trial, by determination of the *recovery* of analyte fortified into known blank sample material. The determination of accuracy as recovery is frequently used in validation of methods for veterinary drug residues in foods, as both certified reference materials and methods validated by inter-laboratory trial are often not available. The accuracy of a measurement is closely related to *systematic error* (analytical method bias) and analyte recovery (measured as percent recovery). The accuracy requirements of methods will vary depending upon the planned regulatory use of the results. The accuracy should be carefully characterized at concentrations near the MRLVD or target concentration for regulatory action (typically at concentrations from 0.5 to 2.0 times the target concentration) to ensure that regulatory action is only taken on samples containing residues which can be demonstrated to exceed the regulatory action limit with a defined statistical confidence.

168. *Recovery* is usually expressed as the percentage of analyte experimentally determined after fortification of sample material at a known concentration and should be assessed over concentrations which cover the analytical range of the method. In interpreting recoveries, it is necessary to recognize that analyte added to a sample may not behave in the same manner as the same biologically incurred analyte (veterinary drug residue). In many situations, the amount of an incurred residue that is extracted (the yield or recovered fraction) is less than the total incurred residues present. This may be due to losses during extraction, intracellular binding of residues, the presence of conjugates, or other factors that are not fully represented by recovery experiments conducted with analyte-fortified blank tissues. At relatively high concentrations, analytical recoveries are expected to approach one hundred percent. At lower concentrations, particularly with methods involving extensive extraction, isolation, and concentration steps, recoveries may be lower. Regardless of what average recoveries are observed, recovery with low variability is desirable so that a reliable correction for recovery can be made to the final result, when required. Recovery corrections should be made consistent with the guidance provided by the Codex Alimentarius Commission¹⁰.

169. *Precision*, which quantifies the variation between replicated measurements on test portions from the same sample material, is also an important consideration in determining when a residue in a sample should be considered to exceed an MRLVD or other regulatory action limit. Precision of a method is usually expressed in terms of the within-laboratory variation (*repeatability*) and the between-laboratory variability (*reproducibility*) when the method has been subjected to a multi-laboratory trial. For a single laboratory method validation, precision should be determined from experiments conducted on different days, using a minimum of six different tissue pools, different reagent batches, preferably different equipment, etc. and preferably by different analysts. Precision of a method is usually expressed as the standard deviation. Another useful term is relative standard deviation, or coefficient of variation (the standard deviation, divided by the absolute value of the arithmetic mean). It may be reported as a percentage by multiplying by one hundred.

170. Method variability, achieved in a laboratory developing a method, is usually less than the variability achieved by another laboratory that may later use the method. If a method cannot achieve a suitable standard of performance in the laboratory where it was developed, it cannot be expected to do any better in other laboratories.

171. Quantitative methods are usually based on a comparison of the response from an analyte in a sample with the response from standards of the analyte in solution at known concentrations. In method development and validation, the calibration curve should first be determined to assess the detector response to standards over a range of concentrations. These concentrations (a minimum of five, plus blank) should cover the full range of analytical interest and the resultant curve should be statistically expressed. However, although it is recommended practice to include a suitable blank with the calibration samples, this does not imply that it is acceptable to extrapolate into the region of the curve below the low standard to obtain a quantitative result. The analytical function relates the response for the analyte recovered from sample material at various concentrations throughout the range of analytical interest. For analytes for which an MRLVD or regulatory action limit has been established in a particular sample material (matrix), response is typically determined for known blank sample material and for blank sample material fortified at a range of concentration above and below the MRLVD (use of 6 different sources of blank materials is recommended).

172. The analytical function experiment data can also be used to calculate the analytical recovery at each concentration and is of particular importance when the presence of matrix co-extractives modifies the response of the analyte as compared to analytical standards. The *linearity* is determined from the analytical function experiments and is the statistical expression of the curve obtained for the analysis of sample materials fortified at the target concentrations. It is typically determined from a linear regression analysis of the data, assuming there is a linear response. It is increasingly common in methods for veterinary drug residues in foods to base the quantitative determination on a standard curve prepared by addition of standard to known blank representative matrix material at a range of appropriate concentrations which bracket the target value (the analytical function). Use of such a “tissue standard curve” for calibration incorporates a recovery correction into the analytical results obtained.

173. It is also necessary to establish the lower limits at which reliable detection, quantification, or confirmation of the presence of an analyte may be performed using a particular analytical method. The *detection limit* may be described in practical terms as the lowest concentration where the analyte can be identified in a sample. It can be estimated using the standard deviation ($s_{y/x}$) from the linear regression analysis of the standard curve generated in the analytical function experiment described above¹¹. Using this approach, the limit of detection is calculated using the y-intercept (assuming a positive value) of the curve plus three times $s_{y/x}$. This approach provides a conservative estimate of the detection limit. The detection limit can also be estimated by measurements on representative test materials as the weakest relevant response of the analyte in the blank plus three times its standard deviation. It is often necessary to fortify test materials at a concentration resulting in a barely detectable response to obtain an approximation of the standard deviation of the blank when using this approach.

174. The *limit of quantification* (LOQ), also referred to as limit of quantification or quantification limit may be established from the same experiments using the y-intercept of the curve plus ten times $s_{y/x}$. For methods used to support MRLVDs established by the Codex Alimentarius Commission, the limit of quantification should meet the criteria for precision and accuracy (recovery) in Table 3 and should be equal to or less than one-half the MRLVD. However, when the limit of quantification of a method is lower than the actual concentrations monitored for compliance with a MRLVD, the validation and subsequent application of the method should be based on a *lowest calibrated level* (LCL), which is typically 0.5x the MRLVD. For use in a regulatory programme, the limits of detection and quantification are important parameters when the method will be applied to estimate exposures to residues, where there may be an interest in monitoring residues at concentrations below the MRLVD, or when conducting residue analyses for substances which do not have ADIs or MRLVDs. For monitoring compliance with an MRLVD, it is important that a LCL be included in the analysis which adequately demonstrates that the MRL concentration may be reliably determined. The LCL of a method used to support an MRLVD should not be less than the LOQ. The Codex Procedural Manual recommends the term *determination limit* under “Terms to be Used in the Criteria Approach”⁷.

Performance Characteristics for Confirmatory Methods

175. *Selectivity*, the ability of the method to unequivocally identify a signal response as being exclusively related to a specific compound, is the primary consideration for confirmatory methods. Certain instrumental techniques such as Fourier transform infrared spectroscopy or mass spectrometry may be sufficiently selective to provide unambiguous identification. These are often the techniques on which confirmatory methods are based.

176. Typically, a minimum of four identification points is required to meet accepted performance criteria for regulatory methods. Methods based on high resolution mass spectrometry are considered to give a higher reliability through more precise measurement of mass than can be obtained using low resolution mass spectrometry techniques. Method performance requirements for confirmatory methods based on low resolution GC/MS and LC/MS, as recently published by an international expert body¹², are given in Table 4.

¹¹ Miller, J.C., & Miller, J.N. (1993) *Statistics for Analytical Chemistry*, 3rd Edition, Ellis Horwood Ltd., Chichester.

¹² Bethem, R., Boison, J.O., Gale, J., Heller, D., Lehotay, S., Loo, J., Musser, S., Price, P., and Stein, S. (2003) Establishing the Fitness for Purpose of Mass Spectrometric methods. *Journal of the American Society for Mass Spectrometry* **14**: 528-541.

Table 4: Performance requirements for relative ion intensities (sample compared to standard) using various mass spectrometric analytical techniques⁹

Relative ion intensity (% of base peak)	GC-MS (EI) (relative)	GC-MS (CI), GC-MS/MS LC-MS, LC-MS/MS (relative)
>50%	≤10%	≤20%
20% to 50%	≤15%	≤25%
10% to 20%	≤20%	≤30%

177. It is considered that one identification point should be assigned to each structurally significant ion fragment detected using a low resolution mass spectrometric method. When a tandem low resolution instrument, such as a “triple quadrupole” mass spectrometer is used, secondary fragments are detected from a primary fragment that is isolated in the first stage of the spectrometer. The fact that these structurally significant fragments are produced from the fragmentation of a major fragment (parent or precursor ion) associated with the molecule provides greater confidence and each such daughter or product ion is assigned a value of 1.5 identification points. A combination of a precursor ion and two product ions provides the 4 required identification points when low resolution MS/MS instruments are used in a confirmatory method.

178. Additional confidence is provided when high resolution mass spectrometers are used in a confirmatory method, as the high resolution provides more precise identification of the mass and may be used to predict the elemental composition of each fragment. For a single high resolution mass spectrometer, each structurally significant fragment detected is assigned a value of two identification points, while product ions generated in high resolution MS/MS experiments are assigned an identification point value of 2.5 each. In addition, at least one ion ratio must also be measured to eliminate the potential for fragments of the same mass arising from isobaric compounds of similar structure.

179. Other techniques, when they are used in combination, may be capable of achieving a comparable degree of selectivity as confirmatory techniques. For example, identification may be verified by combinations of methods such as:

- (a) Thin layer chromatography;
- (b) Element-specific gas-liquid chromatography and accompanying detection systems;
- (c) Formation of characteristic derivatives followed by additional chromatography; or
- (d) Determining compound specific relative retention times using several chromatographic systems of differing polarity.

180. Such procedures must be applicable at the designated MRLVD of the analyte. When a confirmatory method such as mass spectrometry is not available, information on the selectivity associated with the analysis of a particular veterinary drug residue in a sample may be developed from various sources¹³. This information may be captured in a structured logging document of all the information that leads to the conclusion a method has detected a particular compound in a sample, at a measured concentration as reported. While no single measurement or analysis may provide the unequivocal proof of compound identity and/or quantity present that is desired, the combined information that has been compiled provides evidence that the analyst has made a conscientious effort to arrive at a logical result consistent with the data and other information available. Examples of analytical techniques which may be suitable to meet criteria for confirmatory analytical methods are summarized in Table 5.

¹³ Stephany, R.W. (2003). SPECLOG – The Specificity Log. CRD-9, Codex Committee on Residues of Veterinary Drugs in Foods, 14th Session, Arlington, VA., U.S.A., March 4-7.

Table 5. Examples of detection methods suitable for the confirmatory analysis of substances, as recommended by the Miskolc Consultation⁹

Detection method	Criterion
LC or GC and Mass Spectrometry	If sufficient number of fragment ions are monitored
LC-DAD	If the UV spectrum is characteristic
LC – fluorescence	In combination with other techniques
2-D TLC – (spectrophotometry)	In combination with other techniques
GC-ECD, NPD, FPD	Only if combined with two or more separation techniques ^a
Derivatisation	If it was not the first choice method
LC-immunogram	In combination with other techniques
LC-UV/VIS (single wavelength)	In combination with other techniques

^a Other chromatographic systems (applying stationary and/or mobile phases of different selectivity) or other techniques.

181. Although confirmatory methods are generally instrumental procedures, observation of a pathologic or other morphologic change that specifically identifies exposure to a class of veterinary drugs, could potentially be a confirmatory method, if it has sufficient sensitivity and precision.

General Performance Characteristics for Methods for Use in a Regulatory Control Programme

182. There are some additional considerations for selection of suitable methods for use in a regulatory control programme for veterinary drug residues in foods. Methods should be rugged (robust), cost effective, relatively uncomplicated, portable, and capable of simultaneously handling a set of samples in a time effective manner. The stability of analytes must also be established.

183. *Ruggedness* testing should be conducted using the standard factorial design approach to determine any critical control points¹⁴. Typical factors to include in a design include variations in reagent volumes or concentrations, pH, incubation or reaction time and temperature, reagent quality, and different batch or source of a reagent or chromatographic material. Ruggedness testing of a confirmatory method may be required if the method differs significantly from the quantitative method previously validated (if the method uses different extraction or derivatisation procedures than are used in the quantitative method).

184. *Cost-effectiveness* is the use of reagents and supplies which are readily available in the required purity from local suppliers and equipment for which parts and service are also readily available. The *method efficiency* is increased when multiple samples can be analysed at the same time. This reduces the analytical time requirements per sample and usually reduces the cost per sample, as there are certain fixed costs associated with the analysis of samples, whether done singly or in larger sets. The ability of a method to accommodate multiple samples in a batch is important when large numbers of samples must be analysed in short or fixed time frames. *Portability* is the analytical method characteristic that enables it to be transferred from one location to another without loss of established analytical performance characteristics.

185. *Analyte stability* during analysis must be established for both standards and analyte in the presence of sample material, during processing through the complete analysis for all methods used in a regulatory control programme and for typical conditions of storage while a sample is awaiting analysis. The period chosen for stability during storage should cover the expected time when sample material may be stored for all required analyses, including the use of the screening, quantitative, and confirmatory methods. It is prudent to conduct the storage study for a period which extends to at least 90 days beyond the expected time for all screening, quantitative, and confirmatory analyses to be completed and the results reported in case there is a challenge and a request for re-analysis.

¹⁴ Youden, W.J., & Steiner, E.H. (1975) *Statistical Manual of the Association of Official Analytical Chemists*, AOAC International, Gaithersburg, VA.

Method development and validation considerations for residue control methods

Selection of Appropriate Test Material for Validation

186. Laboratories must demonstrate that the methods in use for analysis of regulatory samples have been suitably validated. Traditionally, the multi-laboratory method validation study has been the preferred approach to provide analytical data to define method performance characteristics. However, other models have been developed which include multi-laboratory trials with smaller numbers of laboratories than are required to conduct a full collaborative study and single laboratory validation based on rigorous in-house evaluation of method performance, supported by a Quality Management System, independent audits and analysis of proficiency or reference materials, when available.

187. In developing and validating a residue control method, data should be derived from three types of sample material. Control test material from non-treated animals provides information about analytical background and matrix interferences. Fortified test material, containing known amounts of the analyte added to the control material, yields information about the method's ability to recover the analyte of interest under controlled conditions. Tissues should be obtained from multiple sources to cover the variations resulting from factors such as different diets, husbandry practices, sex, and breed of animals. A minimum of six different sources of material is recommended.

188. In some instances, known drug free sample materials may not be available for use in residue control laboratories. In these instances an equivalent sample material may be used. Equivalent sample materials may consist of either the same matrix as the test sample matrix from an unknown source, or a different matrix from a known drug free source that closely matches the sample matrix. In all cases, the residue control laboratory must demonstrate that the equivalent sample material is free from interferences for the drug and exhibits satisfactory recovery for fortified samples. Additionally, when a material is used from an unknown source for quantitative or screening methods, it is recommended that a second method be used to demonstrate that the matrix does not contain residues of the drug. It is the responsibility of the residue control laboratory to demonstrate fitness for purpose of the equivalent sample material.

189. Finally, analysis of biologically incurred tissue from food producing animals that have been treated with the drug provides information about biological or other interactions that may occur when analysing residue control samples.

Measurement Uncertainty

190. Laboratories should provide their customers on request with information on the measurement uncertainty or statement of confidence associated with the quantitative results produced by each quantitative method. Guidance on estimation of measurement uncertainty is being developed by IUPAC and has been published by other independent scientific bodies¹⁵.

Use of Internal Standards

191. Residue methods are sometimes designed using internal standards for analytical control. A properly used internal standard will compensate for some of the analytical variability of an analysis, improving precision. However, an improperly used internal standard may obscure variables that are an important part of the analytical measurement. If an internal standard is used, it should be added to a sample as early as possible in the procedure, preferably to the test material before analysis begins. The internal standard must reflect the recovery of the target analyte in a uniform and predictable fashion. An internal standard that does not mirror the behaviour of the target analyte in the method will lead to significant errors in calculation of the final result. Caution must be taken in the choice of internal standards to ensure that they do not alter the percent recovery of the analyte of interest or interfere with the measurement process. It is important to know the extent and predictability of the effects of the internal standard on an analytical method. Internal standards can greatly enhance method performance when used properly.

¹⁵ EURACHEM/CITAC Guide to Quantifying Measurement Uncertainty in Analytical Measurement, <http://www.measurementuncertainty.org/mu/guide/index.html>, accessed 18 September, 2007.

Environmental Considerations

192. If residue control methods may be subjected to widely variable physical test environments, this should be taken into account in the development and validation of these methods. Addressing these issues may help improve method ruggedness. Warmer environments may require reagents to be more thermally stable, while solvents used in the analysis will have to be less volatile and test sample requirements to be more tolerant. Cooler environments may require reagents and solvents to have different physical properties, such as lower freezing point and greater solvating characteristics, to provide effective extraction of an analyte. Environmental temperatures may influence the time required to perform an analysis, as well as influencing reaction rates, gravitational separations, and colour development. These considerations may strain efforts to standardize methods for use in broadly differing environments because of the need to adapt methods to compensate for these factors. It is important when considering the physical environment in which a method will be used to remember that volumetric glassware and many analytical instruments are calibrated to be used at specific temperatures, or within a controlled range of temperature. Operation outside these temperatures may compromise test results.

Choice of Validation Model

193. An analytical method developed and used in only one laboratory may have limited use in a residue control programme unless care is taken to meet the rigorous expectations for single laboratory method validation associated with accreditation under ISO/IEC-17025 or equivalent accreditation procedures for testing laboratories. The reliability of reported values may be a concern even though strong quality control procedures may have been employed, unless supported by data from an on-going proficiency programme, comparison with a suitable method validated in an inter-laboratory trial or other forms of inter-laboratory comparison of results. Ideally, a method should be validated by at least three laboratories. Methods which have been carefully validated in a single laboratory with inclusion of properly designed ruggedness tests should be able to successfully undergo a collaborative study involving at least eight different laboratories.

194. The principles for conducting a single laboratory method validation, a multi-laboratory method trial or a collaborative study of a residue control method are the same. Samples for evaluating method performance should be unknown to the analyst, in randomised replicates, containing the residue near the MRLVD or other target concentration, as well as samples with the analyte above and below the concentration of interest, and test material blanks. A minimum of three individual datasets should be generated over three analysis periods, on at least three separate occasions (at least one day apart), preferably with replicate analysis, to improve statistical evaluation of method performance and provide an estimate of inter-day variability. It should be noted that these are only minimal requirements. The establishment of statistically-based performance standards for methods is enhanced by increasing the number of independent analysts and laboratories testing the method, as well as by the number of samples tested. In a single-laboratory validation, it is recommended that the method should be tested by multiple analysts to provide appropriate measures of within-laboratory performance. Expanding the validation to include other laboratories, preferably to the number required for a collaborative study, is recommended. Analyses of blind duplicates, as required in the collaborative study protocol⁷ in only eight laboratories, with one or two animal species and tissues, yields limited quality estimates for overall repeatability and reproducibility. The validation of a collaboratively studied method can be extended to include additional tissues and species in a subsequent study conducted by a single expert laboratory, as required.

Quality Management Systems

195. A Quality Management System is an essential component of residue analysis. It both monitors those factors associated with the analysis of a sample by an analyst and provides the oversight by independent reviewers to ensure that the analytical programme is performing in an acceptable manner. The use of an accredited Quality Management System is invaluable to support decision-making for residue control agencies, improving the reliability of analytical results, and providing quality data for residue control programmes to demonstrate food safety to consumers, producers, and law making bodies regarding residues of veterinary drugs in food. The establishment of quality measures consistent with the principles published by IUPAC is recommended for regulatory control laboratories.

Appendix A - Sampling strategies

Non-biased sampling

Purpose

1. Non-biased sampling is designed to provide profile information, especially as to the extent of application or performance of a control or assurance system for a specified animal/food population over a defined period.

Statistical considerations on sampling population size

2. The number of samples for non-biased sampling protocols should be statistically based and may be influenced by the size of the population (where less than 5000), the prevalence of non-compliance determined to be significant, the confidence to be placed in the results as well as economic considerations.

3. The number of samples based on the binomial distribution will always be equal to or greater than the required number of samples based on the hypergeometric distribution¹.

4. If the size of the population is small the effect of sampling without replacement is significant and the sampling distribution should be based on the hypergeometric distribution.

5. In populations larger than 5000 units the effect of sampling without replacement is negligible. Thus the binomial distribution can be used to determine an appropriate number of samples.

6. The number of samples for a defined confidence will be effectively constant for populations exceeding 5000 units.

Sampling Confidence reporting

7. Where non-compliant results are detected it is possible to derive a crude estimate of the likely prevalence in the general population.

8. However, where no non-compliant results are found then any statements about prevalence need to be stated with a defined confidence that the prevalence of non-compliant results does not exceed a specified percentage.

9. The number of samples required to give a required statistical assurance can be read from Table 1. Other scientifically based statistical protocols may also be used.

Table 1: Number of samples required to detect at least one non-compliant result with pre-defined probabilities (90, 95, and 99 percent) in a population having a known non-compliance prevalence.

Non-compliant prevalence (% in a population)	Minimum number of samples required to detect a non-compliant result with a confidence level of:		
	90%	95%	99%
35	6	7	11
30	7	9	13
25	9	11	17
20	11	14	21
15	15	19	29
10	22	29	44
5	45	59	90
1	230	299	459
0.5	460	598	919
0.1	2302	2995	4603

¹ In the probability theory and statistics, the *hypergeometric distribution* is a discrete (consisting of unconnected distinct parts) probability distribution that describes the number of successes in a sequence of n draws from a finite population without replacement.

10. The probability of failing to detect a specified prevalence of non-compliant results associated with a specified targeting mechanism can be read off Table 2 below. Because of the low efficacy of sampling protocols to detect low prevalences of non-compliance, other assurance mechanisms are more important where a low prevalence of non-compliance is expected.

Table 2: Probability of failing to detect a non-compliance

Prevalence (%)	Number of animals/units of product in sample tested									
	5	10	25	50	75	100	200	250	500	1000
1	0.951	0.904	0.779	0.605	0.471	0.366	0.134	0.081	0.007	0.000
2	0.904	0.817	0.603	0.364	0.220	0.133	0.018	0.006	0.000	
3	0.859	0.737	0.467	0.218	0.102	0.048	0.002	0.000		
4	0.815	0.665	0.360	0.130	0.047	0.017	0.000			
5	0.774	0.599	0.277	0.077	0.021	0.006				
6	0.734	0.539	0.213	0.045	0.010	0.002				
7	0.696	0.484	0.163	0.027	0.004	0.001				
8	0.659	0.434	0.124	0.015	0.002	0.000				
9	0.590	0.389	0.095	0.009	0.001					
10	0.528	0.349	0.072	0.005	0.000					
12	0.470	0.279	0.041	0.002						
14	0.418	0.221	0.023	0.001						
16	0.371	0.175	0.013	0.000						
18	0.328	0.137	0.007							
20	0.254	0.107	0.004							
24	0.193	0.064	0.001							
28	0.193	0.037	0.000							
32	0.145	0.021								
36	0.107	0.012								
40	0.078	0.006								
50	0.031	0.001								
60	0.010	0.000								

Directed or targeted sampling

Purpose

11. Directed or targeted sampling protocols are designed to place a greater intensity of inspection/audit on suppliers or product considered to possibly have a greater potential than the general population of being non-compliant.

12. It is not possible to extrapolate from non-compliant results to draw conclusions about the general population because a sub-population which is considered to have greater chance of non-compliance is being sampled (biased sampling).

13. However, if compliant results confirm non-biased programme results, they provide increased assurance that the system is working effectively.

Appendix B - Sampling of commodities

Scope

1. This Appendix applies to the following commodities: primary food commodities of animal origin and processed products of animal origin made from primary food appearing in Table A and Table B of this appendix, and honey of the following origins and/or processing method:

- (a) Blossom or nectar honey that comes mainly from nectaries of flowers;
- (b) Honeydew honey that comes mainly from secretions of or on living parts of plants;
- (c) Comb honey stored by bees in the cells of freshly built broodless combs, and sold in sealed whole combs or sections of such combs;
- (d) Extracted honey obtained by centrifuging decapped broodless combs;
- (e) Pressed honey obtained by pressing broodless combs with or without the application of moderate heat.

Definitions

Lot means an identifiable group of animals or quantity of animal product intended for food use and determined to have common characteristics, such as origin variety, type of packing, packer or consignor, or markings, by the sampling official. Several lots may make up a consignment.

Consignments means an identifiable group of animals or quantity of animal product intended for food use as described on a particular contractor's shipping document. Lots in a consignment may have different origins or may be delivered at different times.

Primary sample means a quantity of representative biological material taken from a single animal (or group of animals) or from one place in the lot. When the quantity is inadequate for residue analysis, samples from more than one animal (or group of animals) or more than one location in the lot can be combined for the primary sample (such as poultry organs).

Bulk sample means the combined total of all the primary samples taken from the same lot.

Final laboratory sample means the primary or bulk sample, or a representative portion of the primary or bulk sample, intended for laboratory analysis.

Final laboratory test portion means the representative portion of the final laboratory sample on which an analysis is conducted. The entire laboratory sample may be used for analysis in some cases but typically will be sub-divided into representative test portions for analysis. It is prepared by combining and thoroughly mixing the primary samples.

Lot of honey means a discrete quantity of honey delivered for distribution at one time, and determined to have common characteristics, such as origin, variety, type of packing, packer or consignor, or markings, by the sampling official.

Consignment of honey means discrete quantity of honey as described on a particular contractor's shipping document. A consignment may be made up of different lots.

Primary honey sample means a quantity of honey taken from one place in the lot, unless this quantity is inadequate for the residue analysis. When the quantity is inadequate, samples from more than one location can be combined for the primary sample.

Sampling procedures

2. Samples must be collected by those officially authorized for this purpose.
3. Each lot to be examined must be sampled separately.
4. During collection and processing care must be taken to prevent contamination or other changes in the samples which would alter the residue, affect the analytical determination, or make the laboratory test portion not representative of the bulk or laboratory sample.

5. Guidance on sample type and quantity for different commodities is provided in Table A: Meat and Poultry Products) and Table B: Milk, Eggs and Dairy Products. The following are general instructions:

- (a) Each primary sample should be taken from a single animal (or group of animals) or unit in a lot, and when possible, be selected randomly;
- (b) When several animals are required for adequate sample size of the primary sample (e.g. poultry liver), the samples should be collected consecutively after initial random selection;
- (c) Frozen product should not be thawed before sampling;
- (d) Canned or packaged product should not be opened for sampling unless the unit size is at least twice the amount required for the final laboratory sample. The final laboratory sample should contain a representative portion of juices surrounding the product;
- (e) Unopened cans or packages which constitute a final laboratory sample should be sent unopened and intact to the laboratory for analysis;
- (f) The contents of cans or packages opened by the authorised inspector should be frozen as described in paragraph 170d before dispatch to the laboratory for analysis;
- (g) Large, bone-containing units of product (i.e. prime cuts) should be sampled by collecting edible product only as the primary sample;
- (h) When portions of single unit are less than described as a primary sample, additional sample units need to be taken to satisfy bulk sample requirements.
- (i) Portions remaining of final laboratory samples should be frozen and stored in conditions which will maintain the sample integrity.

6. The number of primary samples collected will depend on if a lot is considered suspect.

7. A lot is suspect if there is:

- (a) A history of non-compliance with the MRLVD;
- (b) Evidence of contamination during transport;
- (c) Signs of toxicosis (systemic poisoning) observed during ante- or post-mortem inspection; or
- (d) Other relevant information available to the authorised inspection official.

8. A minimum of six to a maximum of thirty primary samples should be collected from a suspect lot. When the suspected residues are expected to occur throughout the lot the smaller number of samples is sufficient.

9. Imports from countries that do not run verification programmes for compliance with MRLVDs should be sampled as suspect lots.

Specific sample preparation instructions for honey

- (a) Collect 250 mL of liquid or strained honey after the following preparations as applicable;
- (b) Liquidise comb honey: Cut across top of comb, if sealed, and separate completely from comb by straining through a sieve the meshes of which are made by so weaving wire as to form square opening of 0.500 mm by 0.500 mm (ISO 565-1990)¹.
- (c) If foreign matter, such as wax, sticks, bees, particles of comb, etc., is present, heat sample to 40°C in water bath and strain through cheesecloth in hot-water-funnel before sampling.

10. When a sample is free from granulation mix thoroughly by stirring or shaking; if granulated, place closed container in water-bath without submerging, and heat for 30 min at 60°C; then if necessary heat at 65°C until liquefied. Occasional shaking is essential. Mix thoroughly and cool rapidly as soon as the sample liquefies.

¹ Such sieve could be replaced by US sieve with No. 40 standard screen (size of opening 0.420 mm).

Statistical concerns

11. For non-suspect lots a statistically-based, non-biased sampling programme is recommended. Any of the following types of sampling can be used.

Stratified random sampling

12. Where consignments are commingled simple random criteria cannot be applied and stratified random sampling should be considered.

13. In stratified random sampling the consignment is divided into non-overlapping groups or strata, e.g. geographical origin, genders, time. A sample is taken from each stratum.

14. Homogeneity within each stratum is better than in the whole population. Countries or geographic regions are considered natural strata based on uniformity in agricultural practices.

15. Time strata (e.g., month, quarter) are commonly used for convenience, efficiency, and detection of seasonal variability. Random number tables² or other objective techniques should be used to ensure that all elements of a population have an equal and independent chance of being included in the sample.

Systematic sampling

16. In systematic sampling units are selected from the population at a regular interval (e.g., once an hour, every other lot, etc.).

17. It may be applied when there is reliable information on product volumes to determine the sampling interval that will provide the desired number of samples over time. However:

- (a) If the sampling system is too predictable, it may be abused;
- (b) Consignments need to be homogeneous, because systematic sample units are uniformly distributed over the population.

Biased or estimated worst case sampling

18. In biased or estimated worst case sampling, investigators use their judgement and experience regarding the population, lot, or sampling frame to decide which primary samples to select.

19. The population group anticipated to be at greatest risk may be identified, but no general conclusion should be made about the population sampled from the data collected (non-random samples).

Preparation of laboratory samples

20. The final laboratory sample is sent for analysis.

21. Some national/regional legislation/regulation may require that the final laboratory sample is subdivided into two or more portions for separate analyses. Each portion should be representative of the final laboratory sample. Precautions indicated under *sampling procedures* should be observed.

22. The laboratory test portion should be prepared from the final laboratory sample by an appropriate method of reduction.

Shipment of laboratory samples

23. Final laboratory samples should be prepared as follows:

- (a) Each sample should be placed in a clean, thermally insulating, chemically inert container to protect the sample from contamination, defrosting and damage in shipping;
- (b) The container should be sealed so that unauthorized opening is detectable;
- (c) The container should be sent to the laboratory as soon as possible, after taking precautions against leakage and spoilage;

² Random number tables consist of a randomly generated series of digits (0-9). To improve readability there are spaces between every e.g. every 4th digit and between every 10th rows. Reading can begin anywhere (at random) but having started has to continue across the line or down a column and NOT jump about. Example: extract from a table of random sampling numbers: 3680 2231 8846 5418 0498 5245 7071 2597.

- (d) For shipping, all perishable samples should be frozen to minus 20°C, immediately after collection, and packed in a suitable container that retards thawing. Freezer packs or other suitable refrigerants should be used to maintain freezer temperatures during shipment. Samples and freezer packs should be fully frozen to minus 20°C prior to dispatch;
- (e) Replicate portions of the final laboratory sample which may be retained as required by national/regional legislation or as an administrative policy should be placed in a clean, chemically inert container to protect the sample from contamination, sealed so that unauthorized opening is detectable and stored under suitable conditions to prevent a change in the product or any residues it may contain in case future analysis is required for comparison with analytical results obtained on the sample material submitted to the laboratory.

Result interpretation in the laboratory

24. For purposes of control, the MRLVD is applied to the residue concentration found in each laboratory sample taken from a lot.

25. Lot compliance with a MRLVD is achieved when the mean result for analysis of the laboratory test portions does not indicate the presence of a residue which exceeds the MRLVD.

Sampling records

26. Each primary or bulk sample and each final laboratory sample should be uniquely linked to a record with the type of sample, analyses required, its origin (e.g., country, state, or town), its location of collection, date of sampling, and additional information required for follow-up action if necessary.

27. If there is a deviation from recommended sampling procedures, records accompanying the sample should describe procedures actually followed in detail.

Guidance on sample type and quantity for different commodities

Table A: Meat and poultry products

Commodity	Instructions for collection	Minimum quantity required for laboratory sample
I. Group 030 (Mammalian Meats)		
A. Whole carcass or side, unit weight normally 10 kg or more	Collect diaphragm muscle, supplement with cervical muscle, if necessary, from one animal.	500 g
B. Small carcass (e.g. rabbit)		500 g after removal of skin and bone
C. Fresh/chilled parts		
1. Unit minimum weight of 0.5 kg, excluding bone (e.g. quarters, shoulders, roasts)	Collect muscle from one unit.	500 g
2. Unit weighing less than 0.5 kg (e.g. chops, fillets)	Collect the number of units from selected container to meet laboratory sample size requirements.	500 g after removal of bone
D. Bulk frozen parts	Collect a frozen cross-section from selected container, or take muscle from one large part.	500 g
E. Retail packaged frozen/chilled parts, or individually wrapped units for wholesale	For large cuts, collect muscle from one unit or take sample from number of units to meet laboratory sample size requirements.	500 g after removal of bone
Ia. Group 030 (Mammalian Meats where MRL is expressed in carcass fat)		
A. Animals sampled at slaughter	See instructions under II. Group 031.	

Commodity	Instructions for collection	Minimum quantity required for laboratory sample
B. Other meat parts	Collect 500 g of visible fat, or sufficient product to yield 50-100 g of fat for analysis. (Normally 1.5-2.0 kg of product is required for cuts without trimmable fat).	Sufficient to yield 50-100 g of fat
II. Group 031 (Mammalian Fats)		
A. Large animals sampled at slaughter, usually weighing at least 10 kg	Collect kidney, abdominal, or subcutaneous fat from one animal.	500 g
B. Small animals sampled at slaughter ^(a)	Collect abdominal and subcutaneous fat from one or more animals.	500 g
C. Bulk fat tissue	Collect equal size portions from 3 locations in container.	500 g
III. Group 032 (Mammalian Edible Offal)		
A. Liver	Collect whole liver(s) or portion sufficient to meet laboratory sample size requirements.	400 - 500 g
B. Kidney	Collect one or both kidneys, or kidneys from more than one animal, sufficient to meet laboratory sample size requirement. Do not collect from more than one animal if size meets the low range for sample size.	250 - 500 g
C. Heart	Collect whole heart or ventricle portion sufficient to meet laboratory sample size requirement.	400 - 500 g
D. Other fresh/chilled or frozen, edible offal product	Collect portion derived from one animal unless product from more than one animal is required to meet laboratory sample size requirement. A cross-section can be taken from bulk frozen product.	500 g
IV. Group 036 (Poultry Meats)		
A. Whole carcass of large bird, typically weighing 2-3 kg or more (e.g. turkey, mature chicken, goose, duck)	Collect thigh, leg, and other dark meat from one bird.	500 g after removal of skin and bone
B. Whole carcass of bird typically weighing between 0.5-2.0 kg (e.g. young chicken, duckling, guinea fowl)	Collect thigh, legs, and other dark meat from 3-6 birds, depending on size.	500 g after removal of skin and bone
C. Whole carcasses of very small birds typically weighing less than 500 g (e.g. quail, pigeon)	Collect at least 6 whole carcasses	250 - 500 g of muscle tissue
D. Fresh/chilled or frozen parts		
1. Wholesale package		
a. Large parts	Collect an interior unit from a selected container.	500 g after removal of skin and bone
b. Small parts	Collect sufficient parts from a selected layer in the container	500 g after removal of skin and bone
2. Retail packaged		
	Collect a number of units from selected container to meet laboratory sample size requirement.	500 g after removal of skin and bone

Commodity	Instructions for collection	Minimum quantity required for laboratory sample
<p>IVa. Group 036 (Poultry Meats where MRLVD is expressed in carcass fat)</p> <p>A. Birds sampled at slaughter</p> <p>B. Other poultry meat</p>	<p>See instructions under V. Group 037</p> <p>Collect 500 g of fat or sufficient product to yield 50-100 g of fat. (Normally, 1.5-2.0 kg is required.)</p>	<p>500 g of fat or enough tissue to yield 50-100 g of fat</p>
<p>V. Group 037 (Poultry Fats)</p> <p>A. Birds sampled at slaughter</p> <p>B. Bulk fat tissue</p>	<p>Collect abdominal fat from 3-6 birds, depending on size.</p> <p>Collect equal size portions from 3 locations in container.</p>	<p>Sufficient to yield 50-100 g of fat</p> <p>500 g</p>
<p>VI. Group 038 (Poultry Edible Offal)</p> <p>A. Liver</p> <p>B. Other fresh/chilled or frozen edible offal product</p>	<p>Collect 6 whole livers or a sufficient number to meet laboratory sample requirement.</p> <p>Collect appropriate parts from 6 birds. If bulk frozen, take a cross-section from container.</p>	<p>250 - 500 g</p> <p>250 - 500 g</p>
<p>VII. Class E - Type 16 (Secondary Meat and Poultry Products)</p> <p>A. Fresh/chilled or frozen comminuted product of single species origin</p> <p>B. Group 080(Dried Meat Products)</p>	<p>Collect a representative fresh or frozen cross-section from selected container or packaged unit.</p> <p>Collect a number of packaged units in a selected container sufficient to meet laboratory sample size requirements.</p>	<p>500 g</p> <p>500 g, unless fat content is less than 5% and MRLVD is expressed on a fat basis. Then 1.5-2.0 kg is required.</p>
<p>VIII. Class E-Type 18 (Manufactured, single ingredient product of animal origin)</p> <p>A. Canned product (e.g. ham, beef, chicken), unit size of 1 kg or more</p> <p>B. Cured, smoked, or cooked product (e.g. bacon slab, ham, turkey, cooked beef), unit size of at least 1 kg</p>	<p>Collect one can from a lot. When unit size is large (greater than 2 kg), a representative sample including juices may be taken.</p> <p>Collect portion from a large unit (greater than 2 kg), or take whole unit, depending on size.</p>	<p>500 g, unless fat content is less than 5% and MRLVD is expressed on a fat basis. Then 1.5-2.0 kg is required.</p> <p>500 g, unless fat content is less than 5% and MRLVD is expressed on a fat basis. Then 1.5-2.0 kg is required.</p>
<p>IX. Class E - Type 19 (Manufactured, multiple ingredient, product of animal origin)</p> <p>A. Sausage and luncheon meat rolls with a unit size of at least 1 kg</p>	<p>Collect cross-section portion from a large unit (greater than 2 kg), or whole unit, depending on size.</p>	<p>500 g</p>

(a) When adhering fat is insufficient to provide a suitable sample, the sole commodity without bone, is analysed and the MRL will apply to the sole commodity.

Table B: Milk, eggs, dairy products

Commodity	Instructions for collection	Minimum quantity required for laboratory sample
I. Group 033 (Milks) Whole liquid milk raw, pasteurised, UHT & sterilized	In bulk. Mix thoroughly and immediately take a sample by means of a dipper. In retail containers. Take sufficient units to meet laboratory sample size requirements.	500 mL
II. Group 082 (Secondary Milk Products) A. Skimmed milk - skimmed and Semi-skimmed	As for whole liquid milk Bulk containers (barrels, drums). Mix the contents carefully and scrape adhering material from the sides and bottom of the container. Remove 2 to 3 litres, repeat the stirring and take a 500 mL sample.	500 mL
B. Evaporated milk - evaporated full cream & skimmed milk	Small retail containers. Take sufficient units to meet laboratory sample size requirements.	500 mL
C. Milk powders 1. Whole	Bulk containers. Pass a dry borer tube steadily through the powder at an even rate of penetration. Remove sufficient bores to make up a sample of 500 g. Small retail containers. Take sufficient units to meet laboratory sample size requirements..	500 g
2. Low fat	As for whole milk powders	500 g
III. Group 087 (Derived Milk Products) A. Cream - fresh, frozen & UHT; single, whipping, whipped, double & clotted	Bulk containers. Plunge to ensure thorough mixing moving the plunger from place to place avoiding foaming, whipping and churning. Take a 200 ml sample by means of a dipper. Small containers. Take sufficient units to meet laboratory sample size requirements.	200 mL
B. Butter - including whey butter and low fat spreads containing butterfat	In bulk. Take two cores or more of butter so that the minimum total sample weight is not less than 200 g In pats or rolls. For units weighing over 250 g divide into four and take opposite quarters. For units weighing less than 250 g take one unit as sample.	200 g
C. Butter oil - including anhydrous butte roil and anhydrous milk fat	Mix thoroughly and take a 200 g sample.	200 g

Commodity	Instructions for collection	Minimum quantity required for laboratory sample
<p>IV. Group 090 (Manufactured Milk Products - single ingredient)</p> <p>A. Yoghurt - natural, low fat through to full cream</p> <p>B. Cheeses - all varieties</p>	<p>Select number of units sufficient to meet laboratory requirements.</p> <p>Make two cuts radiating from the centre of the cheese if the cheese has a circular base, or parallel to the sides if the base is rectangular. The piece removed should meet the laboratory sample size requirements.</p> <p>For small cheeses and wrapped portions of cheese take sufficient units to meet laboratory sample requirements.</p>	<p>500 g</p> <p>200 g</p>
<p>V. Group 092 (Manufactured Milk Products - multi-ingredient)</p> <p>A. Dairy ice cream - only ice cream containing 5% or greater of milk fat</p> <p>B. Processed cheese preparations</p> <p>C. Flavoured yoghurt</p> <p>D. Sweetened condensed Milk</p>	<p>Select block or units sufficient to meet laboratory sample size requirements.</p> <p>Select units sufficient to meet laboratory sample size requirements.</p> <p>As for natural yoghurt.</p> <p>As for evaporated milk.</p>	<p>500 mL</p> <p>200 g</p> <p>500 g</p> <p>500 mL</p>
<p>VI. Group 039 (Eggs and Egg Products)</p> <p>A. Liquid and frozen eggs</p> <p>B. Dried egg products</p> <p>C. Shell eggs</p> <p> 1. Retail packages</p> <p> 2. Commercial cases</p>	<p>Use sample schedule. Sub sample size will be 250 mL liquid or 500 mL packed shavings from aseptic drillings into containers.</p> <p>Use sample schedule. For containers of 500 g or less or 25 mL or less, collect a minimum of 2 units per sub sample. For containers of 500 g to 10 kg select 1 unit per sub sample. For containers of 10 kg or more collect 1 kg from each unit sampled. Collect with aseptic technique.</p> <p>Use sample schedule. Sub sample size is 12 eggs.</p> <p>For 15 cases or less collect 12 eggs from each case, minimum of 24 eggs. For 16 or more cases collect 12 eggs from 15 random cases.</p>	<p>500 g</p> <p>500 g</p> <p>500 g or 10 whole eggs</p> <p>500 g or 10 whole eggs</p>

PRIORITY LIST OF VETERINARY DRUGS FOR EVALUATION OR RE-EVALUATION BY JECFA

Name of the Compound	Questions(s) to be answered	Data Availability	Proposed by	Comments
Monepantel	Request to establish ADI and recommend MRLs in sheep (tissues).	Company has advised that a data package is available that meets the JECFA requirements.	Australia	Registered in New Zealand.
Monensin	Request to re-evaluate MRL in cattle (liver).	Company has advised that a data package is available that meets the JECFA requirements.	United States	Currently recommended to CAC at Step 5/8 by CCRVDF.
Derquantel	Request to establish ADI and recommend MRLs in sheep (tissues).	Company has advised that a data package will be available in September 2009 that meets the JECFA requirements.	United States	Not currently registered by a national authority.
Ractopamine	Review residue depletion data for pig (tissues).	Available from China.	China	